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CHAIRMAN GANNON: The House Judiciary

Committee will come to order. This meeting is to conduct hearings on the enforcement of existing gun laws.

Our first witnesses are the Honorable Edward Rendell, Mayor Of the City of Philadelphia, and Commissioner John Timmoney, Commassioner for the Philadelphia Police Department.

Mayor Rendell and Commissioner Timmoney, you may proceed when you're ready.

MAYOR RENDELL: Thank You, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

Let me begin by thanking you for what has been over a year-long consideration of ways to curb gun violence in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This is my second time testifying before the full committee, and I've testified before subcommittees on this very same issue.

If you will recall my testimony last year when $I$ testified on behalf of House Bill 46, Representative Cohen and Representative Evans' bill, you will recall what $I$ said then, and $I$ wll repeat in briefer form today, that $I$ believe the answer to gun violence does not come in one
simple package. There is no silver bullet, and there's no ideological correctness to this issue.

The NRA and law enforcement officials who say that we must have better enforcement to our existing laws and that judges must, in fact, hand out severe penalties for people that violate gun laws, those individuals are absolutely correct.

We must have increased law enforcement both in its effectiveness and its efficiency and in the results produced by our court system in dealing severe penalties to those individuals who violate our gun laws.

But to people that say that that alone can't be the same answer, handgun control advocates, many people on this committee, myself, our own great District Attorney, Lynne Abraham, we say that that's one approach and a very needed approach to the problem, but in the end we must also find a way to restrict access to handguns so that Juveniles and prior felons and people with criminal records cannot easily receive handguns through elicit gun trafficking. We are also correct.

And many of us advocate for both of these steps. And there are people who say that the answer to gun violence lıes in educating our children, in prevention programs, in finding alternatives to keep kids from turning to crime in the first place, improving economic opportunity for young people as they enter thelr teenage years, those people. Again, many of us also fall into that category. Those people are undoubtedly correct.

I note today's hearing focuses on ways to step-up law enforcement, to use existing laws and new laws like Attorney General Fisher's suggestion to strengthen law enforcement's response to gun violence. I will cover that $u n$ my remarks.

I want you to know at the outset that it is my strong belief, a belief grounded in 20 years un law enforcement, a belief grounded in eight years as the elected mayor of the largest city in the Commonwealth, a city that has the highest percentage of gun violence $1 n$ its overall crime rate, higher than any other city in America, that we have to do all of these things. We have to take action. I'm callıng an
the most respectiul way $I$ can for this committee to move House Bill 46 to the floor of the House, and let's begin an attack on all fronts to reduce gun violence in the Commonwealth.

As I said last year, and $I$ will move through this quickly, the statistics in Philadelphia and in Pennsylvania are chilling. Between 1988 and 1997 deaths by furearms rose 61 percent in Pennsylvania and 102 percent in Philadelphia.

We have gone from a high of 414 homicides in 1996, a high in this decade, of which 81 percent were via firearm, to thus year we will come in at around 285 homicldes, a tribute to the work of Commissioner Timmoney and his police department. But still of the 285 homicides, 80 percent are projected to be as a result of firearms.

That's also true in Philadelphia for robberıes. Of 12,000 robberies in 1997, 53 percent were at the point of a gun. of 6, 100 aggravated assaults, 2,300 were at the polnt of a gun.

Going back to robberies, one-third of those gun-point robberies were committed by
juveniles using firearms.
For those of you who think that this is only a Philadelphia problem, $I$ want to just show you again - we submitted these before, but $I$ want to show you again a map of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

In light blue are counties where commission of these crimes by firearm increased from 1 percent to 99 percent. In dark blue, and shockingly in most parts of the middle of the state, dark blue indicates that these crimes by firearm Increased by over 100 percent.

Take a look at the map by homicide by
firearm. This is a change between'96 and'97.
Note the dark blue right in the middle of what we refer to as the "T". So for those of you that think that this is an urban problem only, thas is clearly evidence to the contrary.

Pennsylvania robberies by firearms, same period, same thing. Light blue. Dark blue. Not just Philadelphia, not just Pittsburgh, but throughout the entire Commonwealth. Assaults by firearms, same picture, light blue 1 to 99 percent, dark blue, 100 percent.

Now, over the course of time, the last two decades, we $\ln$ Pennsylvania and you the Pennsylvania legislature have taken strong steps to deal with all violence and particularly gun violence.

My first year as District Attorney my office was asked, and we did enthusiastıcally, draft a new Death Penalty Bill for the Commonwealth. The Death Penalty Bill was passed by the legislature in 1978, has been on the books and hundreds of Pennsylvania juries have returned death penalty verdicts. Not all of them, but almost all of them involving death as a result of the use of firearms.

In 1982, in my second term as District Attorney, I drafted - and many of the people on this Committee or the senate Judiciary Committee sponsored a mandatory sentencing bill for people who commat the five most serlous felonies with the use of a firearm. It called for a mandatory manimum sentence of at least five years.

The bill in most parts of the state has been effective. In Philadelphia its effect has been muted because of the response of some, and by no means all, but some of our judiciary.

With gun offenses in Philadelphia, convictions have almost doubled. The number of jail terms netted out by these convictions has Increased over the last few years by 120 percent.

All of the tough law enforcement
weapons that you as a legislature have given us have paid off. Consider a statistic that is almost unbelievable. In 1993, there were 26,000 intimates in our state penitentiary system. In 1996, in just $31 / 2$ years, that number increased 30 percent to 34,000 inmates.

So we are taking strong law enforcement measures. We are sentencing people to longer periods of time. Our prison population, those that are sent to prison for the most serious offense, often gun violence, has increased by 30 percent. And yet these figures still exist. This pattern still grows and grows and grows. Now, in 1995 introduced by Senator Fumo and supported by many people here, section 6111-G made it a felony to knowingly and intentionally sell or deliver a gun if he or she has reason to believe that the gun is intended to be used in the commission of a crime.

This was very important legislation.

I'm going to asking Commissioner Timmoney to talk to you about the problems that even the stepped-up efforts of the ATF Task Force is having. They are getting better results, but the problem they have in enforcing and making a provable case are: 1, to get someone to testify. Even with tracing, we trace a gun to a multiple purchaser in a gun store as we did in Wılliamsport where someone purchased 11 guns in one day and one of those guns was used in a particularly vicious crime here, attempted murder of a police officer. We can show you why it is impossible - and $I^{\prime} m$ sure District Attorney Abraham will talk about this -- to even build a case where the buyer who went into the gun store, John Jones, legal buyer, no impediments to buyıng on his record, he buys 11 handguns that day - because that's allowed in Pennsylvania. It $\ln \mathrm{s}^{\prime} \mathrm{t}$ allowed in Virginia. It isn't allowed in

Maryland. It isn't allowed in south Carolina. But it is allowed in Pennsylvania. He bought them in Williamsport. He sold them on the streets of Philadelphia months later.

He sold them without telling the people
he sold them to his name. He sold them wearing dark glasses and probably a cap pulled down heavily over his ears.

The person that bought the gun who later uses it to commit a murder, even $I f$ we were willing to make a deal with a murderer to testify against someone who sold him a gun, the chances that the murderer would be able to identify that person are almost nil.

And to take the person who bought the gun and say, hey, your gun was used in a murder in Philadelphia, he will say, gee, it was stolen. You didn't report it was stolen. I forgot. The police never catch anybody anyway. I didn't know it was stolen. I kept it in my house and, gosh, someone must have come in and stolen It. I kept it in my car. I had no idea it was stolen. It is almost impossible to lank that person up.

But your statute, Senator Fumo's statute, says that we also have to prove that the individual had a reasonable belief that the gun is intended to be used in the commission of a crime.

You will hear from experts in criminal
law lake District Attorney Abraham and District Attorney stiles that proving that that type of knowledge, imputing that type of knowledge is very difficult because when a kid buys a gun from a store purchaser on the street, he doesn't say to the store purchaser, hey, buddy, I need that gun because $I^{\prime} m$ going to rob that corner grocery store.

If he says anything he says, boy, it's rough out here. I need this gun to defend myself. Bingo. No prosecution.

Attorney General Fisher's excellent legislation, which $I$ know has been endorsed by the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Associatıon, excellent legislation, it simply strengthens the penalties. It doesn't make them mandatory. We still would have problems with judges enforcıng them, but we should do them.

We should pass General Fisher's bill
because it sends a message. And some judges may choose to use those increased penalties in a way that sends a message to individuals which hopefully deters others. That alone, even combined with what you did in 1995, isn't going to solve our problems.

United states Attorney stiles and
District Attorney Abraham will tell you, and I'll leave it to them to give you the full report, that in our efforts to have stronger law enforcement, we entered into an agreement, the City, the Police Department and the District Attorney's office, to take cases where people with felonies who were found to have guns who if tried in the Phıladelphia Courts might get an average of 4 months in prison, but in Federal Courts the Federal guidelines call for 59 months in prison.

We have begun a program -- and we are the first big city in America and the second cıty after Richmond, Virginia to enter into a program

- and the NRA endorsed the program, and chalienged me to do $1 t . \quad$ And we did it because $I$ thought it was right. And it has had results. It has had significant results. But, again, not enough.

One gun a month legislation we believe is not the total answer, but we believe is a very important and necessary component of what we do.

In Pennsylvania, 9 percent of the purchasers buy 30 percent of the guns. The ATF
will tell you that less than 1 percent of guns are reported stolen. Yet we now know that multiple purchasers in Philadelphia - of all the guns that commit crimes, we can trace close to 25 percent of those guns to multiple purchasers.

Another 20 percent we cannot trace
because of obliterated serial numbers. But any police officer or ATF will tell you when the serial numbers are obliterated, they are oblıterated because it is a result of gun trafficking and multiple purchases.

So almost half of the crime guns used are as a result of multiple purchasers. That's
.4 percent of all of our purchases in
Philadelphia and the Philadelphia area.
In 96 we had 25,000 purchasers. 103
of them were involved in sales that would be prescribed by one gun a month. That's. 4 percent. But 5,000 of the 38,000 guns actually purchased, 5,000 of those would have been taken off the street. Those are the guns that are used to commit crimes.

There is no question that one gun a month is desperately needed in this

Commonwealth. There is no question that
stepped-up law enforcement is desperately needed in this Commonwealth.

I commend General Fisher's bill to you. It should be passed. I commend House Bill 46 to you. It should be passed.

And lastly $I$ always hear, the people of Pennsylvania don't want gun control legislation. I believe they want legislation to curb gun violence. In fact, as you recall, we used a Republican polling firm, the American Vıewpoint, to do a poll.

That poll found that in Pennsylvania 71 percent of the people statewide would favor legislation to reduce handgun trafficking by limiting handgun purchases to one per month. Seventy-one to 24 it was favored. Shockingly, in rural and suburban areas, 76 to 25 percent it was favored.

I know that people in the legislature never consider voting on whether it will help them or hurt them in reelection, but we did ask that as well. Would you be more or less likely to vote to reelect your state legislator if he or she supported this legislatıon to reduce handgun trafficking by limiting handgun purchases to one
per month. Seventy-one percent statewide saud that they would be more likely. Sixteen percent said they would be less likely.

Twelve guns a year is enough for any law-abiding Pennsylvanian. Strengthen law enforcement. Make it easier for law enforcement to crack down on people who violate our laws. Pass House Bill 46 , one gun a month.

Commissioner Timmoney.
COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to come here today to discuss this very important issue of gun violence.

We started this year, 1999, with random gunfire in south Philadelphia to bring in the new year where a young 11-year-old boy was shot in the head. Just two nights ago a man in west Philadelphia was shot at 42 times and killed.

Philadelphia, as the Mayor said, owns the dubious distinction of having consistently 80, 81, 82 percent of its homicides committed by guns. It is the highest of the ten largest cıties in America.

There are two main reasons for this dubious distinction. One is the legislatıve
framework that allows easy access to guns. Two, the lenient fashion in which courts deal with the gun offenders.

I don't think anybody will argue with the proposition that convicts and kids should not have access to guns. Unfortunately, as a result of loopholes in the laws, such access is easy and available.

Let me give you some examples, and the Mayor mentioned some, from our ATF Philadelphia Polıce Department Task Force. The most obvious one is the store purchase where so-called legitimate gun purchasers are limited to the number of guns they purchase by the amount of cash they have in their pocket.

It's quite common and very lucrative for a legitimate purchaser to purchase firearms, particularly handguns, in bulk. These guns can then be sold on the streets of Philadelphia to the highest bidder. The seller then clalms the guns are stolen and then pockets the profits.

In addition to the profits driven by store purchasers, many individuals with clean records buy guns for family members or boyfrıends who are prohibited from such purchases.

Our office, working with the ATF, recently conducted an operation at a gun show outside the City where we observed a young woman who bought several guns that were picked out by their boyfriends. Those guns are then taken back down to Philadelphia. A check of the boyfriends revealed all of them had records and were unable to purchase the guns.

Simılar illegal gun purchases take place at flea markets. We have the Pennsylvania Instant Check system that allows the immediate purchase of handguns when the applicant provides a Pennsylvania driver's license or state Identification card.

All you need to do is get a phoney drıver's license or put down fictitious information on the identification card and you can get guns with no problem.

For example, the Instant Check does not have access to the Philadelphia Active Warrant System. You can't check. It is not on-line. You can't check to see if somebody is wanted on a warrant.

The Instant Check System cannot access Philadelphia juvenile records prior to 1995. Yet
people with a juvenile record prior to 1995, depending on the charge and conviction, wall be prohibited by law of making such a purchase.

Another sign of the ease at which legal guns can be obtained in Pennsylvania is the recent appearance of Pennsylvania as a leading source state for legal guns to other states.

Traditionally, this dubious distinction belonged to southern states. In the last three or four years on ATF's national records, we started to see Pennsylvania become a source state, and now in the last year come into the top ten of the source states. And the bar is going up as opposed to going down.

As southern states, as the Mayor mentioned, have begun to restrict and pass sensıble legrslation, we have the dubious distension of filling the void created by the laws in some southern states.

At the end of October, the Philadelphia
Police Department made 3,648 gun arrests. We have already seized over 4,000 .

We will at the end of this year seize about 5,000 guns. Let me give you some point of reference.

In New York City in 1990, New York Caty has its highest rate of homicude ever.

Twenty-three hundred people were killed in New York Cıty in 1990.

In 1990, the New York City Police Department in its worst year confiscated 18,000 guns. The Philadelphia Police Department, we will come in at 285 homicides, the lowest homicide rate in 15 years. A pretty good year.

The Philadelphia Police Department will confiscate the equivalent of 25,000 guns. So in our best year we have confiscated the equivalent of 25,000 guns as compared to New York in uts worst year where they confiscated 18,000. The problem, again, easy access.

One of the strategies we are trying in Philadelphia, the Mayor mentioned it, is Operation Cease-Fire which is a collaborate effort between the local and federal prosecutors to arrest, indict, and then prosecute people engaged $1 n$ gun activities and gun violence.

To date, with almost a year in
operation, there have been 200 cases, half of which involve gun traffickers that have been indicted and will be prosecuted by Mr. stiles'
office.
It's a step in the right direction.
It's a real good step in the right direction, but ュt doesn't help all our problems in this area.

We need to effectively curb the supply of guns and the easy access to guns. We need that plus a strong law enforcement. Law enforcement, $I$ think. $I$ can say, we're holding up our end of the bargain. We probably need to do a better job, and the courts need to do a better Job. The legislature has to chip an with some reasonable legislation. And a first good step would be one gun a month.

I keep hearing the Mayor heckled as being somehow agaunst the constitution. When I go to community groups, no matter where $I$ go in Philadelphia, when $I$ explain to them one gun a month 12 guns a year, if you have 144 guns after 12 years, if you think of it, if you are married you can double that. People just shake their head, yet this man is constantly being attacked as being somehow against the constitution.

We in law enforcement we need your
help. It is dangerous in the streets of Philadelphia for the average person. It is also
dangerous for the Police Department. We are here to plead, to beg, to cajole, whatever is necessary, to get the attention of America. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank You,
Commissioner Timmoney. Any questions?
Representative Cohen.
REPRESENTATIVE COHEN: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I'm Lita Cohen, State Representative from Montgomery County.

Mayor Rendell, thank you for touting House Bill 46. As you and $I$ know, at your urging I am the prime sponsor of this Bill. I certainly agree that it is necessary in our efforts to stop the wrong people from doing the wrong things with guns.

Commissioner Timmoney used the word cajole. I think we'll have to turn it back to you and beg and plead with you to do a very quick lobbying job because as $I$ understand it presented to us next week will be the amendment that's coming from the senate concerning restricting municipalities from suing the gun manufacturers. In addition to stopping us from having a seat at the table, as we have in the tobacco
settlement, it also would then restrict us from sharing in any monetary settlements.

I shutter at the thought of, for example, our police and our law enforcement agencies receiving legitimate guns for legıtimate law enforcement purposes and having them be defective and injure or explode and severely hurt our own law enforcement agencies. So I think -and would be restricted from any kind of a lawsuit under this current bill that's going to come to us.

I urge you to lobby the Legislature of the dangers of this kind of action, not so much for the single purpose of protecting our own law enforcement agencies.

MAYOR RENDELL: Very quickly, I
obviously agree with you. Although we have chosen not to see that yet, because I have played a central role in trying to bring about successful negotiations with the gun manufacturers for voluntary restriction, those negotiations have not produced very much fruit.

I don't know what my successor will do, but he should have that option. You don't even restrict people from suing tobacco companies.

You don't restrict people from suing automobıle companies.

What a message it would send if the Pennsylvania legislature with statistics like this in a poll on one gun a month banned the right to sue, banned our right to sue as a police department, banned individuals' rights and municipalities' rights to sue for any reason. Why single this out?

If $I$ were other industries, I would be knocking on your door to pass similar legislation. And you are going to be hard put to explain why you did it for the gun industry and didn't do $1 t$ for any other industries, didn't do it for the chemical industry, didn't do it for people who produced tractor-trailers, for people that produce all sorts of pharmaceuticals and drugs. I would be knocking on your door if $I$ were another industry shortly after you did it.

It's insanity. It sends out awful and terrible messages. It is not helping us get at this problem.

We have a problem. You don't need me to put up those maps of pennsylvania again we have a problem in this state. That would be the
absolute wrong answer.
Thank you for reminding me. We will get out something as quickly as we can.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representatıve Roberts.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Mr. Commıssioner for being here.

I don't really have a question, but to follow up on what Representative cohen just saıd, It's no accident that this Bill is in the Senate. Having passed the senate Judiciary Committee, it could go to the senate floor any trme and we could pass it or concur in it depending on how it comes to us when we are in session Monday and Tuesday and perhaps Wednesday of next week.

This ls a national effort by the National Rifle Association nationwide. Somethang like 14 states have already passed some version of a bill which would prevent municrpalities and political subdivisions from suing gun manufacturers, which for me tells me the NRA is simply an arm of the manufacturing powers in this country.

And it seems to me, although $I$ agree that you are perfectly correct in you're tryang to negotiate with the National Rifle Association for voluntary restraints, that whatever kind of arm's-length negotiation you thought you had is all over.

Whatever you are saying to them, they are in Harrisburg and they are running this thing this month.

MAYOR RENDELL: I agree with you. What's happening in other states is just very disheartening, very disheartening.

REPRESENTATIVE ROBERTS: I would expect that it would not have a difficult time passing with a number of us here voting no and making our speeches. I think the Governor's already indicated that he will sign it.

I would suggest that tomorrow is the day to file your suit.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Williams.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. Your show-and-tell, Mr. Mayor, of the gun deaths and crimes that crimes committed with handguns is very telling.

I agree that - I've been working to try to get something like that drafted where we would have special courts and special sentencing like the Attorney General's, but his is a suggested sentencing.

I would like you to talk a little bit about how we might be able to convince the rest of the state and the DA's Association which is not in favor so much of special courts for people that have already committed crimes who have committed another crime with a gun, how we might be able to convince them of its value.

MAYOR RENDELL: It's been a while since I've been a district attorney, so I'll let District Attorney Abraham field that.

I think special courts have some value. When we did our very effectave career criminal program, we had a special group of courts try career criminal cases. It significantly enhanced results.

I will say, though, for example, in General Fisher's bill there is no reason why -well, I know the legislature can't in and of itself raise sentencing guidelines. It can only make recommendations to the Guidelines

Commission.
But adopting General Fisher's bill and giving stronger penalties without either raising the guidelines or making the sentence mandatory really makes it a toothless tiger.

The General is doing all that he can. I don't mean to be critical of ham. Only increased guidelines or mandatory sentences are going to ensure that you are going to get the type of results that you want.

And even as the Commissioner said and I'm sure the $D A$ is going to tell you, even then, even when we have mandatory sentences, many of our judges find just the most fallacious ways of getting around the mandatory sentences.

We have gun-point robberies in Philadelphia that are found by judges to be only theft simply because they want to avold giving the mandatory minimum of five years.

The District Attorney, I'm sure, can tell you legions about that.

I will talk to the DA's Association. I
know you'll have a chance to talk to our great District Attorney. Raising guidelines or mandatory sentences $I$ think are hand and glove
with special courts.
REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I feel if we can't prosecute the way that we need to, then we are not able to enforce the existing laws and we will have a much more difficult time doing new laws. Thank you. CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Petrarca.

REPRESENTATIVE PETRARCA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mayor, we have gone over this before. In my part of westmoreland county, the schools were closed this past Monday for huntıng season, the first day of hunting season.

My district -- my overwhelmingly
democratic district $I$ believe is adamantly opposed to gun control. I don't support gun control and $I$ will not vote for gun control.

My question is, what happens - what do I tell my constituents - - what happens when one gun a month doesn't work? Where do we go from here? And what can we do as a Legislature? And what can $I$ do as a legislator that does not support gun control to help you?

You talk about the problems with

Judges, liberal judges in Philadelphia. I don't believe that is that much of a problem in other areas of this Commonwealth.

What can we do sort of short of gun control legislation, those of us that don't support that, to help you?

MAYOR RENDELL: I agree you don't have the same problems with judges in other parts of the state. You get much better sentencing responses to people that use guns.

Having said that, you don't want me to show you the map again. My guess is that Westmoreland County has had significant increases in

- and I'll bring out the maps again - - gun violence robberies, gun violence homicides, gun violence assaults. It is not stopping.

You have judges that basically do their job. So I'm sort of confounded about what to tell you.

I will also tell you that one gun a month only applies to handguns. The vast, vast, vast majority of hunters in the state of Pennsylvania do not hunt with handguns, they hunt with long guns. And even those that choose to
hunt with handguns, they can buy 12 a year.
They can have a separate handgun for hunting every day they go out hunting for almost two weeks. And they can rotate. I don't know how long hunting season is, but they can have a separate handgun for every day.

This doesn't infringe on the rights of any law-abiding citizen, No. 1. No. 2, it will work. It has worked.

Did you hear the Commissioner?
Virgınıa used to be the No. 1 exporting state $1 n$ the eastern part of this country. It no longer is because they can't have multiple purchases. We are becoming -- we've got to stop it.

If you look at this as legislation that somehow affects the rights of hunters or somehow affects the rights of a Pennsylvanian who wants to carry a gun to feel secure on his or her person or in his house, you're wrong. Twelve a year. He has unlimited long guns and 12 handguns a year.

We have to actually face up to the problem and start thinking in common sense. We can't -- we can't -- I don't mean -- we have to talk, I think, sense to our constituents and say,
hey, folks, this has nothing to do with you. This has nothing to do with you. Your life is not going to change. If you want to buy a handgun, you can buy a handgun once a month. You can have 12 a year.

If you want to hunt with that handgun, fine. If you are a hunter and you use long guns, you can buy 20 a month. But we do draw lines. Pennsylvanıa doesn't allow you to buy a bazooka for hunting. It doesn't allow you to buy a bazooka for defending your own home. One gun a month is a reasonable line. You have all of the good judges. We have the laws on the books. Pass General Fisher's law. Make $1 t$ mandatory. I would make it mandatory I'd make it a mandatory year. You'll have to burld a whole lot more prisons, but $I$ would make it mandatory. A felon with a gun, one year in prison, mandatory.

Get ready to build the prisons, but make it mandatory. At the same time restrict access in a way that doesn't hurt an individual. Don't be afraid -- and $I$ don't mean you, but as a body we shouldn't be afraid of the NRA. The NRA lobbied hard against Brady, yet
polls showed that 65 percent of their membership favored the Brady Bill.

They spent tons of money trying to defeat the Brady Bill. Sixty-five percent of their own membership was for the Brady Bill.

I hope you took a look at the poll. I know $I$ gave everyone a copy in Harrisburg last year. Rural voters favor one gun a month. Rural voters would be more lakely to support a legislator who passed one gun a month.

One gun a month is reasonable. People aren't dumb. They understand what we're are trying do. They understand that 12 guns a year is enough for them.

I know you to be a thoughtful and extremely bright legislator on a whole host of issues. It makes me sad. It makes me sad to hear you say those things.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative
Kenney.
REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Mayor, Mr. Timmoney, thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Commissioner Timmoney, you mentıoned

3,600 gun arrests, I believe, in the city of Philadelphia.

How many of those were illegally-owned guns? Or were they all illegally-owned guns?

COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: Some were legally owned.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Were they
sımply breaking gun laws or were these criminals that dıdn't purchase these guns legally anyway?

COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: The vast majority got them illegally or you couldn't have a situation where you have a parolee who has an argument with a neighbor and shoots the neighbor.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: That gun is seized?

COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: Yeah.
REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: He was legal?
He got it legally?
COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: The girlfruend purchased it and gave it to her boyfriend.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Let me ask you
this. Is that 3,600 guns or individual persons?
COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: Individual
persons that have a BOFA charge. They may have a
robbery charge also.
REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: What happened to those? Were they put in jail?

COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: I have no idea. Judge McCaffery and District Attorney Abraham?

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: One of the comments that the Commissioner made is not only access, but leniency of the court system.

I represent law-abiding citizens $1 n$ Northeast Philadelphia that play by the rules. Our question is, if you are illegally - if you break the law - - and Mr. Mayor mentioned burld prisons. I have never had one constituent ever complain in my office about building prisons and locking criminals up. I think that's what we should do.

My concern is those 3,600 individuals, is the system letting them on the street which then has an additional threat? Not only did they have access to the guns maybe illegally, but now you are imposing an additional threat by allowing them - slapping them on the wrist and saying go get another illegal gun and do whatever you do?

COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: There's some of
that. There's also an issue of leadership. For example, you would get some attitudes within the State of Pennsylvania that guns - guns are seen as okay in the state of Pennsylvania, and as many as you want.

That attitude, I think, focuses down into the attitude of judges also. You can get them easy. What's the big deal?

I think if you put up reasonable legislation, for example one gun a month, and that you're serious about $1 t$, and that message comes from the stop, that also filtered down to judges and their thinking.

We've clearly got to beef up that area. Just as difficult is the issue of access. With access, criminals and kids get thelr hands on guns. It is too easy to get guns in the state of Pennsylvania, far to easy.

MAYOR RENDELL: I know. You are absolutely right. There is too much leniency. The DA is going to tell you about that chapter and verse. There was too much leniency when $I$ was DA a long time ago. Judge McCaffery can tell you about that.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Following up

Representative Petrarca and his questions, okay, we do one gun a month. These 3,600 people are still out on the street because you don't put them in jail for breaking that one gun a month. I'm for building more prisons.

MAYOR RENDELL: Then $I$ suggest you amend General Fisher's Bill and make it a mandatory flat one-year prison sentence. Again, our judges, and the DA will tell you, will find a way to get around it or they will try. Amend the Bill and make it mandatory one year,

Representative Kenney. That would be the best way to proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Commissioner, getting back to that 3,600 number, do we know how many of those were sent to jail? Somewhere, not that you need it today.

COMMISSIONER TIMMONEY: I can get that information to the committee.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Thank YOu.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representatıve Dermody.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Good morning, Mr. Mayor. Thank you, Commissioner for appearing before us this morning.

I'd just like to talk a little bit about your testimony regarding mandatory sentences and the sentencing guidelines.

I've been on the Sentencing Commission since I've been in the Legislature, and I'm now Chairman of the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing Relief where we come up with the guidelines for various crimes.

General Fisher's Bill would enhance guidelınes for firearms violations which makes some sense to me. But $I$ do have a problem with when you mentioned leniency. I don't see that. I was in the DA's office for six years in Allegheny county. I don't see the leniency that you talked about elsewhere in the commonwealth that we see in Philadelphia.

I'm not a big fan of mandatory
sentences. Even as a prosecutor there was always the case where we didn't want to implement the mandatory. I didn't. The DA didn't. The judge didn't. The victim didn't. Yet we are facing this mandatory sentence that the Legislature, who knows nothing about the crime that was committed, says we have to impose.

I guess what it gets to is we continue
where we are making criminal justice policy based on problems that appear to be only in Philadelphia.

I think throughout the state if there's a firearm violation, the guidelines are adhered to as they are today. If they are enhanced, so be it. We will have to take a look at that. The judges will have to enforce and follow the gundelines and be forced to at least file a form that says why they deviated from those guidelines.

I just wonder if there's another way besudes driving state-wide policy because there's a problem here in Philadelphia.

I don't think a mandatory sentence is the answer anyway. Go ahead.

MAYOR RENDELL: When I was DA - - and now you're forcing me to put my DA hat on, I never had a problem with a mandatory sentencing blll. Because if $I$ thought there was an exception, a 77-year-old woman is on a porch and being harassed by juveniles throwing rocks at her, etc. She takes a gun out and fires a shot in their general direction to warn them. That's technically a violation that might trigger
mandatory sentencing.

I always had the guts not to prosecute that case. That's what preosecutorial discretion is all about. We vest prosecutors with discretion in every crime.

I had the discretion when $I$ was a prosecutor to bring charges of murder one or voluntary manslaughter. So I had the same type of discretion built into the law.

That's the way that the cases that are aberrations where mandatory sentences shouldn't be applied, that's the way we made sure we don't have those aberrations, prosecutorial discretion.

You're asking us a difficult question, ュf 1 t is a Philadelphia problem. I don't know what the answer is. I might suggest merit selection of judges. That's another difficult issue for all of you to deal with.

Again, you don't have a problem with sentencing, Representative Dermody, you have a problem with increasing gun violence.

Let me say that in the rest of the State you don't have a problem with leniency, you don't have a problem with enforcement of the
laws, although we still can do better as Commissioner Timmoney, but again, $I$ won't bring out those charts, you have a problem with increasing gun violence, homicides, robberıes and assaults. You have a serious problem.

So you can't sit there and blindly tell us that everything is okay in Westmoreland county or everything is okay in Allegheny county. It may be okay in the way you are dealing with the end product, but it $u s n^{\prime} t$ okay at the front part because your rates are going up, too. It is time for us to act in Pennsylvania.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Mr. Mayor. You just said that, you know, trying to reduce homicides, robberies and assaults, which is why it is my impression that most of those crimes are not committed with weapons.

MAYOR RENDELL: I can only talk about Philadelphia. Maybe the U.S. Attorney's Office of ATF can talk about this. Roughly 40 percent, if you lump the ones we can trace back to multiple purchases and put in the percentage of guns we can't trace because their serial numbers are obliterated. That doesn't happen by accident, Mr. Chairman.

Roughly 40 percent of the crime guns in this county come from multiple purchases. Remember, every multiple purchase is legal.

John Jones, no criminal record, walks in and buys twelve 9 millimeter pistols, automatic pistols. He is doing it - we all know why he's doing it. It is as clear as the nose on our face why he's doing it. He's going to take them and he's going to sell them. Not immediately anymore because they have goteen wiser and smarter as the police and ATF have become more effective. So 40 percent of the guns that are used for crimes, 40 percent come from multaple purchases.

Remember, we are restricting - - I don't want to pull out my charts again. We are restricting 130 purchases out of the 25,000 that are made. That's what one gun a month would do.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Isn't it true that even under existing law, if $I$ sell a weapon to someone - -

MAYOR RENDELL: On the street?
CHAIRMAN GANNON: On the street. The
law now requires me to go through a dealer and also to do an instant check, so $I$ have broken
existing law by selling a weapon. I've already broken the law for selling a weapon without following the existing law. I sold that illegally.

MAYOR RENDELL: I want to go back to my original comment about senator Fumo's legislation. No. 1, it is virtually impossıble to prove that there was even the physical act of a sale because John Jones who buys those twelve 9 millimeter pistols, he goes a month later into the streets of Philadelphia and he's wearing dark glasses. He sells at night. He's probably wearing a ski cap pulled way down over his head. There's almost no visible way he can be identified. He sells it to some 16-year-old kid or some 32 -year-old multiple robbery-convicted felon.

Even if we trace it back to him, and he may have already obliterated the serial number, but even if we trace it back to him, how do we prove it was him who sold it?

The police bring him in and interrogate him. He may often say, I have nothing to say because we can't force people to say anything, or he says, it was stolen. Why didn't you report
it? Gee, I don't think the police ever get any of that stuff back. Boom.
secondly, under your laws we have to prove that he had reason to believe that a young man or the 33 -year-old felon he sold it to was going to commit a crime.

As I said, if there's ever any dıscourse at all, the discourse is usually, it is tough out here, I need a gun to protect myself or family. Bingo. That's the problem. That's the problem.

You can't just do it by law enforcements. Again, remember what $I$ said at the beginning. I'm all for every measure you can use to strength it. I'm obviously too much of a hawk because $I$ think mandatory sentences would be a great idea and many of you don't in the Fısher Bュll.

We've got to do both. It is
inescapable. We've got to do both. It's time. We owe $1 t$ to the people that are getting killed and maimed. We owe it to the old people who are afraid to go out of their homes.

I will tell you most respectfully there are old people that are afraid to go out of their
homes other than just in Philadelphia. I mean, this isn't the canvas of Alice in Wonderland anymore. Things have changed. Maybe it never was, but it certainly isn't any more in 1999. As we enter the new millennium, it's not.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: It seems to me that
the reason he was wearing a ski mask and dark sunglasses and wanted his identity hidden was he was breaking the law. That wouldn't change.

MAYOR RENDELL: That wouldn't change.
No one who is breaking the law wants to be found out. Wouldn't you agree or disagree that perhaps deterring someone, a strong deterrent from somebody getting a bright idea of purchasing weapons with the $1 d e a$ that I'm going to go into Philly or Pittsburgh and sell them out of the trunk of my car would be far more effective or far more towards reaching the goal that we all want to reach of reducing gun violence than putting another page to Title 18 ?

MAYOR RENDELL: When you talk about deterrents, he's got a legal right to buy those twelve 9 millimeters. Gosh, we can't get you all to restrict the purchase of handguns to 12 a year. We can't ever restrict the purchase of
handguns any other way. So he's got a legal raght to buy that.

How can we deter him? Again, the ATF and Police Task Force each year locks up more and more for this type of trafficking.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: That brings me to my point. If $I^{\prime} m$ going to go up and buy 11 or 12 guns because $I$ have my own reasons, that's my right, and $I$ have no illegal intent or any agenda for dealing with those guns illegally, $I$ don't care who knows.

If I'm buying 12 guns to sell on the streets of Philadelphia, $I$ don't want anybody to know about that.

My thought is, you are deterring somebody that has an illegal intent, but you are not deterring anyone who says, I don't care who knows that $I^{\prime}$ ve made multiple purchases because I collect them or whatever reason.

MAYOR RENDELL: One gun a month has a collectors exception. Let's assume just for a second -- $I$ know there are other witnesses, particularly Judge McCaffery has to get back to court. Let's just assume - - because this is interesting - let's assume - you sald there
might be a reasonable explanation for why someone would want to buy twelve 9 millimeter pistols at one shot.

I tried to think about that. I don't want to get citizens ticked off at me. I tried to think about that. One of the things I thought about was if he's a collector. There's a collectors exception in Representatave Cohen's Bill.

Another reason $I$ thought is maybe and this wouldn't be my choice for a holiday gift. Maybe he wanted to give everyone in his office a 9 millimeter automatic pistol for a holiday gift. He gets a gift certificate in their name.

He's got 12 office employees, Jones, Smith, Parker, Brown, whatever. He buys 12 gift certificates for 9 millimeters in their name. They come in and it doesn't violate the one gun a month law.

Other than that, can you fathom --if you can, you are smarter than $I$ am. I'm not the smartest guy around. Can you fathom another legitimate reason for buying twelve 9 millimeters pistols in one stop?

Can anybody? I don't want to make this a quiz because $I$ know sometimes politıcıans don't do so well on pop quizzes.

Wearing my other hat, can anybody think of anything other than a collector? By the way, no collector collects twelve 9 millimeter -- 12 of the same pistol. That's a nonunique pistol. No one collects 12 Saturday Night Specials. We have a collectors exception in there anyway.

Other than buying for the office or buying for every member of his family, which he can do with gift certificates, can anybody think of a legitimate reason?

Again, I've thought about it for several years now. I wish I knew.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I want to thank you, Mayor Rendell and Commissioner Timmoney for coming before the Committee and presenting testımony. It's been very helpful and instructive and informational, and we appreciate you expressing your views.

MAYOR RENDELL: Again, $I$ want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and your council. I know sometimes $I$ sound like a broken record. You always give us the ability to come and say our
peace.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you.

Our next witness is the Honorable Judge Seamus McCaffery, Judge of the Philadelphia Municipal Court.

Welcome, Judge McCaffery. You may begin when you're ready.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Thank you. First of all, I'm not rushing back to court. I'm actually rushing back to Fort Dix where I'm a Lieutenant Colonel in the military this week.

One, I'd like to thank everybody for inviting me here to discuss some of the problems we have with the Courts or $I$ should say violence and dealing with the courts.

I'd like to start off by just gIving you a lattle background about myself. I'm the fırst and only retired 20-year police officer ever elected as a Trial Judge here in Phıladelphia County.

I've also now been in the military 31 years. I've carried a gun for over 30 years. As a matter of fact, I'm certified. I'm probably one of the only certified judges in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in handguns and
assault weapons.

As a matter of fact, $I$ just completed the FBI sub-machine gun school last week. The President Judge just loved giving me off for that.

The bottom line is, you're talking to somebody who is not a novice when it comes to guns. I also have two of my three sons that are both cops. My third is soon to be a police offacer.

I tell a lot of people, especially in my courtroom, that when you look at the news at night and you see all the dead bodies being carried off our streets, did anybody ever think of who notifies the familues of those dead people? Well, $I$ did that for years as a homıcide detective.

I say all of this by saying to you, 1 , I'm extremely well versed in weaponry; 2, I'm very serious about guns and what they do to our citizens. I take it very, very seriously.

Some years ago, I actually strenuously went after creating a gun court here in Philadelphia because I, too, felt that guns were not given the serious - how would you say - -
concern that they should have been.
To date, we have not created that gun court. As a trial judge, I received a lot of remanded gun cases to my courtroom. I handle them myself. I want to just share with you some of the things that go on in our system and basically dealing with 6106 and 6108 , violations of the Uniform Firearms Act.

When an individual is locked up in Philadelphia county for a gun, the officer takes him into custody and they obviously go downtown. Charges are given out by the District Attorney's Office, one of which is usually 6106, making ュt a felony to carry a "concealed weapon" on him.

Now, often times what you run into here in Philadelphia County is the police arrive on the scene and the guy is standing there with a gun in his hand. The individual throws the gun.

The bottom line is when it comes in front of a judge for a preliminary hearing, it $u$ s not concealed and therefore $1 t$ is remanded. There goes your felony.

What does that mean? It is a serious charge, which $I$ believe just several years ago was increased from a misdemeanor to a felony.

Carrying a concealed deadly weapon is now thrown out.

As such, we are looking obviously at a limıted amount of jail time the individual can get. Then what we have is the following. I'm just saying this by way of sharing with you my frustrations.

We have what is known as 6013 or Rule 1100. I'm sure you're all aware what happens there is an individual has to come to trial within a certain time frame.

Because of the volume of cases here in Philadelphia county, often times by the time discovery is turned over and the case is then listed for trial, we are looking at cases with 80, 100,110 days already in the system and not having one first listing in a trial room. Not first listing.

Or should the case have been listed in a trial room, we find that the following occurs: 1, discovery is incomplete and not turned over, therefore the case can't go on, another continuance date; 2, police officers or whtnesses don't show up in the courtroom because of whatever.

As a judge, it becomes very frustrating because now cases are going well over 120 days, and next thing you know our defense bar, rightfully so, bring up what is known as a motıon for dismissal under Rule 6013. As a trial judge, that's what happens. The volume of cases that we have here in our system is absolutely incredible.

Ballistics reports - - it's tough to get a case in front of a trial judge, especially with a first or second listing when you have all discovery including a ballistic report.

I'm sure Commissioner Timmoney can tell you that right now there are so many guns in the system that our Firearms Identification Unit cannot have all of the reports necessarily prepared and submıtted to everyone, including the Court, for trial.

What does that do? That means you can't put the case on. Again, we are seeing more and more cases going by the wayside because of: 1, the volume; 2, 6013 and Rule 1100 ; and 3, cases that are being remanded at the preliminary hearing.

So what $I^{\prime} m$ saying to you basically is
the following: These cases are coming in front of me. We are talking misdemeanors now. If, the case goes to trial - and by the way, ladies and gentlemen, not every case goes to trial. A lot of these cases that aren't dismissed or discharged for whatever reason, either they're stipulated out and the individual has a plea bargain, i.e., 12 months reporting probatıon, or then it goes to trial.

If it goes to trial and I find him guilty, $I$ glve him a jail sentence. I know it is pretty novel around here, but that happens, believe it or not. I impose a jail sentence.

We in Philadelphia are the only courts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that have Municrpal Courts. What that means is there are 25 of us. There are only five trial judges.

What it basically entails is anybody found guilty or anybody that doesn't make the sentence imposed has an automatic right of de novo appeal. I'm sure you all know what that means.

Every time $I$ give somebody a jail sentence, every time $I$ give somebody a sentence that he or she does not like, they automatically
appeal me to the Court of Common Pleas.
So basically what you are looking at is that the prosecutors have to go through a myriad of problems just to get an individual convicted of a crime.

The arrest, the scheduling within 120 days, discovery, witnesses, judges if they do, $1 n$ fact, impose a serıous sanction for having a weapon, now we are right back in the court of Common Pleas again with a whole new trial.

So as you can see, the complexity is far greater here in Philadelphia county than you would see in Allegheny County, Westmoreland county and some of the other counties in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvanıa.

We have our own inherent problems here ın Philadelphia County. That's basically one of our blgger problems.

As I mentioned at the start of this, I hate every night seeing my sons that are cops going out. And $I$ have got to personally pat them down to make sure they have bullet-proof vests on.

Guns in Philadelphia County are really a problem. They really are a problem. I think a
lot of $1 t$ deals with what is going on in our system overall. The system is - the fact that we just can't get these cases on in either a timely fashion or in a way where a serious and significant message is sent to these bad guys, if you carry a gun, you are going to jail.

Again, the system is set up so that it's really tough for a prosecutor, in my oplnion, to get that case through. It is basically set up, in my opinion agann, where the defense attorneys have a lot of latitude when it comes to defending these cases.

Again, they can sit back and wait to see if discovery is provided. They can sit back and see if witnesses and police officers aren't there. They can make their 6013 motions. They can then if they don't like the outcome of the trial automatically de novo right to the court of Common Pleas. So you are talking about an elongated process that doesn't exist anywhere else in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

So I do take this whole issue of guns and violence very seriously because, like $I$ said, I have sons out there. I know personally from my own experience what guns can do. I personally
notified families of victims for years.

I can't speak for everybody in our court, but that's pretty much what goes on here. at least the beginnıng level, the prelimınary level of our system.

That's pretty much all $I$ have to say. I hope $I$ was at least a little informative. How about some questions.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Judge McCaffery. Any questions?

Representative Josephs.
REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: I used to practice a little bit in the Philadelphia courts long ago. And we had those problems then, so I can imagine what they are now.

I'm glad that you talked about them because $I$ don't find it very helpful in this exercise to shift the blame to another part of government. Oh, we'd do okay if it weren't for those judges.

I think all of us are together in this, judges as well as legislators and law enforcement people.

What would you suggest? Do we need more resources in the Philadelphia Courts? Do we
need more judges? Do we need computerizing? Should the state be appropriating more money?

JUDGE McCAFFERY: I was elected in
1993. At the time $I$ took the bench, I was averaging about 26 trials a day. Right now I'm doing 49 cases.

If you can imagine, one motion to suppress is taking an hour, hour and a half and you still have 47 other matters to handle, by the end of the day the trial judges are very, very stressed out. They are extremely stressed out.

What happens is - again, I'm not talking for the Court, and I'm not speaking for all the other judges. What $I$ start to see is judges are getting burnt out because of the volume. Because of that, they are trying to move cases.

How do you move a case? You erther give it a date and continue it or you discharge it. Why? Because an aggressive police officer who may be in five different courtrooms isn't there at that moment, therefore the judge can discharge the case.

Or, last but not lease, they are just forcing these cases on or forcing these cases
out. I personally at sentencing get a chance to look at the actual extract from prior contacts. It is appalling, in my opinion. when $I$ can stand up and hold up a document that goes probably 7,8 feet long of arrests with just about all of them discharged, dismissed, discharged, dismissed all the way down the line. I'm talking about guys with priors.

You need to understand we are dealing with big volume. Our numbers are limited. The young prosecutors that our wonderful District Attorney puts in our room are overwhelmed.

They walk into work and they wall be handed 30 cases for tomorrow morning. They walk in front of a horrendous volume.

Again, $I$ invite you all to come over. I'm un Court 603 every day. Come in and watch it. The volume is unbelievable. The stress that the young Public Defenders and young DA's are under is absolutely incredible.
In my opinion, things are really
starting to fall apart. How do you address it? Obviously, $I$ think the DA's Office needs a lot more support so they can get discovery in a trmely fashion. Have more prosecutors there to
handle these cases.
And also for you guys from out west, my circle of friends are all gun folks. We're shooters. I'm not a hunter, but I've been in the mılıtary. I teach ground combat. I'm very much into weapons.

I don't know anybody that could get one a month. I have lots of guns. I just can't imagine buying more than one gun a month. I know that may sound funny coming from a gun guy. When I talk to a lot of these folks, we are shooters. We are avid shooters. We are avid gun collectors. My biggest hobby right now is learning about these different types of things and the history of weaponry, things like that. Again, it comes from my background in law enforcement and the military.

There are a lot of folks out there. There's a real concern about this dichotomy, this spread. We feel there's a need for something to happen, especially here in Philadelphia.

As the Mayor pointed out, the mandatory sentencing, $I$ think we really need to look at thıngs like that because there are situations where people that should be going to jail are not
going to jail.
That's strictly my own, by the way, opinion.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Manderino.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Other counties that do not have the Municipal Courts, the same gun-related charges that you are hearing in Municipal Court would in their counties go directly to Commonwealth Court. The District Judges would not hear them.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Not Commonwealth Court.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I mean Common Pleas Court. Excuse me.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: The District Justice
will handle the preliminary hearing. Keep in mind out in the other 66 counties it is different. In the other 66 counties you have a police officer reading a report to a District Justice. And under the law we are mandated to look at all of the evidence in light most favorable to the commonwealth and only prima facially are we looking for that level of evidence.

The District Justice will then hold it for the Court of Common Pleas. Once that case comes in front of a CP judge, there is no other right of appeal, de novo right of appeal. That is the highest.

Here in Philadelphia we have that impediment of a Municipal court where every time somebody is found guilty or sanctions are given that they don't agree wath, boom, they have that automatic trial rıght.

Agaln, it adds to the problem of having these cases handled readily.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: But your court, Municipal Court, is doing the preliminary hearings now?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Our court does prelımınary hearıngs.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And also doing the trials?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Trials for all misdemeanors.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: At least with regard to this one area of streamlining, if we streamline, what it would do is take Munlcipal Court out of the trial portion of this.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Only $1 f$ You increased the sanctions to felonies. We handle everything. Again, we had suggested a gun court here in Philadelphia. And literally when we were looking at the issue the Legislature increased it to a felony, so it took that level out of our court.

The creation of a gun court, in my opinion, would significantly help.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Remind me. I know this is something you work with every day. If we had a mandatory one-year, as the Mayor suggested, sentence for a gun violation, that would still have --

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Automatic de novo right of appeal.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: That would still have folks, unless it was added on with other convictions, going to county prisons not state prisons. Am I correct?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: It depends on the
language. If it is 11 to 23 months it stays wathin the county. If it is 1 to 2 years, here's the deal. If it is a mandatory one year, is $1 t$ going to be 6 months to 12 months? If so, it
stays in the county. Or if it is a mandatory minimum of one year and it's 12 months to 24 months, that's state time. It takes it out of Philadelphia County.

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

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Representative Dermody.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: A question, and it's on procedure mainly.

You discussed the situation with 6106 or a felony violation of the Uniform frrearms Act being reduced to a misdemeanor.

That would still be a violation of the Uniform Firearms Act. Right?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Under 6106 it will be remanded back to us in our court.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Would the charge still be a violation of the Uniform Firearms Act?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: 6106. 6108 will be discharged at the preliminary hearing.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: My question is this: Is there any way that it would still be a misdemeanor violation of the Uniform Firearms

Act? I haven't looked at the act in a while. Why couldn't the system just say that all violations of the Uniform Firearms Act shall be heard in the Court of Common pleas as opposed to sending them to Municipal Court where you can get that trial?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: It could be done. Absolutely. That's something that you folks have to do. Our jurisdiction is up to M1.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: Why would we have to do it? Couldn't the DA or the President Judge make a decision right now? we are concerned about violations of the Uniform Firearms Act. We are concerned about guns and how they're treated in Philadelphia County. We have a problem that's greater than anywhere else.

Why not take and say in Philadelphia County, all violations of the Uniform frrearms Act can't be heard at Municipal Court and will now be heard in Court of Common pleas? Could they do that today?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: That could possibly be done. It is jurisdictional. It is legislative.

REPRESENTATIVE DERMODY: In every other county a misdemeanor is heard in Common Pleas Court.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Right. We are a different court. We are a different court. Keep in mind, too, one of the other problems that the prosecutor has at the preliminary hearing is they have to get that case in front of a judge in 3 to 10 days under the law.

It's very, very tough for them to have the prosecutor at the preliminary hearing already showing that the guy doesn't have a license to carry, things like that.

The judges seem to feel, hey, we are not prosecutors, we're not defense attorneys, the burden is on the Commonwealth. If the Commonwealth doesn't show that burden at the prelimınary hearing, the case is remanded pretty much. That's the kind of difficulty they are dealing with.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Representative Dermody. Judge McCaffery, as I understand, on misdemeanors you actually have the trial?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: That's correct, up to

Misdemeanor 1 .
CHAIRMAN GANNON: That's nonjury?
JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Nonjury waiver trial.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: You also do the preliminary hearing and also the arraignment?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: The arraignment is done in Philadelphia County by a bail commissioner. The actual preliminary hearing is done by a Philadelphia Municipal Court Judge. That Judge will either hold it for court for all felonies charged or remand it back to our court and our criminal trial rooms, which $I$ am one of. I don't do preliminary hearings, $I$ do the trials.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: It seems from what you are saying that one of the problems that you have is after you've gone through this misdemeanor trial, that the Defendant now has a right to appeal de novo to the Common Pleas Court. He's starting from square one all over again.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: The Commonwealth, again, has the burden of getting the witnesses in, getting everyone ready for another trial at the Court of Common Pleas.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I would imagine that
would be a little bit frustrating that you went through this process.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Frustrating? $I$ had hair once.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: The other thing from what you're saying, $I$ guess where we're looking at some of the crimes that are already on the books and raising up the degree from say a misdemeanor to a felony, that's taking jurisdiction away from your court. It lightens your work load, but $I$ guess it creates other problems.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Well, again, keep $n$ n mind a lot of the sad examples I'm sure the Distract Attorney will put forward will not be un our court but the Court of Common Pleas. Don't think by getting it out of the Municipal court you're going to solve a lot of problems.

I'm sitting here right now trying to collect transcripts of, individual pulls a gun out of the trash can and pistol-whips you, gun discharges, clips part of your ear, and it is remanded back in front of me for a misdemeanor at a preliminary hearing.

I'm trying keep track of these types of
things so we can hopefully make some changes here because, quite frankly -- and you as a former prosecutor, you can understand -- you can't believe the cases that are being remanded.

Why are they being remanded? I don't know. To me, there's problems that need to be addressed. Luckily, we have the folks now that are going to address them, I hope.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: So what you are saying is you are getting cases back or remanded that you kind of feel shouldn't come back, that should stay up.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: My understanding of
the law -- there's a lot of stuff that's going on right now that we find, $I$ should say, pretty serious matters being remanded as misdemeanors that, in fact, should be held for court as felonies.

That's a problem you have when you have the type of system you have here in Philadelphia. Again, it is not endemic of the municipal court system, you are talking about a lot of these other horror stories you will hear come out of the CP Court as well, different cases or facts coming out of there. It is not

Philadelphia Municipal Court judges. You will find a lot of problems dealing with the system, lf you will.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: I'm just tryıng to get a clear reading of what you are saying or what $I$ understand. It looks to me like it's a continuing circle. It goes up to the $C P$, gets remanded back because it has been downgraded to a mısdemeanor. The trial is held in your court. It's appealed de novo back up to CP.

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: We are the gate way. Everything comes through Municipal Court, everything. The actual preliminary hearing must go in front of a Municipal Court judge.

The Municipal Court judge at the preliminary hearing makes the determination whether or not it should be held for court on all felonies, whether or not it should be remanded back because at the preliminary hearing the Commonwealth didn't have the necessary evidence to hold them prima facially keeping in mind that all the evidence must be looked at in a light most favorable to the Commonwealth.

But even at that level, the Commonwealth didn't meet their burden and
therefore it must be remanded for misdemeanors back to Municipal Court.

Once we go through those hurdles of discovery, getting witnesses in and putting a case on at trial, and if the individual should be found guilty, boom, that's when de novo right of appeal comes in and the whole process starts all over again with the exception of the preliminary hearing.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: You talked about the idea of a gun court. Apparently that's an idea that you've been working on for a while.

How do you envision that would help to solve some of the problems with the system you are in right now and also with dealing with the issue of gun violence?

JUDGE MCCAFFERY: Gun courts have been created in a wide variety of states throughout the nation right now. They have been received and are overwhelmingly successful.

What they do is basically put together a group of judges that are serious players and they take this stuff seriously and they hande things in the serious nature that they should be.

Those types of gun courts work. It as proven that they work. I think they can work here in Philadelphia county if the right people, the Board of Judges or the President Judge, whomever is responsible for its creation, would put it together as long as you have individuals that stay focused and basically understand what the law is and how to apply the law and make sure those cases get on.

Again, one of the problems we're having - I don't have the statistics in front of me, but an inordinate amount of these cases are walking out the door. They are not getting to trial. They are walking out the door under 6013 and the Rule 1100 problem that we're having.

That is connected, in my opinlon, to the volume of cases. It is just tough for the folks over here to get these cases on in front of a judge.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, Judge McCaffery, for coming before the committee and sharing your thoughts on this very important issue.

Our next witnesses are the Honorable Lynne Abraham, District Attorney for the city of

Philadelphia, and Michael Stiles, Esquire, United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Welcome, District Attorney Abraham and Mr. Styles. You may proceed when you're ready.

MS. ABRAHAM: Representative Gannon, it is my pleasure $u$ being able to come before you and the Members of the Committee on this important discussion.

I had -- before $I$ lose my train of thought on some of the issues that have been raised prior to my sitting here, I wanted to cover them.

First, with regard to Mr. Timmoney's statement about mandatory minimums, it is already discretionary with the Commonwealth whether to proceed on mandatory minimum sentences or not. So we do have that discretion all over the Commonwealth.

I think if you want to discuss that further, $I$ just wanted to remind you -- I'm sure you knew it. I just wanted to remind you that we don't always proceed on mandatory sentencing cases when we believe that it shouldn't be a mandatory sentence case.

I think the district attorneys, many of whom, by the way, stood for election as judges this year throughout the Commonwealth and almost every one of them was successful, are mindful of their own prior discretion and how they'll hande matters as judges.

I do believe, however, that with respect to Representative Joseph's remarks, I don't agree with them at all. I think blame must go where it is assigned.

Our judges - and this is not unique to Philadelphia - deserve - those who are not following the law and fully carrying out their duties, do deserve the blame for some of the criminal conduct on the streets. I want to place it where it should belong.

We have many fine judges in
Philadelphia, but some of the judges, as referred to by Judge McCaffery, are not doing, in my judgement and his judgment, what they ought to be doing.

I do believe that there are reasons for more resources both in the prosecutor's office and elsewhere. However, $I$ believe that insofar as Philadelphia is concerned, because we have
many more cases of gun-related violence than almost anyplace else in the Commonwealth, it would be extremely helpful - and $I$ know if Commissioner Timmoney were here he would agree with me that if you have three or four ballisticians with thousands and thousands of guns, it is practically impossible to do gun ballistics tests and have them done in a timely fashion.

Frankly, as a former judge of both Municipal Court and the court of Common Pleas, I can tell you there really isn't any real purpose to having a ballistics report ready for a preliminary hearing other than to delay the case so long that the case is dismissed. That's the real reason for ballistics tests. It is a mechanism. It's a tool.

Judge stiles, my former colleague on the bench, shared the same issue. It really is a discovery tool which has no reason in rhyme or any other fashion, to have a ballistrcs test to show that the gun is operable for a preliminary hearing when that shouldn't be required. It ought to be presumptive. It ought to be, like anything else in a preliminary hearing, prima
facıa. The actual proof of operabilıty comes, if at all, at the time of trial.

We didn't support, Representative
Little, a gun court. And $I$ think Judge McCaffery just said the same thing $I$ did but in a different way.

If we have the same judges doing the same thing you are doing now in both Municipal and Common Pleas Court, then to have a gun court and allow them to do the same thing does little. It's not going to speed up ballistics. It's not going to speed up convictions. It's not going to assure convictions. It's just going to have a judge doing something.

And my experience tells me - and I've been at this a little while. My experience tells me that as far as the jurisdiction of a judge, you can't, unless there's some constitutional change that $I^{\prime} m$ not aware of that is in the offing, restrict a judge who's elected to be a judge of a general jurisdiction to just gun court. It's just not going to work.

I think it is a great mechanism for putting more judges on the bench. I'm not going to get into that. That's a political issue, but
it's not going to accomplish what $I$ think. What I thank it's going to accomplish is as a prosector and a judge it's extraordinarily frustrating on both sides to have a list which is so horrendously long which does not include in both Municipal Court as well as Common Pleas Court -- Municipal Court has summary cases plus violations of probation after the list.

And in Common Pleas Court it includes extensive pretrial motions, longer even than Municipal Court and an extraordinary length of violations of probation hearings after the regular list.

And also, finally, $I$ don't want to make this a Philadelphia issue because if this degenerates into a Philadelphia issue, we're dead in the water and we might as well admit it. This is an issue that's much broader and much deeper than Philadelphia.

And also as a gun owner -- I'm a licensed and registered gun owner since the 1960s. I support gun control. And I agree with the Mayor in his support of House Bill 46 because I also appeared before you, Representative Gannon, Representative Cohen, and others. I
still support it. It's a good start. And I believe that we ought to do that.

One final question that $I$ think was raised -- actually two. With regard to 6111 G5, the Bill $I$ believe that had been previously referenced about prosecuting those who sell guns, to me, the Mayor may have said, it is sort of like the turkey on the table with the tail neatly folded in. A beautiful artistic representation of how a turkey ought to be presented on Thanksgiving day, but the tail is absolutely useless.

6111 G5 is useless because, as a matter of law, we would have to prove what was in the mind of the buyer and the seller. And the buyer of the gun, who would be our main witness, is usually the person who has the major felony charge against him. In other words, he's a robber, he's a rapist, he's a burglar. He has a long felony record. He goes to somebody. The person sells him a gun.

For him to testify that the seller knew that he was going to use the gun for criminal purposes $1 s$ to have the felon testifying against the gun seller. And as a credibility matter,
that's just not going to work.
So it was a great idea. Good
intentions, as all $I$ believe your efforts have been in this respect. It is execution that has been unworkable.

I suggest, frankly, that one of the things that $I$ want to talk about among a lot of others -- and I'll try to go as quickly as $I$ can -- is Senate Blll 806 which is a constitutional amendment which would prevent our Pennsylvania Supreme Court from making it impossible for police officers throughout this Commonwealth from doing their duty in a thoughtful and constructive way.

It is probably something that ought to be revisited if as a member of this body you are again considering how we can make a major impact on violent criminals.

Hunters, sportsmen, people that love to shoot at targets - I don't mind clay pigeons. The real ones, the Higgins pigeons shoot, I'm sorry, with all due respect to my pigeon-shooting friends, forget it. I'm not in favor of that. Clay pigeons I don't care. Real ones I think ls stupid. That's not sport.
I think that we ought to look at 806
because one of the major things that this body
must feel as a frustration to it is when you have
done every single thing you can possibly thlnk of
to stop illegal gun use possession, is to pass
great statutes which the supreme court overrules
by such cases such as commonwealths versus
Hawkins, commonwealth versus Jackson and
Commonwealth versus cue which effectively
eliminated the police department from relying on
the very thing that they rely on all the time,
and that is police radio calls.
sometimes even millions in many jurisdictions,
man you are looking at or the woman has a gun
are information that the polyce officer ls acting
on, man with a gun, robbery in process, homicide,
arson in process, whatever the crime is.
which may kill you.
Commonwealth versus Mottos, which is the so-called coerced abandonment case, just a police officer drawing up to anybody in the Commonwealth for the mere informational purpose, whether it is with knowledge of anything going on or just a police officer's well-honed suspicion to ask that person a question means that the person is -- the person $1 s$ permitted to run if the person knows he's going to lose the race with the police officer, all he - and it's mostly he. I don't want to eliminate she. All he or she does is reach into his or her pocket and start throwing stuff out. Because if he's going to be caught, then he is going to claım coerced abandonment. And under mottos and the cases that have followed it, all that is going to be suppressed, every gun, every drug. They're all going to be suppressed.

In White and Lablong, search and seizure of automobiles, many of our judges believe that once a defendant is out of a car, because of White and Lablong, if the police officer happens to go in and do a search for any reason really, that's going to be dismissed
because the officer has to first hold the defendant, hold the car, and then go get a search and seizure warrant.

So while we're looking at courts, Representative Joseph, I don't want you to forget that while our supreme court -- I have the greatest respect for the court. I'm a member of the Court of this Commonwealth. I was a judge un this Commonwealth. I'm not ascribing bad motives to them.

I believe that Pennsylvania law ought to be just coextensive with the United states Constitution. That will protect everybody.

I think 806 is one of those ways to do it because you can fight all you want about whether it is a Philadelphia problem or a Lackawanna problem or an Elk County problem. One of the things we must not fail to look at is the Supreme court of Pennsylvania and how they have handled these cases among other issues.

I think what we really want to do today is discuss not only how we may make arrests more effective, but how we may take a sense of feeling that Philadelphia and other great cities throughout this commonwealth can make its
citizens feel safer.
There is no doubt that guns are closely associated not only with homicides and other violent crimes, but with accidents and suicides. I don't want this moment to pass without recognizing that.

The Journal of the American Medical Association just last week did a study that showed that - you can of course - - it is like any study, you can object to it or disregard it or distingursh it from something else. I don't think there's any doubt $n$ anybody's mind that people go out and buy guns for a variety of reasons.

If $I$ buy a gun for protection, which $I$ have bought two of them, by the way, there's always a chance if my house is burglarized both of them are going to be stolen and used or somebody is going to have a gun drawn on me, and let's be fair about it, most people are not going to draw a gun on somebody who already has his out, cocked, and ready.

I think what has to be done is taking a look at how we can effectively address the issue of guns being used by people who have a mind to
commit suicide, to kill their wives and children and husbands and loved ones and to go anto schools and shoot up the schools even when the guns have been purchased lawfully.

I believe that this horrendous paroxysm of violence that has overtaken the county for the most part, interestingly enough, is not happening in large cities, it's happening in small towns and villages and small citles all over this country.

And nobody ever has to invoke any other names but Pearl, Mississippi and Columbine, Colorado and Evansburg, Pennsylvania - Edenburg, Pennsylvania.

I listened to the Mayor of Edenburg talk the last time when we listened to House Bill 46. It is absolutely astounding what's happened. Now it's in Hawaii and California.

Frankly, when those mass homicides happen, sometimes they get only a little over three-quarters of an inch in some of our newspapers. It's only when it's like a Columbine that we see it.

It's my considered judgement that while I have regard for any organization which has a
product or an item to sell or tout, over the past several years $I$ think the NRA is really frightened. I think they are really frightened at the eroding support that they are having within their own membership.

Just this past week the insurance companies announced that they are not going to defend the NRA and gun manufacturers against the defective product issues.

I don't know where the bill that the Senate is going to hear next week is going to go. I rather suspect, unfortunately, it is golng to pass.

I know that there's already a constitutional challenge mounted against it. It is my considered judgment that no matter what happens, whether it is ultimately successful or not, the courts are to be open to the maximum extent even with all of the problems to the people, not closed to subdivisions like the Crty of Philadelphia or any other city in the Commonwealth.

There are a lot of other things that we are doing to help enforce the laws. A couple of them $I$ think are worthy of note.

I think, first, we ought to pay recognition and homage to a couple of wonderful local programs which $I$ commend to your attention. William Mackey, who is here or he was here, anyway. William Mackey of City-wide Improving and Planning, I believe that he and I join together $\ln$ a community effort to have no toy guns sold in any of our toy stores. No action figures which have guns or violent figures depicted and violent videos. That's something that's important and $I$ think ought to be looked at to something as a goodwill gesture and ought to be statewide issue.

We have engaged in Philadelphia $1 n$
goods for guns through the philadelphia
Antiviolence Antidrug Network. The President of the United States and governors and mayors across this country have recognized the gun buy back or we call it goods for guns. We don't want to make it look like we are buying back guns.

I myself contributed a thousand dollars to this effort through a foundation $I$ started because I believe that gun buy backs or goods for guns are really important. It helps save lives.

I think there are lots of thangs that
have been accomplished with the great cooperation of the city of Philadelphia, the Police Commissioner, my colleague and friend, Mike Stiles, which $I$ think have created a dent, an important dent, on gun violence, and that is the child of FAST, Federal Alternatives to state Trials, which Senator Arlen specter and $I$ came up with about eight years ago.

It is the federal alternative to local trials where we know or have reason to belleve that the crime will be treated differently in federal court than in state court because of the - we don't have laws such as felony possession which $I$ hope you will support, as $I$ do.

The new program called operation Cease-Fire that Mike Stiles will speak about, I support it wholeheartedly. We have two district attorneys assigned to the United states Attorney's Office, cross designated, plus three assistant U.S. attorneys prosecuting Philadelphia gun cases which if they were handled right and if the judges enforced the law and if there were some different laws, which I'll talk about in a moment, on the books, we wouldn't need this. We wouldn't need to rely on our federal courts.

But for felons in possession, it is a mandatory minimum sentence of five years. And my pal here is getting 5 -year sentences, 10 -year sentences, 15 -year sentences for armed career criminals that we might get probation or a county prison sentence with time given for good time and earned time.

It is really a Pennsylvania disgrace that this is permitted to happen. I support Operation Cease-Fire's efforts. And as long as I've been in office, we have been doing that.

Another program that does have potential is the new program that we started in the 24 th and 25 th Police District. Because I just don't want to just talk about legıslation, I want to talk about prevention. And I'll get to legislation in one more minute.

In the 24 th and 25 Police District, in East Philadelphia, that is the place where our young people are most likely to kill or be killed. It has the most -- the highest homicide ranking of any police district in Philadelpha.

We started a youth violence induction project in that jurisdiction with the Philadelphia anti-drug anti-violence network
about which $I$ spoke a moment ago with their street workers, with the juvenile court, the adult court, Philadelphia safe and Sound, Polıce Department, and public/private ventures.

This is a high-risk high-reward kind of project. We have picked out a hundred of what we believe to be the most violence-prone or the people most likely to be killed, juveniles and young adults.

They are given intensive supervision by probation officers. These kids are given job training and job opportunities. They are given in-home visits. They have youth workers go out and interact with them. They are offered drug treatment and alcohol treatment when they need it.

We don't want to see them die. We don't want to see them in prison. If this program works, and it is too soon to say whether it will work, but we are hopeful because of it, and it came as a result of my visit to Boston to see what they are doing, this will go a long way to coming back to you and talking about a statewide project.

Finally, with regard to preventatuve
programs, $I$ want to talk about a program called Don't Fall Down in the Hood. This is a program that my office through my Juvenile Deputy. John Delaney, came up with. What Don't Fall Down in the Hood is, is every young offender in Juvenıle Court about which the Mayor spoke, who is found - - adjudicated a delinquent for possession of a firearm, the DHS, Department of Human service Youth Homicide Review Team, the Institute for Development of African American Youth, saint Gabriel's Hall, and my office all take all these kids. And it is only for possession, not for use of a firearm, simple possession.

They are subjected to, in addition to any other sentence, a three-month program specifically designed for these young people. The first two months of Don't fall Down in the Hood are these young people, mostly boys, must attend a class four days a week from 3:30 to 7:30 when a lot of their moms are at work and these kids have the potential for getting into the most mischief.

In addition to that they must attend school every saturday. They receive academic support for their schools as well as instruction
in entrepreneurial skills. It keeps them off the street.

They also are then taken on class trips. They go to the morgue where they see real dead bodies killed by real live bullets. They know that nobody is getting up from the table. They are taken to McGee and other rehabilitative hospitals to speak to young men, just like themselves, who are hemiplegic, quadriplegic, paraplegic, to tell those kids, look, don't end up like me. This is where $I$ am and this is how I have to exist forever.

They go to the prisons. We take them to funeral homes. We do all things that we possibly can to talk to them about the consequences of gun-related crime so that we can save them.

I have plenty of business. I don't need any more. And Philadelphia and other jurisdictions don't need any more youth offenders becoming our adult offenders.

Finally, $I$ think legislatively there are some terrific things we can do. Besides the special unit which $I$ am hoping to get funding for, which will carefully track probation
violators who or parole violators who are engaged in gun crime, $I$ do believe that one handgun a month is essential. I believe it should be given a second look. And $I^{\prime} m$ hoping that that will be reconsidered.

I support General Fisher's Operation Hard Time initiative to promote changes in the gun laws to make instead of felons in possession a misdemeanor of the first degree, a felony of the second degree.

I wrote a letter to the Pennsylvania Commission on sentencing that recommends that the offense gravity score for violations of firearms be from a 4 to 5 to a 9. That would mean a minimum sentence of 18 to 30 months in prison because those with offense gravity scores that are low but prior record scores that are high only get county prison time which because of overcrowding means that they will be immediately or very shortly after paroled.

I think also guns and drug crimes like armed career criminals, drugs and gun offenses that are handled by the United states Attorney's Office can be changed. And I think it ought to be a separate offense to possess guns in
furtherance of drug crimes.
Right now if you are arrested with a gun, if the gun isn't in the possession of the person dealing the drugs, we lose the gun charge. Therefore $I$ believe that since guns and drugs are inexplicitly linked, there ought to be a change in our law to make it a crime to have a gun with drugs.

The final thing, with regard to having a gun with an obliterated serial number, the act is altering or obliterating the marks on a gun. Since many of our offenders have guns with obliterated serial numbers as a practical - again, this gets to be the tail on the turkey, very attractive and impractical.

We cannot prove in a court of law that the person in possession of the gun beyond a reasonable doubt is the person that did the obliteration of the serial numbers, therefore it is very difficult to prosecute those kinds of offenses. And we don't bother because it $1 s$ a waste of prosecutorial resources. They are too few and far between to do that.

I believe that all of these things ought to be considered. These are more than

Philadelphia issues. Philadelphia just has more of them. These are statewide and really national issues that $I$ commend to your attention.

And $I$ thank you very much for convening this committee yet again to deal with a very difficult and important issue.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank YOu.
Mr. Stiles.
MR. STILES: Thank you very much.
Thank you for inviting me.
My background is very much like
Lynne's. I've been a United states attorney since 1993. Before that, for ten years $I$ was a common pleas court judge $1 n$ Philadelphia. And for 12 years before that $I$ was in the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office and left Chere to run for Judge when $I$ was First Assistant District Attorney.

I would like to briefly talk to you a little bit about Operation Cease-Fire which you have heard about its successes and some of its limits, and answer any other questions you might have.

Operation Cease-Fire has been in
existence for almost a year, since January of
this year. And the District Attorney is correct that before that we had an active system established by Lynne and Senator specter and Mike Balsam who was the U.S. Attorney before me to review state cases for federal prosecution.

Back in the past, federal alternatives to state trıals was in existence, but not anywhere near to the extent in terms of what we have done for firearms cases un the last year.

We would average about 60 firearm cases a year for federal prosecution until operation Cease-fire was funded and put together. And this year up until now we have 211 federal firearm indictments and expect in the next couple of months 40 to 50 more. So we'll have over 250 federal firearm indictments this year, quadruplıng the number of cases that we have tried previously.

We were funded $\$ 1.5$ million. Congress
funded us to establish this operation. And you have heard we have three Assistant United states Attorneys, thanks to Lynne, two special Assistant United states Attorneys who are District Attorneys who she has sent to our office to try these cases. We have a paralegal in her office
and one in ours reviewing firearms arrests. We have five Philadelphia police detectives and five ATF agents who review and put these cases together.

We focus on serious violent offenders, felons in possession of firearms, armed career criminals who by definithon have three or more either violent convictions or significant drug convictions, drug traffickers in possession of fırearms and illegal gun traffickers.

Federal sentencing statutes call for persons with two or more violent crimes who are arrested in possession of a firearm for a sentence of about five years. Three or more convictions is a mandatory 15 -year armed career criminal category, a mandatory 15 -year conviction.

If you are a drug dealer found in possession of a firearm, there's a mandatory five-year firearm sentence which must be served consecutive to whatever the sentence is for the drug offense. That will depend, of course, on how many drugs there are. The weight of the drugs will determine the federal sentence for the drugs.

This is mostly a Philadelphia program, although my jurisdiction covers the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. And we have not just Philadelphia county prosecutions, but other counties in Southeast Philadelphia that we have Operation Cease-Fire in.

In Philadelphia, as you've heard, we led the nation in use of guns in violent crimes. We heard 82 percent of homicides are committed with firearms in Philadelphia. That compares to a national number of about 66 percent nationally are homıcides committed by firearms.

Robberies, in the City of Philadelphia, 55 percent are committed by firearms. That compares to the nationwide figure of about 41 percent.

My belief, and $I$ speak for myself now, and $I$ do have to make sure $I$ say this, particularly because it is on tape, U.S. attorneys, unlike district attorneys and mayors, do not set policy. There's one justice department. The president of the United states and the Attorney General of the United states sets policy for the Justice Department, but $I$ can talk to you about my experiences and my beliefs
with regard to this level of firearms violence in Southeastern Pennsylvania and Philadelphia.

I think there is a culture - I sald this a year ago when we started Operated Cease-Fire. I think there is a perception among criminals that carrying a firearm alone does not really raise a risk of any significant jail time.

If a criminal gets up in a morning and decides whether he, or once in a while she, is taking his or her firearm with him, it's not a calculation if $I$ get caught with this alone $I$ will have to do some serious time in jarl. More firearms are carried, so more crimes are committed from firearms.

I think that perception is being changed to some extent and $1 n$ some instances antidotally. We've arrested - - ATF and the Philadelphia Police have arrested people in Philadelphia under Operation Cease-Fire and they say, oh, no. I heard about this.

One guy said, my wife told me about this program. She heard about it on television. You mean to tell me $I^{\prime} m$ getting prosecuted federally? You mean $I$ 'm really going to have to
do five years or more?
It is beginning to have some impact. I think it's been a great success in that respect. It has followed to some degree the example of Project Exile in Richmond, Virginia.

I chose not to name it Project Exile because $I$ did not want to give the impression that it's exactly like Exile for this important reason for you, $I$ think.

In a city like philadelphia or any large city, we cannot replicate what Project Exale is doing in Richmond because in essence they have taken all the firearms cases that qualified under federal law for federal prosecution, and they can do that.

In almost three years of operation they've had 518 indictments. We could not do that in the United States Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

We have in a normal year about 600 indictments overall. That includes significant organized crime cases and white collar cases and police corruption cases and many other things that we do and do well.

You heard the Commissioner say there
were 3,600 firearms arrests. The United States Attorney's Office can't take all of those cases. Frankly, again, personally, philosophically, I think it is local responsibility, that kind of crime patrol is. We can help. We can supplement, but we can't do and ought not do the lion's share.

That's why $I$ am very encouraged and support legislatıve proposals that's would ralse the penalties under the Crimes Code, state penalties for firearms violations.

I've reviewed the proposal Attorney
General Fisher made. I would support it. I would ask you to consider whether some mandatory sentence provisions as opposed to just guidelines.

That $I$ was judge, as Lynne was, for ten
years. Guidelines in state Court can be disregarded or not followed, as you all know, simply by a one sentence explanation by the trial judge. That can't happen in Federal Court.

In Federal Court, guidelines are really a euphemism for requiring the judge to follow those guidelines unless the prosector says this defendant has given us substantial assistance $1 n$
other cases and therefore merits a departure from the guidelines.

So $I$ would suggest in addition to the very legitimate proposals that you think about the level of prior criminal activity, prior convictions that would cause the legislature to say it is reasonable when somebody has three prior violent convictions.

We can't tolerate that person caring a gun any longer. Upon that conviction there should be a mandatory five years, whatever you thュnk is appropriate.

As $I$ say, $I$ don't set policy so $I$ don't
have a personal position on one gun a month, but that is an issue that the President of the United States and the Attorney General have taken a position on in support of one gun a month legislatıon. And $I$ do see in our firearms trafficking cases significant use of straw purchases where persons without records are recruited to go buy firearms, and up to 90 a month.

We had a case recently where the Defendant's name was Gregory stiber. He was selling firearms, believe it or not, out at a

Christian bookstore in Germantown that he owned and operated.

He used four straw purchasers who bought 90 guns within a five-month period for him to sell out of the book store to criminals illegally which were used in crimes.

That's a summary of what we're doing. It is with great support from the Mayor, from the District Attorney, and from the Police Department as well as Federal agencies.

I appreciating the opportunity to be invited here to tell you about it and wall be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you, Mr. Stiles.

Representative Josephs?
REPRESENTATIVE JOSEPHS: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I must say $I$ was really surprised District Attorney Lynne Abraham didn't agree with my comments.

But $I$ wanted to ask, and $I$ thank you both for being here and both for the good jobs that you do. I wanted to ask Mr. Stiles because I - the District Attorney gave us the answer.

There's a national movement by the

National Rifle Association to cut off the clvil access to the Courts by municlpalities and political subdivisions to sue manufacturers for some of the lax supervision.

Some of the way that some of these products work, you know, along the lines of trying to get some sort of involuntary supervision that even our most charming and very good negotiating Mayor is not able to get within one inch of them.

Can you tell the committee, Mr. Stiles, what while either your personal or official opinion is of the bills that we may be dealing with next week that would make sure that we as a city could not sue gun manufacturers?

MR. STILES: In an a word, No. Three days ago, $I$ guess maybe the end of last week, Representative Evans called and asked me that question.

And $I$ knew--I think you can understand this--there are 94 United states Attorneys across the--around the country. The Justice Department has to speak with one voice.

And individual U.S. Attorneys don't set the policy. So $I$ knew that $I$ would not able to
answer him immediately on what the position of what the Justice Department was.

And frankly, $I$ don't think it's appropriate to give my personal view on this. But as a result of that inquiry, as we speak, there are at least ten components in Washington, D.C. in the Justice Department trying to answer that question as quickly as they can for me to relay it to Dwight Evans.

And I will be happy to do that for you as well. And $I$ told them yesterday that $I$ don't know whether we're going to get an answer in time for you or not. But they are working on that. And that's the best $I$ can tell you.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: The District Attorney has been able to definitely--I have seen probably the best of all cooperation between local and the federal offices and dealing with this issue and a lot of other issues.

I want to thank you for that. I want to thank Mr. Stiles for that--what you do. Question to both of you. One, as you know for a number of years we were caught in this debate of the 10 th amendment.

At what point should the federal
government interfere with states' ability to do what was best for the citizens of that state? And we came up with the Preemption Doctrine and all of that.

Now, I think we're going through the same debate with respect to counties and the Commonwealth. And so my question was to--whether or not you're advocates of uniformity, whether there should be a Uniform Firearms Law which really dictates to 66 counties as to how those counties should deal with issues which might be problematic in one county but not problematic in another, or whether or not we should allow counties through their legislative bodies to do what's in the best interest of their county, especially when you have clear evıdence that there's a problem that's more endemic to this county than it would be someplace else.

So that's my question. Would you advocate for uniformity and believe that we're on the right track by repealing all local ordinances dealing with some of these issues? And I'm trying to strengthen a uniform policy. Or would you purport counties being able to act in $1 t s$ best interest?

MR. STILES: I am going to give you a quick answer. And part of it is ducking again because we really do have this limitation on being a policy setter. But $I$ will tell you.

In my role as United states Attorney dealing with $94 \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}$. Attorneys around the country, $I$ am constantly arguing that individual U.S. Attorneys also have discretion to deal with the problems that are unique to their particular districts. And we ought not have the same uniform requirements imposed on us.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Well, what I was thinking about is that some areas where the state has exercised jurisdiction, it has provided enabling legislation which allows counties to then structure situations that might be endemuc to that county but not exceed the state law.

Because I think their - part of the struggle that we're having, albeit a legitimate struggle, that when we talk about 3600 gun arrests in Philadelphia county - I think that Representative Cohen is legitimate.
And when -- and I'm using

Representative Cohen as an example. It's legrtimate when she raises that question that we
don't have that same problem in Montgomery County. Or somebody raised the question that it doesn't exist in Elk county.

I think, as in the interest of the people that they represent, they have a right to ralse those legitimate concerns.

But by the same token $I$ don't think that we should do things in Philadelphia county or Allegheny County that completely frustrates the efforts of people in those other counties.

But what $I$ would like to see happen $1 s$ the District Attorneys Associations, whrch stretches across Pennsylvania, pretty much have their hand on problems which are endemic in too many of these counties.

I would like to see them come with some recommendations - and if - to how we can fashion legislative prescriptions which helps people in these places that need help right away and at the same time provide some relief for people in the other places who will be facing the same problem in years to come. I think once that happens then we can get past some of the struggle that we're having.

MS. ABRAHAM: Well, I'm going to make a
county proposal to you, Representative Thomas. I don't speak from the Pennsylvania District Attorneys' Association. I'm the Legislative Chair.

My office plays a very active role, as you well know, in matters of importance. My sense tells me that no District Attorney even in the most or in the least crime plagued area will agree that a gun can't kill.

And $I$ think it's better if you want to impose a formal meeting between some $1 n t e r e s t e d$ legislators and District Attorneys about issues other than gun crime because $I$ could never agree to anything that denigrates gun crime in Philadelphia or Pennsylvania.

If you wanted to have some ideas on the table that you and your fellow legislators want to discuss with us while not binding the association, $I$ believe that we're a bunch of reasonable men and women.

We would be honored to come to a place of mutual convenience to discuss with you all in an informal setting matters of mutual interest across a wide range of ideas.

We'll give you our view of it. You can
give us your view of it. And you never can tell. We might able to reach an accord. I mean George Mitchel did it in Ireland so far. So I don't think the gulf between the legislators and the -and the District Attorneys all that much in many areas.

So I think we can breech some gaps. I don't know about gun crime, but there may be some other issues we can talk about.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: And I guess my last question would run to this whole question of liability. How far should the law stretch in order to send a message that, one, if you buy a gun legally but put it in the hand of someone illegally and that person in turn uses that gun in a way that is of loss of life or serious bodily injury that this original party that -who was negligent in their management or care of that firearm will have to suffer some liability for the harm that it's caused?

MS. ABRAHAM: I think Mike is deferring to me. I think you have to look at what we're talking about Representative Thomas. In and of itself, a gun is inherently lethal. If you gave me a gun, if $I$ came to you and $I$ said, Dad give
me your gun.
And $I$ want to go out in the backyard and shoot some squirrels. And we're living in rural Pennsylvania, and $I$ accidentally shoot some a kid who - I'm shooting at a squirrel, but $I$ miss. Somebody . - my sense tells me that criminally there wouldn't be much likelihood that you would be prosecuted.

Now, you might be sued. And you would be sued civilly. But if $I^{\prime} m$ - - if you have a gun in the house or in your store and $I$ have access to it, and you do not take the care to keep it where $I$ can't get it, and $I$ do get it and $I$ kill myself or $I$ go out and kill some child or adult or $I$ use it to commit a robbery, one of the burdens, Mr. Thomas, of keeping a lethal weapon in your possession - it's not the same as an automobile, although an automobile can kill, too.

But this is inherently lethal. And an automobile is not inherently lethal. This firearm - if $I$ take it and use it to commit a crime or to kill somebody, there are many instances, although not all in Philadelphia and across the Commonwealth, where you could be charged.

Not would be, but could be charged with keeping this dangerous instrumentality in a place where $I$ could get it. And $I$ use it to commit a crime.

So one has to be careful about what you do with lethal weapons around ones home. And there are issues of not only criminal but civil liability that follows depending on the unique circumstances of each case.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Representative Gannon. I appreciate you allowing me to participate $1 n$ this hearing today. I have been doing some work on this issue, especially on the gun courts and legislation that would follow Operation Cease-Fire and the legislation enrichment.

It's been interesting. And I wanted to ask Mr. Stiles a number of questions on this. You mentioned that you see cases from outside Philadelphia County.

Can you tell me the percentage of cases that come from the suburbs and also what your area of U.S. Attorney - where you cover? And how many other areas in Pennsylvania, how many other people cover it?

MR. STILES: There are three U.S.
Attorneys in Pennsylvania, three districts. I'm the eastern district of Pennsylvania. There are nine southeastern counties in Pennsylvania. I can't tell you.

I can get you the information in terms of how many Cease-Fire case indictments we have outside the Philadelphia area. But I don't have that off the top of my head.

I would say they are probably not more than ten or fifteen percent. But $\quad$ particularly made clear to other counties outside Philadelphia that this is not a Philadelphia program.

This is available. And we've done cases in Reading, Allentown, and elsewhere and have set up programs like the program that we have with the District Attorney in Philadelphia for review and referral to our office for federal prosecution.

REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: I have
introduced a bill which is House Bill 1459 which is the is the Gun court Bill that we mentioned before that the District Attorney doesn't like.

But part of that bill covered the Issues of mandatory sentences of five years for
the same kind of felonies that are coming to the Federal Court. You mentioned to, and am $I$ wrong in assuming that would this be helpful to have this kind of thing in a state court in some kind of state court system so that you could go on doing the same kinds of things that you do on the whole broad range of subjects.

MR. STILES: Absolutely. It's really where it belongs. We - and the federal government has never been considered. And $I$ don't think it should be considered to have the line share responsibility for crime control or crime problems.

We will do certain cases on the margins which we've done well for a long time with federal agencies of expertise. But we don't try - if we try one homicide case a year that might have some federal jurisdiction, the District Attorneys tries all those.

We don't do any rapes. We do very few robberies. We do some car-jackings. But we are not, $I$ don't believe, meant to try all the firearms cases. And frankly, I think one of the purposes of these federal projects is to result in state legislative reaction just like this, to
bring the balance back to where $1 t$ should be in terms of local prosecution. I am all in favor of it.

MS. ABRAHAM: I believe that if we had sentencing guidelines like the federal sentencing guidelines where the judges follow the guidelines -- you know, you can follow them.

You cannot follow them. I mean, I fill out those reports all the time. They are meaningless. I mean, you really don't want to have a kid in Forrest County for the same offense that a kid in Delaware County -- I won't use Philadelphia County.

You don't want to have disparate sentences. The guidelines that we have still allow for wild fluctuations between what happens in one county and what happens in another. But if you have real guidelines, that and -- I was on the Sentencing Commission.

And I am not taking a shot at the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing. I served on that commission for five years, so been there and done it.

The problem is that it's not required which judges have the discretion to go up and
down and find the Defendant who is obviously guilty of an offense, guilty of a lessor offense, to dismiss a felon, to remand it to municipal court so it can be tried two times.

You also have to consider two things. One is making our sentencing guidelines just similar to -- and they're very burdensome in the federal court. They are tough, like the Philadelphia phone book used to be very thick and very complex.

But that eliminates one thing. And maybe -- and $I$ know this is radical. But I'm not afraid to talk about radical changes -- if we might want to look at the constitutional change that made the Municipal Court in Philadelphia different from all other courts.

We might want to make those Municipal Court judges -- just so $I$ don't get in trouble with my former colleagues -- common place court judges and not have a two tiered system in Philadelphia.

So that serves -- I don't know that serves our purposes any longer. I mean it has some good points. I did it for four years, loved the Court, loved the men and women on the court.

You know, time marches on. I'm sure that will get headlines, that will get me into trouble.

Hey listen, you know what? People are dyıng in the street. That's radical. Tryıng to form a solution isn't radical. It's just forward thinking.

Now, $I$ 'm not saying you should do it. I'm saying maybe you should look at it. Do we want to do $1 t ?$ We won't need a gun court if we do $1 t$ that way. So maybe we'll have something else to talk about.

MR. STILES: It also - I think that dıscussions reinforcing the need to upgrade gun offenses, whether you take everything you try an municipal court and put it into common pleas court, maybe more than you have to do.

But if you think that a firearms offenses should no longer be misdemeanors - and aside from guidelines, judges with everything that they have to try and everything that they have to dispose of -- a misdemeanor is a signal to say probation.

I mean, $I$ believe that there are classifications of crimes. And $I f$ the legislature thinks as $I$ think you should, that
firearms offenses ought to be more seriously categorized, then let's make them a felony. Let's apply some mandatory penalties to them. And that moves it out of municipal court anyway. REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Well, that was the purpose -- the intent of my legislation was to move it to a different level. And I appreciate the Judiciary Committee for having these hearings today so that these kind of issues can be dıscussed $1 n$ a public forum. Again, thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I think you're both very - -
Commissioner Timmoney mentioned 3600 gun arrests.
U.S. Attorney Stiles mentioned it. And

Representative Thomas mentioned it. And Madam District Attorney, you and your written statement talk about the first four months of 1999.

And I guess you referenced 150,000
people. I think crime was always the number one issue. They left. The reason they left--you're here. I'm still here.

MS. ABRAHAM: I'm staying. I know you are.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: But here's what

I have. Here's where my constituents have a concern. Page one at the bottom. Assistant District Attorneys and my felony nonjury units disposed of a 145 gun cases and 90 of them resulted in a conviction. Now, my constituents think those 90 went to jail. Did they go to Jail?

MS. ABRAHAM: A lot of them didn't. Some got probation. Some got county prison sentences, some, depending on the case. And obviously $I$ have to look at the case. Some of them got jail sentences because of prior probation violations or parole violations.

I think there is some reason for concern of your constituents. I am very concerned as $I$ also have been about the prison cap. And $I$ think our judges ought to sentence more people to state prison. But they don't.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: But of those 90, how many do you think went to jail?

MS. ABRAHAM: You know what? I don't have the sentence in front of me, Representative Kenney. But $I$ can tell you that as soon as $I$ get them.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: HOw many dud
not go to jail because there is no room in the county prison?

MS. ABRAHAM: Well; I don't believe I'm not speaking for judges. But I'm speaking for myself as a judge. I never ever considered the fact that there was no room in the jail to put a defendant who should have been there.

That's for someone else to think. But other judges do thank, Well, I've got this robber coming up next. Maybe -- and I've got this guy who is just in possession of a firearm. Maybe I won't send him to jail.

I'll save the room that we have for the next guy. My records -- if I'm an offender - Kathy MacDonald just handed me some figures. I can answer your questions.

My prior record score means that I should go to jall. I should go to jail or prison, either one.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Are jail and prison the same thing?

MS. ABRAHAM: Well, prison to me is state prison. Jail is like county jail. That's the connotation that $I$ make. And $I$ think that's a distinction that maybe those of us in the law
profession use.
Representative KENNEY: So on state roads they're jails and --

MS. ABRAHAM: That's jail. That's a county prison or county jail. I always use prison in the sense --

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Well, let me put it this way. My constituents don't want them on the street.

MS. ABRAHAM: Oh, sure they don't. Sure they don't.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: So therefore, we're putting them - I guess my concern is - what you're saying is, there are judges that do make sentence decisions based on whether there's room at the prison.

MS. ABRAHAM: Well, there's a lot of these cases where the judge found them guilty. Or there were other cases that - where we had - for example, the issues $I$ raised previously, where there was an illegal search or a throw-down case where we negotiated rather than loose the case.

So some got probation. Some of them are pending. Some of them got jail sentences,
county prison sentences. And $I$ will get to the exact figures.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: So there are those people that should be in prison that are not in prison?

MS. ABRAHAM: There are some that should be in county prason, sometimes even state prison, who aren't.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Well, would that be more or less? I mean --

MS. ABRAHAM: Well, again, depending on when - I think it's too general. Frankly, I have to know each individual case because there might be a felony case, like a robbery case, or part of a case that was dismissed or left only with the gun. A jury may have --

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: What the prison can't issue is the decision made by local government not to build more prisons to house these criminals.

MS. ABRAHAM: Well, it's twofold. It's the previous administration agreeing to a cap on the prisons. And those present administrations built a new prison which was filled within a matter of weeks after it was opened.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: What do you mean, Agreed to?

MS. ABRAHAM: Well, there's a prison cap.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Well, would limit our prison space?

MS. ABRAHAM: Oh, sure. The prison cap was in the agreement. It was a consent decree entered into by and between the then mayor of Philadelphia and the lawyers representing the prisoners that they, the city administration, would agree to cap the prison. That's a consent decree. We agreed to it. I filed a lawsurt.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: I'm just trylng to - - my constituents - I mean - - but are you saying there's an agreement to limit the amount of people in Philadelphia that can be locked up?

MS. ABRAHAM: Yes. Because of the federal prison cap which has been in affect for ten, twelve years now. I mean, I don't agree wrth it. Judge Shapiro doesn't agree with it.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: YOu know I'm talking about if the city of Philadelphia wanted to spend the money to build a new prison they could.

MS. ABRAHAM: I think -- I think that's a different story altogether.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Well, that's what $I^{\prime} m$ asking. The prison cap story, like, does this local government - have they decided not to build?

MS. ABRAHAM: Oh, no, no, no. I don't think that's the case. I can't speak for the Mayor. But $I$ can't believe that he agreed not to build more prisons.

I think what has happened is there have been a variety of issues, not the least of which is, there was a proposal to build another prison up in the northeast on the same location as the other jail facility.

And the nelghbors absolutely will not have it. And the city council person who represents the district has said in print that she would not agree to any city council proposal for a prison in her councilmatic district.

And the bill can't get anywhere with the district counsel persons disapproval. But that doesn't mean that the city of Philadelphia has not agreed to build more prison space. I think the City of Philadelphia wants to build
more prison space, and indeed must build more prison space.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Do you agree, Mr. Stiles? You're building a new facility downtown. Is that correct? Is $1 t$ open?

MR. STILES: No. It will open in June.
A federal detention center.
REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: And how many
rooms at the inn there?
MR. STILES: Well, they're for federal prisoners where - actually people are awaiting trial. And $I$ think the answer is seven or elght hundred persons awaiting federal trial were held without bail or couldn't make the bail.

MS. ABRAHAM: I want to add one thing.
Those prisoners are being held now in our local Jails. Some of them are being held in there. I've forgotten the number. It's not all that great.

But those prisoners would be
transferred to the new federal correctional
facility which would free up at least some, not a significant number. But we're up to over 6, 000 prisoners in that prison, in the correctional center which is well over capacity and well over
the cap by probably 800 or 900.
REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Will the federal prison - detention center be full when you open it?

MR. STILES: I don't know a detention center or prison anywhere that's not full a day after you open it. Yes. I think the answer to that is it will be. There are a few - and $I$ don't know the numbers being held in county institutions.

Most prisoners, federal prisoners, awarting trial are being held in other federal institutions and have to be transported in from long distances every day, but yeah, it's not going to provide any relief for state or county prison overcrowding.

REPRESENTATIVE KENNEY: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you. I want to thank you, District Attorney Abraham and U.S. Attorney stiles, for attending the hearing today and presenting testimony and sharing your thoughts. And we appreciate it very much.

Our next witnesses are the Honorable Dwight Evans of the $203 r d$ Legislative Distruct
and the Honorable Andrew Carn of the 197th Legislative District.

Representative Carn is a Member of this Committee, and Mr. Dan Siegel, President of Pennsylvania Against Handgun Violence.

Welcome, Representative Carn, Representative Douglas, Mr. Siegel, and the 4 th gentleman. Could you identified yourself? You may proceed when you are ready.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: Thank you, Mr.
Chairman. I would like to thank you for providing the opportunity for testimony on the issues surrounding the enforcement of existing firearm laws and regular regulations within our Commonwealth.

As $I$ review the existing laws, it
became very clear to me that there existed deficrencies in state and federal law as it relates to the issue of gun safety.

Title 18 of the Pennsylvania Code requires that the State Police distribute free of charge to every licensed gun dealer copies of a firearms safety brochure.

The brochure is developed by state police and contains a summary of our state's gun
laws. Currently, the Commonwealth requires that various law enforcement personnel receive training in the use of firearms.

But we do not require safety training for the general populace. This seems a little odd to me because Pennsylvania requires training for measure of an individual's skill with respect to a variety of products and occupations.

Whether it's driving a car, or practicing medıcine or law, Pennsylvanıa cıtizens must pass a test or demonstrate in some way a certaln level of proficiency.

Pennsylvania law also does not address the issue of safety of firearms products that are sold and operated in the Commonwealth. There are no minimum safety standards for firearms sold in our state and no requirements that safety devices be purchased or incorporated into the design of firearms.

It is true that the House approved legislation to provide mandatory purchases of safety locks. However, neither the Pennsylvania code nor the approved trigger-lock bill requires the use of safety devices on firearms.

In this case, state law does not
provide incentives for gun owners to be responsible. Again, I find this to be strange because we mandate the use of safety devices on other products such as seat belts in cars. If you do not wear a seatbelt while operating your vehicle, you can be fined in our state.

I feel that we can be safer and smarter when it comes to firearms also. As a state, we should adopt policies that support responsible gun owners.

For this reason, I introduced House Bill 1775 which mandates the purchase of safety locks and provides immunity from civil liability for gun owners who use safety locks.

I modeled this provision after language that was adopted overwhelmingly by the U.S. Senate (78-20) and U.S. House (311-115). The immunity provision was supported by prominent gun rights advocates such as Orrin Hatch, Trent Lott, John McCain, and Strom Thurmond.

In Pennsylvania, we provide full or
lımited immunity from liability to various individuals and/or organizations as an incentrve to do the right thing. Some times immunity is provided to encourage individuals to do important
jobs.
Here are just a few examples of the people and groups that are provided full or limited immunity in state law: Medical good samaritans. School employees. Volunteer firefighters. Farmers. Little league coaches and officials. State government.

In my view, it would be appropriate to protect responsible gun owners from lawsuit, if an unauthorized user, such as a child or a crimınal, obtains possession of their weapon.

I would stress that this is not mandating use of the safety locks. Nothing in my proposal would require the use of trigger-locks. If a gun owner uses the locks, the gun owner gets immunity. If the gun owner does not use the locks, the gun owner does not get immunity. Under my proposal, immunity is simply an incentive.

On many occasions, government provided incentives to its citizens to achieve certain goals. From tax breaks to immunity from prosecution, government often utilizes incentives to encourage different types of behaviors.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the

Committee, I would like to thank you for supporting my bill when $I$ offered it on the floor of the House a few weeks ago.

I understand that there were concerns about full versus limited immunity. I would like to publicly offer to work with you on a compromise that would be acceptable to all concerned. I think that you and $I$, along with all Pennsylvanians, would agree that encouraging safe behavior with respect to firearms is a laudable and bipartisan goal for state government.

I will conclude by returning to the issue of safety standards. Currently, guns are the only consumer product not regulated by any state or federal safety regulations. I find this to be incredible when you consider that one of the primary functions of a firearm is to cause serious injury or death.

The lack of safety regulations are one of the major reasons for the proliferation of junk guns. Junk guns are cheap and poorly made weapons that are often used in the commission of crime.
federal statute or our state code; which would preclude the implementation of safety regulations for firearms. In addition, federal and state law does permit safety regulations for a host of every day products such as cigarettes, toys, and food.

Several states have taken the initiative in this area and established consumer protection regulatıons. California and Massachusetts have provided the Attorney General in their respective states with this authority. Safety regulations have been
implemented in various ways. In Californıa, the government certifies every gun model, while Massachusetts allows the gun industry to self-test.

However, the Attorney General can dispute the finding and require an independent test at a certified lab.

Some states have made safety standards the responsibility of the state police, while others have appointed an independent board of experts.

In my view, the Attorney General is the most appropriate place for assigning
responsibility for consumer protection regulations. Currently, Pennsylvania's Attorney General is authorized by the state law to develop policies that protect the state's consumers.

In addition to being the state's top law enforcement officer, Pennsylvania's Attorney General is authorized to investigate commercial and trade practices in the distribution, financing and furnishing of goods and services for the use of consumers.

The Attorney General is also charged with advising the legislature on matters affecting consumer interests, including the development of policies and the proposal of programs to protect consumers.

As a result, I introduced House Bill 1777 which would give the Attorney General the authority to develop consumer protection regulations for firearms.

I look forward to discussing protections for responsible gun owners and consumer protection regulations with the Members of the Committee and other interested colleagues in the future.

I hope that $I$ have provided you with
ways that we can improve our state gun laws, and I look forward to working with you in the future. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Thank YOU, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank you and other members of the committee for this opportunity this morning to give some of my thoughts relatıng to the issue of firearms safety.

This morning has been a rather interesting discussion. You've heard the Mayor of the City of Philadelphia. You've heard the Police Commissioner. You've heard the U.S. Attorney. You've heard the District Attorney.

This is the first time in my 19 years if experience in the House that $I$ think we've had a rather open discussion of the issue. I want to address what $I$ think will greatly enhance the enforcement of the existing firearms rules and regulations.

As you well know, the laws enacted to deal with this issue focus on enforcement and punishment. It is a law that deals with prevention.

In the last decade alone, the
Pennsylvanıa legıslature has overturned Philadelphia and Pittsburg's ban on assault weapons, prohibited all local governments from making any gun regulations, prohibited local police throughout the state from questions as once in terms of applicants regarding carrying permits, exempting concealed carrying permits holders from the Brady Act, also the state 48-hour waiting period, eliminating the 48-hour waitang period entirely once the instant background check was put into existence.

We're here to talk about enforcement. But as a body we have systematically taken away local officials ability to rein inappropriate ownership and the use of firearms.

The reason -- I think it's important to understand that you've heard this from the Mayor, the Police Commissioner, and the District Attorney.

But $I$ believe that we as a General Assembly have basically created and added more to the problem than to it's solution, knowing that a vast majority of people in this country want to prevent and address, knowing prevention will
contribute to a focus on enforcement of gun laws. We started, along with Representative Andrew Carn, Representative Babbette Josephs, Representative Connie Williams, and other people, what $u s$ called the Common Sense Firearm Safety Caucus.

The Common Sense Firearm Safety Caucus was formed earlier this year in response to the need to offer better prioritized - to the general assembly relating to the issue of guns and safety.

Pennsylvania, in any view, is in a position to enact reasonable and responsible measures that have proven to save lives in the states that have passed them.

We're not a large caucus. But we represent the concerns and the wishes of the majority of the people in this Commonwealth. Our mission is to develop and educate legislatıve strategy, to increase firearm safety and reduce the level of gun violence in Pennsylvania.

Some of you may feel the urge to point to the recent reports about violent crime being down in Pennsylvania. While that may be true for much of the country, according to the

Pennsylvania State Police in 1998, Pennsylvania violent crime rose by 5 percent.

Philadelphia violent crime rose by 10.7
in 1998. Philadelphia accounts for 44 percent of the violent crıme committed $u n$ Pennsylvanıa last year. The vast majority of Americans support both reasonable gun safety measures.

Democrats and Republican alike need to drop this issue about the constitutional issue that shields the gun issue from heightened scrutiny and regulation. Why does that prevent us from a public discussion on limits? We need to let common sense prevail.

Sometimes common sense includes rejecting do nothing proposals that actually weakens current law in some instances while at the same time doing nothing to protect our children from injury or promoting safety education and training.

Having said that, the Common Sense Firearms Safety Caucus will push legislation that meet it the following criteria: First, we should talk about protecting our children from injuries by limiting access to firearms.

Secondly, we should talk about limiting
gun purchases to responsible adults. Third, we should promote firearm safety education and training. Fourth, we should stress the local gun control and law enforcement efforts by combatting illegal safety and trafficking.

No. 5, we should implement a fair and comprehensive background check system with appropriate safeguards designed to prevent firearm injury and violence.

No. 6, we should enhance law enforcement safety by banning assault weapons and junk guns. We know for a fact that a majority of voters including the gun owners say that Pennsylvania laws are not tough enough. Only 6 percent believe that laws are too strict.

I want to briefly tell you what the Common sense Firearm Safety Caucus thinks is reasonable and responsible for the immediate future.

First, trigger-locks, in our view are - what we did this fall was not tough enough. We need to do more. 91 percent of Pennsylvania voters including 86 percent of gun owners say we should require trigger-locks on all new guns.

Crimes committed with handguns has
reached a level in Philadelphia that is outrageous. A proposal to limit handgun purchases to one person a month, we do not believe that will limit anyone's right.

As you have heard earlier by the Police Commissioner, you can still have 12 handguns a year. 68 percent of Pennsylvania voters, 51 percent of Pennsylvania gun owners think it is reasonable. It is a reasonable approach.

This approach does not make purchasing a handgun more difficult for anyone except for those who should not purchase one to begin with. 87 percent of Pennsylvania voters, 78 percent of voting gun owners say there should be no handgun sales or ownership to anyone under the age of 21.

A ban on assault weapons. We must stop this insanity. Pennsylvania voters mirror those at the national level in which 71 percent say a complete ban on assault weapons. These
approaches are the right approaches and do not infringe on anyone's rights aside from being the right way to go. They also have the support of the majority of Pennsylvania.

I would like to, before I conclude, Mr. Chairman, introduce a gentleman here to my left
who is a constituent who started an organization called the Father's Day Rally Committee.

And he started that organization, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, because of the violence he knows that was taking place $u n$ the City of Philadelphia, particularly in the African American population.

And $I$ would like for him to take a couple minutes just to talk about something that is very much real. And we sometames talk about in Harrisburg things that are not as real.

MR. QAYYUM: Thank you very much.

First of all let me, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Judicial Committee, thank you for this opportunity to present a brief testimony.

First of all, Representative Evans, who happens to be my Representative, gave me this opportunity. And $I$ wanted to thank him.

My organization, called the Father's
Day Rally Committee, is an organization of African American citizens in the city of Philadelphia.

We actually came together ten years ago after the city of Philadelphia had a tremendous record breaking homicide rate of 501 murders in
one year. And in the next year it went up to 536 murders. We initiated what we call a peace campaign.

We actually stood on the corner of Broad and Dried, which is in Representative Thomas's district, and called for a peace movement in the City of Philadelphia to reduce homicides.

Since that happened ten years ago, now homicide has dropped in half. My understanding with the police report was that $1 t^{\prime}$ s even down to 200 homicides in the City of Philadelphia.

But what we have found out is that even though homicide has dropped, that does not eliminate the number of people being shot. And what people don't like to talk about -- we already talked about homicide numbers. But those homicide numbers also relate to other victims of gunshots.

The national figures show that for every one person killed with a gun, there's a hundred wounded. And if you go to any hospital in the country or any rehabilitation center, you would see thousands of young men and women who have been victims of homicides.

I would just like to make -- my other comments are not dealing with so much the legislative issue because I'm not a legislator. You are. But from the issue of a father referencing organization and also talking about the moral values which is creating the climate that we feel for the high number of homicides taking place in everybody's community.

And as legislators, if you believe in God or don't believe in God, laws are created because you don't believe in God. And I feel everyone sutting in this room is a God-fearing person no matter what your religion is.

You have a moral responsibility and spiritual responsibility to establish proper legislation and create laws that will protect all the citizens of this state. And as $I$ sat in this room, and $I$ said to Dwight earlier, it's interesting that we're having this hearing this morning. Really in the room -- as $I$ was looking in the library, most of the books are about the civil war.

They're about other wars. They are about bearing arms. I was reading the great speech of former President Lincoln about a
divided country.
And in some sense, we are moving in that darection again in this country. As I turned on the news last night and looked at what was happening in seattle -- and you're looking at me and saying, what does this have to do with legislation and about guns? But it's setting the moral character of the country that we're moving into.

As I look at the legislators in front of me, most of you, $I$ guess, are maybe younger than $I$ am. But $I^{\prime} m$ a child of the '60s.

And the tone was set then, if you remember as you looked at yesterday's actions in Seattle. The first thing $I$ said to my wife was, I remember those days very well, the ' 60 s and '70s when there was a movement in this country, the Black Power Movement, Civil Rights Movement, or the Antiwar Movement.

And we have a tendency to forget where we came from. And $I$ would say to you this morning, $I^{\prime} m$ pleading to the legislators to think and really study and look at the impact of what's going on in America today.

We have a saying in the African

American community. We have a saying. When America has a cold, we have pneumonia. And what's going on in America is that black folks are being killed daily and no one is saying anything because we're black folks.

But when white folks start getting killed, people start getting upset. That's the way $I$ do that analogy of a cold and pneumonia. But it shouldn't be that. We should not be a divided country or divided city or divided state. We all are cıtizens of this country. We all have a responsibility.

So $I$ would plead with you to look at and think about this as you look at laws. Yes, there's counties in upper Pennsylvania where there's not a problem. Everybody owns guns. Everybody hunts.

In Philadelphia, there is a problem. Everybody owns guns. And a lot of folks that own guns are hunting and hunting the wrong folks. So if you do not have a problem with home rule, you need to look at that as one solution.

Now, I heard the argument about crossing lines. But once again we have a unique problem in the City of Philadelphia that has to
be solved. Limiting it to one gun a month is one solution. Gun locks, as Representative Carn and Evans talked about, is another solution. And there's many more.

Our ability to sue gun manufacturers is another solution a lot of us feel will bring issues. So those are issues that we feel are very important in the City of Philadelphia.

Let me end by saying that last night $I$ was reading an article in the Black Enterprise. The Black Enterprise is a black business magazine. And the article was about marketing techniques in this country where major corporations are now marketing sneakers, clothing, records, and rap records to urban markets because what they're finding out is if $1 t$ sells in urban America, it will sell in rural America.

They know that white kids buy what black kids are buying. So black kids in this country are having a major influence on your children in the suburbs and the rural areas. That has to be looked at.

So we are beginning now to have a common bond racially in this country. Young
white kids are acting like young black kids. They're adopting our culture. It's upsetting a lot of you. And $I^{\prime} m$ sorry if $I^{\prime} m$ offending anybody, but it's real. It's something we have to look at.

I'm saying that in reference to this culture in this country. There's a culture of war. There's a culture of violence. And it's affecting every child whether you're black, you're white, you're Asian, or you're spanish.

We have to put a stop to that.
Legitimate serious legislation will help but will not solve it. I'm one that believes that more spiritual conviction will solve our problems.

But at the same time $I$ understand we need legislation to solve our problems because everybody does not belleve in God, and everybody does not have a moral or spiritual belief.

We must have responsible legislation giving the City of Philadelphia the right to sue manufacturers. If that is what we have to do, lt needs to be done. Giving the right to one gun a month is a good legislation. And all the other legislations that will eliminate violence in our community must be done.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I will finish with this last comment. Basically, as $I$ indicated to you in the last couple years, with the Mayor, with the Police Commissioner and the District Attorney, as you can see, I think that in the City of Philadelphia we have attempted to do the things that we need to do.

There's no question that we could do a lot more. But in my view -- and I thank you especially, Mr. Chairman and Members of this Committee, because for the first time we're having an open discussion. But $I$ think we have to go beyond having an open discussion because we have to come up with some outcome.

I don't think this is going to be a Democrat/Republıcan, urban/rural approach to solving these problems, Mr. Chairman.

A couple weeks ago when we voted on the trigger-lock bill -- and $I$ certainly wish we would have gone a lot further. But when I looked at that vote, it was 45 Democrats and 50 Republicans.

You and Representative Godshall took kind of the lead on that particular issue. We need to continue that kind of coalition. But we
have to get a little bit more serious. Because ıf you look at -- since we changed the gun laws in 1994, 1995; particularly in the City of Philadelphia, we have gone from 5,000 permits to 33,000 permits in Montgomery County. The number has also doubled and increased.

So the question that Representative Thomas raised, in my view, regarding the issue of uniformity, we have to figure out some way. How do we strike a balance?

And $I$ think we've been missing - and $I$ think you are golng in the right direction with these hearings. But again, $I$ hope it's not like we always do, Mr. Chairman. We go through the process, but do we really come out with something at the end?

I want to thank you for this
opportunity to speak before this committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank You, Mr. Evans.
Mr. Siegel.
MR. SIEGEL: Thank you, Chaırman Gannon and Members of the House Judiciary Committee, for allowing me the opportunity to address this Committee.

As you know, I am Dan Siegel, President
of Pennsylvanians Against Handgun Violence, the only grass roots gun control lobbying organization in the Commonwealth. I am also a past member of the Board of Handgun Control, Inc.

I continue to serve as a spokesman for handgun control in Pennsylvania. I have been involved in the issue of gun control for approximately two decades and have worked with many members of Congress, this Legislature, and this committee on what is commonly called gun control legislation.

I believe that most people who know me will agree that $I$ am basically a moderate when it comes to gun control, and that $I$ understand the practical $1 s$ sues which confront this committee and the Legislature.

I do find it ironic, however, that the reasons stated for this hearing are to consider the levels of federal, state and local enforcement of the laws and regulations concerning firearms within this Commonwealth.

According to the invitation that $I$
received, the committee wanted to hold this hearing before reviewing any proposed legislation on this issue. In light of the events of the last few weeks, it $1 s$ clear that, for whatever reasons, individuals in the Harrisburg legislature have moved forward with a variety of gun control legislation, inconsistent with the stated goal of this committee and this hearing.

The problems with gun control in Pennsylvania is not that there are too many laws. The problem with gun control in Pennsylvania is not that there are not new laws which $I$ and others believe should be enacted.

The problem with gun control in Pennsylvania stems from the fact that this legislative body has historically meddled with every piece of so-called gun control law on such a frequent basis that it is virtually impossible to determine the effectiveness of any of the legislation.

For example, $I$ was a member of the Select Committee to investigate the use of certain automatic and semiautomatic weapons, which was formed in 1994. The majority of this committee's members were individuals who would generally be considered pro-gun.

I represented Handgun Control, Inc.,
and was the only Representative from a pro-gun control organization. Despite the committee's makeup, we did propose sweeping revisions of Pennsylvania's gun laws. The Committee's final legislative proposal was endorsed by 13 of the 15 Members of the Committee.

The Natıonal Rifle Association's Representative neither supported nor opposed the committee's proposal. When that legislation reached the senate floor, however, amendments were made which strongly opposed the bill. Among the amendments which passed were the following: One, Elimination of Pennsylvania's 48 -hour waiting period for handgun purchases; Two, elimination of Philadelphia's stricter standard for carrying a concealed weapon; and, three, reduction of the fee for gun purchasers.

This amendment effectively eliminated funding for any community education programs. Among the amendments which the senate defeated were: One, an amendment which would have required all persons with permits to carry concealed weapons to have mandatory training; and, two, an amendment which would have precluded
persons convicted of ethnic crimes from possessing or owning a firearm.

These votes, particularly the elimination of Philadelphia's right to control who receives a concealed carry permit, are particularly ironic because many members of the legislature continue to state their support for as much local control on a variety of issues as possible, yet this legislature has consistently implemented firearms legislation from this viewpoint.

For example, when Philadelphia enacted an assault weapons ban, this legislature, led by Senators from Philadelphia, immediately passed a law which preempted all local gun legislation.

The final version of the Uniform Firearms Act was passed in June of 1995, and was a significantly watered-down version of the bill which has been endorsed by our bipartisan committee.

The amendments which passed, although not numerous in number, were significant in the extent of their impact -- and it is now common knowledge that those amendments have led to Philadelphia being one of the major centers of
gunrunning on the entire east coast. In fact, it is because of those amendments that many members of this body, both Republican and Democrat are now strongly supporting one gun a month legislation, commonly called anti-gunrunning legislation. These laws are needed because of the manner in which the Senate, with the House's consent, tampers with the proposed 1995 legislation.

Attached to my remarks is a listing of the amendments to the Uniform Firearms Acts since its enactment. Amendments were passed in 1995, 1993, and twice in 1998. All of these amendments either further diluted these laws or pushed back the effective date of various provisions of the act.

In essence, despite passing the Uniform Fırearms Act in 1995, this Legislature has repeatedly done everything it could to delay the nmplementation of that law.

If this Committee wants to know about the effectiveness and enforcement of firearms laws in this Commonwealth, the first thing this Committee needs to do is look at the Legislature in Harrisburg as a whole and understand that the
reason that these laws do not seem to be effective or enforced is because this Legislature consistently refuses to allow the enforcement of the laws it passes.

When $I$ last addressed this Committee on the issue of one gun a month legislation, I emphasized this fact, and the events of the past few weeks only serve to highlight this. The mandatory gun lock legislation which came out of the House a few weeks ago is feel-good legislation.

We already know that 90 percent of all handguns are sold with gun locks, many of them being of an inferior quality.

Did this Legislature address the quality of those locks? No. Did this Legislature mandate that guns be stored with the locks on? No. Did this Legislature mandate that guns be stored with locks where children or others may have access to them? No.

Gun manufacturers are currently the only industry not regulated by the consumer Products Safety Commission in Washington. It $1 s$ also common knowledge that gun manufacturers' products do not reflect the latest technology.

For example, we know that gun locks could be installed as a standard feature on handguns, but because there is no requirement to do so, two manufacturers choose not to.

The legislation which this Committee apparently has endorsed mandating the use of gun locks will not benefit the citizens of this Commonwealth in any meaningful way. Neither will the legislation approved by the senate to preempt the right of cities to file lawsuits against manufacturers.

The litigation against gun manufacturers, while certainly a unique strategy, is something that cities should avail themselves of. Why? Because of the cost to the cities of gun deaths and gun injuries, which are becoming an epidemic.

What this Committee needs to do is examine the initial proposed legislation from the 1994 Select Committee, as well as various alternatives put forth since then. These proposals include anti-gunrunning statutes, mandatory sentencing issues, potential regulation of cheap/inferior quality weapons, and other legislation designed both to insure a higher
quality/safety level of handguns, and to prevent guns from getting into the hands of minors and others who we all agree should not possess those weapons.

How can the courts and police of this Commonwealth enforce legislation passed in Harrisburg when it seems as if at least once a year this Legislature tinkers with the laws?

How can the courts and police of this Commonwealth enforce legislation passed in Harrisburg when it seems as if at least once a year this Legislature tinkers with the laws in a way which since 1995 has done nothing but weaken those laws?

The reality is that the message which has been sent consistently both from this Legislature and the Governor's Mansion is that it is acceptable to make it easy to obtain weapons and to use them in Pennsylvania.

It is time for this Committee not to
recommend feel-good legislation because of whatever political agendas may suit the Members of the Committee or others in the Legislature. It $u s$ time for this committee and the enture Legislature to look at our existing laws and to
enact amendments which are effective and are designed to address the problems currently effecting the citizens of Pennsylvania.

This means that this Legislature and this Committee should do everything it can, as addressed at the prior hearing on one gun a month bulls, to eliminate multiple purchases of weapons.

It is also time that this Legislature and this committee make certain that guns do not get into the hands of children. Or, if they do, that those guns have a lock on them so that children do not get hurt.

I live in suburban Delaware County, an area which is traditionally considered a safe area. We have had shootings. We have had robberies involving assault weapons, and we have had a variety of incidents involving handguns and long guns over the years.

The most tragic incident to me is not the robbery of a nearby Acme with an assault rifle, it is the serious injury suffered by a 7-year-old who went into the drawer of a dresser in his apartment and found his father's loaded handgun.

That boy looked at the gun and pulled the trigger. He spent weeks at Children's Hospital in Philadelphia recovering from his injuries. Many children are not that lucky.

While it would be nice to believe that parents, teachers, and society as a whole will do everything necessary to teach children not to use guns and to stay away from them, we know that this us not a reality.

We also know that making the laws weaker means that criminals can get guns easier. Both of these realities are what this committee and what this Legislature need to consider and to address.

Unless and until this Legislature has the fortitude to address these issues and to realize that poll after poll after poll demonstrates that the citizens of Pennsylvania embrace legislation designed to address these problems, these problems will continue to occur and the debate about guns will not go away. More importantly, neither will the deaths and the injuries from those guns.

It is time for this Committee to consider and to recommend mandatory gun lock
legislation so that after a gun is sold the owners of those weapons store those guns safely.

This Committee should also recommend the enactment of anti-gunrunning laws in one of the various forms that has been proposed. And this Committee should do whatever it has to do to keep guns out of the wrong hands. Only then will the citizens of this commonwealth feel that we are moving forward.

The Legislature needs to take the lead and not be led by the pro-gun special interests.

I want to thank this Committee for allowing me to address it and hope that these hearings will lead to positive changes in our laws. If Pennsylvanians Against Handgun Violence and $I$ can be of service to this committee, the Legislature, or to anyone else concerning these issues, we welcome the opportunity. Thank you again for inviting me to speak today.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: TO bring this issue to the attention of Pennsylvanians all across the state - and I'm kind of excited. I remember back in'94 and'95 in conjunction with the Philadelphia anti-violence anti-grafitti network we held a series of public hearings and
outlined all of these proposals that are now on the table and really couldn't get the momentum going there. So I'm glad that the momentum is there.

Now, the only thing $I$ ask, is that and $I$ think that $I$ 've heard my colleagues from other counties say it. The Uniform Firearms Act really had a Philadelphia advocate who was pushing it. A Philadelphia advocate pushed the repeal of all local ordinances because he believed that this should be a uniform policy.

I've heard no one bring him in or sit him down and talk to him about uniformity versus individual counties being able to do what's in the best interest of their counties.

And a lot of colleagues outside of Philadelphia County what they're saying is why should Philadelphia county jump up and down when your advocates are coming from Philadelphia County?

I know in my own caucus it was my caucus leadership who felt that these local ordinances should be repealed and that some of these proposals should not be discussed.

So I guess what $I$ 'm saying is, thank
you for your recommendations, but at some point we have to be honest with each other and we have to call the chips where they fall. And until we can be honest with one another, $I$ think that we're just going to kind of keep going over and over this whole discussion.

Thank You, Mr. Chairman.
REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: To the
gentleman, $I$ hear what he is saying. But when he said, be honest - $\quad$ d don't think you called names. You just said persons. But my response would be to you, sir, that $I$ think that as you described the momentum, the momentum is happening.

The difference that $I$ see from 1999 and 1994 is Edinboro. It's Columbine. It's Kentucky. It's Pearl, Mississippi. It's not Pete Jefferson in South Philadelphia who found a handgun and was shot in the head by a 7-year-old or Gloria Brown's daughter.

What $I$ see is - every single day you
heard the U.S. Attorney say that 82 percent of the murders last year were with a handgun. It us in the national debate at the Presidential level. It's a national debate.

So I don't care if you're Republican or where you're from. I think the difference is the people are ahead of the politicians and the people do want some sense of common sense, a common sense approach.

They don't think that just having gun safety in and by itself is golng to solve it. We've got to talk about the court system. We can talk about the media. We can talk about all those aspects, but we need to do a better job and start talking about it because the only reason cities are using the courts in the first place is because we as Legislators in Harrisburg, in Washington, and in other places have failed, in my view, to offer some real common sense approach.

So people figure, well, lıke the only option $I$ have is the courts. That's why they go to the courts, because they don't feel they have any other option.

So when you say, speak honestly, I don't disagree with you. I don't care if it's a Democrat or a Republican.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Well, let me just give you two examples. One, the Bill that
the senate voted on 31 to 10 -

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Eleven.

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: 39 to 11 to prohibit counties like Philadelphia from suing gun manufacturers. The one Philadelphia vote - -

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: TWO.
REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Well, the one Philadelphia vote was the Minority Chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Now, who's that?

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: Representative Fumo.

REPRESENTATIVE EVANS: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS: And I don't
know of anybody who has talked to the senator about what $I$ hear is where he is.

The other example, and $I$ don't want to prolong it because $I$ remember we went through the gun debate in'94-'95. We as Democrats were in the majority. The speaker came down out of the Speaker's Box to the floor and had serious concerns about Philadelphia's so-called ordinance and about our interest at the time to move this issue to some reasonable recommendations.

Okay. And $I$ don't know about your
tenure, but $I$ have never seen a speaker come down out of the speaker's Box and have serious concerns.

And I'm not coming down on those people. In that case, I'm talking about Mr. Deweese, the Chairman who was the Speaker at the time.

I think that we have to include them in the conversation because $I$ think that we can get anywhere as long as we talk to each other about what the problem is. But I've never seen Chairman DeWeese at any of these hearings and I've never seen senator fumo at any of these hearings.

That's the only thing that $I$ 'm saying.
They have to be included because any legislative proceedings have got to have the support of the leadership regardless of what caucus you're in, even if we're saying in Philadelphia. We've got to have that.

If We have a problem that's epidemac to Philadelphia, then Philadelphia has to be on board with that problem. Either that or the date is wrong or there's a misinterpretation of what's going on.

REPRESENTATIVE CARN: I would like to respond by saying that none of us are monolithic in our thinking. There are a lot of perspectives on this issue.

Clearly, all Philadelphians do not agree on how to address this matter. But I'm Just hoping that -- and $I$ do recognize that it is the will of the people and whatever districts we represent that determines how we vote on these issues.

So when we're talking about everybody being on board, $I$ would expect senator Fumo's constituency to get him on board if they feel that they do not agree with him.

So as one legislator to another, it's still up to the people to have the will to force us to do what we need to do in the Legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE: Mr. Siegel, a question that's been on my mind for a while. I've heard the term used a number of times by the witnesses, and $I$ thought that maybe you could, since you're on that committee, give me a definition of an assault weapon.

MR. SIEGEL: Well, there are a number of definıtions of assault weapons. There's a

Federal definition which deals with guns based on certain characteristics.

In the Committee we have the state Police definition which is basically - they were referring to cheap guns used in crimes and included a lot of handguns.

I'm not sitting here saying that. I mean, there's so many. There are a variety of definitions. That's the problem, and I acknowledge the problem.

When you are trying to target a specific gun or something - and that's why I'm not here trying to suggest that you do that.

But there are some definitions. Some deal with the size, the distinguishing features, whether there's certain things on it, certain things with capacity, and that's with all of 1 . You could have a different definition.

And $I$ know -- don't think that. If thus Committee wants to go forward looking at guns based on just their physical characteristics, that is the way that's going to do it.

So I understand your question. There are so many different definitions. That's the
problem with the assault weapons debate. And that comes from someone that's involved with it on one side of it.

But I don't think you should be looking at a particular gun $X, Y, Z . \quad$ Look at safety issues, training issues, and those issues which affect all weapons because there are 200 million guns out there already.

We've got to deal with what's out there, not necessarily one gun because it looks more evil than another.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much, gentlemen, for being here, and Representative Carn and Representative Evans.

Well, Representative Carn, you're a Member of the Committee. Representative Evans, you're welcome to join the Committee for the remainder.

Our next witness is Major Ronald J.

Hackenberg, Director of Records and

Identifications with the Pennsylvania state Police, and Mr. Ronald Plesco, Esquire, Executive Policy Specialist, Legislative Affairs Offlce of the Pennsylvania state Police.

They are going to take just a couple of
mınutes to set up their presentation. But what $I$ would like to do for the remainder of the hearing - I'm going to bring the witnesses up in panels. That will expedite the hearing a little bit. So we're working with the witnesses and getting the panels together. So the remainder of the witnesses will be heard in panels to expedite things.

We'll return in about one minute with Major Hackenberg and Mr. Plesco.
(Break.)
MAJOR HACKENBERG: Mr. Chairman, Committee Members, on behalf of the Pennsylvania State Police, $I$ welcome this opportunity to address the House Judiciary Committee and testify on the issues surrounding the enforcement of exlsting firearms laws and regulations within this Commonwealth.

The fundamental purpose of Act 17 of 1995, the Uniform Firearms Act, was to provide support to law enforcement in the areas of crime prevention and control.

Under the Uniform Firearms Act, individuals who have been convicted of specific enumerated offenses or fall under other
conditions identified in the Act, are prohibıted from possessing, using, manufacturing, controlling, selling, or transferring firearms. The Uniform Firearms Act establishes criteria where firearms are prohibited from being carried without a license. For instance, it is illegal to carry a loaded firearm in any vehicle or a concealed firearm except in an individual's place of abode or fixed place of business without a valid Pennsylvania license to carry firearms.

A violation of this section is graded a felony of the third degree unless the individual has a license that expired within the last six months or would otherwise be eligible to obtarn a valid license to carry a firearm. In such circumstances, the violation is graded a misdemeanor of the first degree.

Additionally, no individual, except persons exempt from licensing or possessing a valid Pennsylvania license to carry firearms, is permitted to transport firearms in a vehicle.

With regard to carrying firearms in Philadelphia, individuals are prohibited from carrying a firearm at any time upon the public streets or on public property in the City, unless
the individual is licensed to carry a firearm.
Moreover, the Act provides that any person who knowingly and intentionally delivers or provides a minor with a firearm in violation of this chapter, commits a felony of the thrrd degree.

The Pennsylvania State Police, within our responsibility to administer the Act, has established the Pennsylvania Instant Check System (PICS) to conduct background checks to determine an individual's eligibility to carry a firearm or obtain a license to carry firearms.

In conducting PICS background checks, the Pennsylvania State Police searches data bases covering Pennsylvania criminal history, juvenile records, wanted person files, protection from abuse files, mental health, and national records that include federal and other states' criminal history record information, national wanted files, protection orders, mental health, military records, and renounced citizenship information.

A toll-free telephone number has been established for firearm dealers and county sheriffs for instantaneous access to the PICS background check process.

The Uniform Firearms Act additionally
regulates the sale and transfer of firearms within the Commonwealth. Licensed Pennsylvania firearm dealers are required to conduct a background check through PICS to determine an individual's eligibility to acquire a firearm.

The dealers are also required to complete certain forms promulgated by the Department. The Act requires an application/record of sale to be completed on all handgun transactions. The form is not required for the sale of long guns, although the background check is still necessary.

However, private transfers of long guns are not required to be conducted through a dealer. Accordingly, a background check is not conducted to determine the individual's eligibility to possess the firearm.

With the requirements for firearm dealers in Pennsylvania to complete and maintain specific documentation related to the sale and transfer of firearms, dealers are also directed that any confidential information obtained on an individual shall only be used for the sole purpose of a firearm background check
transaction.
Use of the PICS background check system for any purpose other than the sale or transfer of firearms or use of information obtained for the purpose of the background check in violation of the Act is a felony of the third degree.

The Uniform Firearms Act also requires dealers to maintain specific records and collect fees for PICS background checks, \$2.00, and surcharge fees, $\$ 3.00$, on firearm transactions subject to sales tax.

Unlike the Gun Control Act of 1968 which requires the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms to ensure federal firearm licensing compliance with federal laws and regulations, the Uniform Firearms Act clearly assigns the Pennsylvania state Police the responsibility for the administration of the Act.

But dealer compliance, investigation, enforcement, and auditing of the Pennsylvania licensed firearm dealers is not regulated or exclusively delegated to the Pennsylvania state Police.

Individuals attempting to acquire firearms through a purchase or transfer through a
dealer are required to complete the application/record of sale and/or the applicable federal firearm transaction records forms.

An individual misrepresenting him or herself by making a false written or oral statement in an attempt to acquire a firearm in violation of this Act commits a felony of the third degree.

Unlike the Federal Gun Control Act of 1968, an individual attempting to acquire a long gun through a licensed Pennsylvania firearm dealer is not required to complete an application/record of sale under the Uniform Firearm Act which requires self-certification as to the accuracy of the information and identification provided in order to acquire the firearm.

The state application/record of sale form used for all handgun transactions clearly identifies those circumstances for which an individual is prohibited from acquiring a firearm.

Without reading and completing the form, an individual may not know what may or may not be prohibited. Without the signed document,
enforcement of this section is difficult.
Early in the PICS operation it became evident that some individuals did not realize that they are prohibited from possessing and acquiring firearms.

Individuals who had been acquiring long guns before November of 1998 were not required to go through the background check process.

Also, before PICS, background checks did not encompass as many database searches. Individuals who are denied through the PICS check, under the Act and within 30 days of a PICS transaction, may challenge a denial determination.

Based upon records obtained through extensive research, when further information is located to determine that an individual is not prohibited under the Uniform Firearms Act or Federal Firearms Law, a denial determination can be reversed.

The Pennsylvania State Police have developed an administrative regulation for enforcement of violations of the Uniform Firearms Act.

Meetings with the Bureau of Alcohol,

Tobacco, and Firearms have been held to discuss and develop enforcement strategres and provide for timely and efficient exchange of investigative information.

Procedures have been established for the multi-agency investigations and provide for follow-up contact with the state Police firearm Division as to the status of investigations.

Investigations are prioritized as they relate to individuals who have records indicating crimes of violence, multiple prohibiting offenses, habitual drug offenses, protection orders requiring confiscation of firearms, and prohibiting mental health records.

The Pennsylvania state Police and agents from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms meet regularly to exchange informatıon on investigations and coordinate enforcement efforts.

As a result, cases are being investigated by state Police, local law enforcement agencies, and federal authorities for prosecution of individuals who allegedly have been providing false written or oral statements to firearm dealers in their efforts to illegally
acquire firearms.
The PICS has also identified fugitıves from justice as they attempted to acquire firearms. Warrants are verified and law enforcement agencies are contacted immediately by PICS staff.

To date, 142 fugitives have been identified and taken into custody as a result of the PICS firearm background check.

In conclusion, the Pennsylvania state Police would like to express our appreciation to the Pennsylvania firearm dealers for their continuing support of the PICS, and to local, state, and federal law enforcement agencies, who continue to support and enforce the primary objective of the Uniform firearms Act and safety of the people of our Commonwealth.

MR. PLESCO: Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, what $I$ handed out to the Members of your Committee are two pamphlets. One is Major Hackenberg's testimony, and the other is a pamphlet about the Pennsylvania check system.

What that is, it is a Power Point presentation that instead of going through the whole thing for the Committee, I'd like to just
highlight some of the slides in the presentation. The first slide that appears behind you is a slide that is also on top of Page 4 in your handout. That slide is a listing of databases of the Pennsylvania Instant Check System in Pennsylvania.

They are as follows: The Pennsylvania criminal record history to include juvenile criminal record history, action of, to include juvenile criminal record history, active protection from abuse orders, mental health and the missing, and wanted files, as Major Hackenberg just told you.

Major Hackenberg emphasized and I'd like to emphasize about the 142 people who went into the dealership trying to purchase a gun. And what happened was it was verifıed. And those 142 individuals were arrested either on that evening or thereafter.

And they did not purchase a gun. The Major gave you a status of about two per week. That status right there, that 142 , shows that the system is working as designed and as written by you, the Members of the Legislature and this Committee.

A few slides down and towards the back of the presentation, I believe on Page 5 or 4 - what I would like to do is give you a rough overview of what's happened since the invention of the system.

For those of you that know, the system went up on July 1 of 1998 . For handguns, it went up on November 30 th. For long guns and therefore all firearms, it went up after November $30 t h$ of 1998.

All firearm purchases were required to go through the system to check the background of the person trying to buy the gun.

And since its inception as of $11 / 26$ to last week, there has been over 671,000 transactions, calls to the system.

As you recall, the only individuals permitted to use this system are those - the sheriffs in this state and also firearms dealers in this state. Those individuals can only use it to process a record of sale/transfer a sale of fırearms, or they can also use it - the sherıffs use lt to process the application for license to carry.

Since that time, the automated part of
the system has maintained about the 62 percent efficiency level. What that means is that 62 percent of calls to the system are handled in an automated fashion.

The system does not transfer those calls outside. The operator of the system gives a yes or no that this person is permitted to purchase or have a license or this person is not permitted to have a license to purchase.

Next slide, please. Thank you. Total denials to date. Of the 671,000, there has been 17,400 denials to date. Of those, the Pennsylvania State Police have received administrative challenges in roughly a little over half, 8,306.

The denial challenges, of those received, 3,333 have been reversed. So the system we are running -- approximately about 1 percent to 2 percent of the people who have called have been denied. And of those, those who have taken the administrative challenge, it's 3,333 to date.

Next slide, please. Thank you. On behalf of the Pennsylvania State Police I would like to thank you. Sorry for the shortened
version, but in the interest of time for the Committee, I would just like to get those statistics out.

And the major and $I$ would be happy to answer - handle any questions that you might have. Thank you very much. Okay, I'm sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I just want to make sure $I$ understand sell and purchase and transfer.

If $I$ wanted - walked into a gun store today as the purchaser, today, whether I'm purchasing a handgun or a long gun, I as the purchaser get a background check run on me. Correct?

MR. PLESCO: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: If I am purchasing a long gun for my son to give him as a Christmas present, he doesn't get a background check run on him, $I$ just give him that long gun. Is that correct?

MR. PLESCO: In the case of the son, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Now, I'm buyıng a handgun for my son for Christmas. Can $I$ do that or doesn't a background check have
to be run on my son before $I$ can give him that gun? That's the part $I^{\prime} m$ stuck on.

MR. PLESCO: I hate to ask you this
question. But how old is the son, the hypothetical son in this case?

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: I don't know
since $I$ don't have a son. I made him up. Tell me. Is he a minor or considered majority? Because it, of course, matters.

MR. PLESCO: Right. If the son in question is under the age of 18 , the son cannot have a handgun purchased for him. If the son is under the age of 18 , the son cannot possess or have a handgun purchased and transferred to him.

If that son is over the age of 18 , and the Major can clarify this a little further, the son can have it purchased for him. And under Pennsylvania law, the son is exempt from a background check.

That sort of goes down the family tree.
I could give to my son a long gun or a handgun and transfer it to them and they are exempt from a background check.

The same thing with a grandfather to son all the way down to the grandson. It doesn't
go off of the family tree. I cannot buy for a cousin or my grandfather cannot buy for REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Okay. Now, let's take the gun purchase out of the family lineage. I can go into a store and purchase a long gun that $I$ am going to give to my staff person as a Christmas present?

MR. PLESCO: NO.
REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Long gun?
MR. PLESCO: Long gun or handgun.
REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Either one needs a background check on the person who will be using it?

MR. PLESCO: Yes. The purpose of Pennsylvania law and federal law - both laws consider the transfer of possession, etc., of a firearm, sale of firearm, to be under the National Check System and the Pennsylvania Check System.

So in the hypothetical you would have to bring that recipient in to a gun dealer and have that transferred to them, and they would have to be an eligible recipient, meaning they would not be kicked out of the Pennsylvania instant check system or the national check
system.
REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: So today if
I walked in a gun shop in Pennsylvania and $I$ purchased 12 guns, whether they are handguns or long guns, technically $I$ can only be purchasing those guns for myself or for my child or my parent?

MR. PLESCO: Doesn't go up the family tree.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Doesn't go up the family tree, only down. So if $I$ walk in and $I$ buy 12 guns today, $I$ better be using all 12 of those guns for myself or my 12 children?

MR. PLESCO: Actually, it's depending on the type of gun. If it's a handgun, in Pennsylvania you have to fill out two forms, an ATF 4473 form and a Pennsylvania record/sales form. If it's a long gun, you don't have to fill out the Pennsylvania form, but you do have to fill out the federal form.

Your hypothetical is correct.
REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: And those forms that $I$ am filling out, am $I$ filling them out expressing and attempting to transfer that gun to somebody who is eligible, or is that not
who they cover?
MR. PLESCO: Our forms, the ATF form 4473, tells you that you can't do that. Our law tells you that you cannot purchase for a person that $\quad$ s ineligible to receive.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Right. NOw, assuming what $I$ was is - assuming I am going Into a gun store to buy multiple guns with the intent to transfer one or more of those guns to somebody who is eligible for me to transfer them for, is there any part of those pieces of paper that $I$ am filling out that is expressing my intent to transfer them, or it doesn't matter? You don't know whether $I$ plan to transfer them or not.

MR. PLESCO: Raght.
REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Just after the fact, if $I$ transferred it illegally, $I$ could get in trouble versus if $I$ transferred it to a relative $I$ would be okay?

MR. PLESCO: Having not read an ATF 4473 form recently, not within the last couple weeks, I will not speak toward that form. But I can speak toward our record of sale form. And $1 t$ doesn't include any of that.

REPRESENTATIVE MANDERINO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank You. Those numbers they were showing us about the number of rejects otherwise that you had 8,000 challenges, was that included in that $17,000 ?$

MR. PLESCO: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: SO Of the 17,000 , you would have to subtract 8,000 from that. They were challenged. And from that, it was over 3,000 that were actually reversed?

MR. PLESCO: Right.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: So you are talking about 14,000 where the actual rejection was upheld?

MR. PLESCO: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: Of the total of over 600,000 and something?

MR. PLESCO: Correct. Or I should qualify that, 14,000 where it was upheld or that those individuals did not take the next step to appeal.

They realized they had something on their record and did not take the next step to appeal this. And those are the cases that we
refer out, we investigate with the ATF, etc.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: And those folks that are rejected, they are also rejected for long guns as well as handguns?

MR. PLESCO: Many. Yes, sir. Any firearm, sir.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: AnY Eirearm at all?
MR. PLESCO: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Yeah, Brian.
THE SPEAKER: I have a question. It's on the same vain. Of those people that came in and got rejected, is there now in the law any offense for their attempt to purchase a weapon or transfer a weapon when they are not entitled to do so?

MAJOR HACKENBERG: Yes, there is. And it's a felony. But it's not quite as simple. In other words, we do not run out and arrest those 14,000 people.

There are a lot of - when somebody goes in and gets a rejection, it takes a considerable amount of research to determine whether or not that person can be prosecuted.

And even once that's determined we will actually look at it and say, should the person be
prosecuted?
When we do the research on these, obviously we found 3,333 people that were right. They were intended to -- they were legally allowed to purchase a firearm once we had done sufficient research into it.
secondly, as stated in the testimony, there are a lot of people who have had a lot of offenses that are, $I$ guess you could say, relatively minor.

Offenses that were graded felonies many Years ago such as minor thefts in the $1960^{\prime}$ s or earlıer that were graded felonies at the time who mught have come in to purchase a gun and really not been aware that they were not allowed to purchase.

So what we do is we review the rejections. We sit down with ATF. We do this on a regular basis. We take a look on a priority basis and try to pick the best one. The people who have violent felonies in their background, people who have been charged with prior firearms violations, things such as that, before we would move forward and investigate and then subsequently arrest.

THE SPEAKER: Isn't it a violation of federal law, too, for that same person?

MAJOR HACKENBERG: Yes, it is. That's why we meet with the U.S. Attorney and ATF and decide who is going to pursue it.

THE SPEAKER: Okay, then my next question is this. Except in violation of federal law, has the federal government taken any of those cases?

MAJOR HACKENBERG: Yes.
THE SPEAKER: Okay.
MR. PLESCO: On the Federal form and on the State's form. When they have to fill out the State form they swear under felony of unsworn falsification under Pennsylvania law and also under penalty of felony that they have not been convicted of any prohibited offense.

And so from a prosecuting attorney's standpoint, they can get them. Mrs. Abraham. Now, the mistake from a paper standpoint is you get them for that and also get them for a separate offense under the separate felony Under Firearms Act.

THE SPEAKER: OkaY. Just one point to clarify. We had heard testimony about a bill
that's in the senate that would set up a registry in Pennsylvania of lost or stolen firearms. Isn't it true that that already exists in PCIC? MAJOR HACKENBERG: Yes, it does. THE SPEAKER: Okay. Thanks. CHAIRMAN GANNON: You have a form you call a record of sale form. Do we have -

MR. PLESCO: From the previous hearing, sir, there is a copy of it. I will pull one out and get you a copy here if $I$ can.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: That is what you use to do a background check, information on that form?

MR. PLESCO: On handgun purchases, yes, sir. It's only required to be filled out for purchases of handguns. Purchases of long guns don't fill it out. But we have to supply the information on the ATF 4473 form.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: And does the ATF form and this form have the same information?

MR. PLESCO: It's similar, but not the same. Our form lists on the back of it all the prohibiting offenses. The ATF form is a little longer than our form and requires a few extra signings.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Correct me if I'm wrong. Is it the ATF form where it actually tells you that you can't transfer this weapon to somebody that is going through a dealer or --

MR. PLESCO: My recollection of the ATF form is that it does. Some other $S t a t e$ forms do require that. Pennsylvania's record of the sale form does not.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Major and Mr. Plesco, for being here today and presenting testimony to the Committee.

It's been very helpful. Thank you again. I know you have appeared before. It's all been very enlightening. Thank you, gentlemen.

You may proceed when you are ready.
MR. BRINSON: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for hearing us. I appreciate it. I'm sure you stayed for this voluntarily. And I wish that the others had.

Those that left, I can assure you I will not vote for them in the next election. Of course, $I$ am not in any of their districts, not even Pat Browne's.

We do represent the Lehigh valley

Firearms Coalition, all three of us. And he is from Bucks County. We represent 20 gun clubs and 20,000 gun owners.

In addition to that, we are affiliated with many other groups across the state, all the way to Allegheny county, representing a quarter of a mılifon gun owners.

We appreciate your hearing us. We have sat here and listened to the government present its case. And $I$ am very happy that you will listen to some of us poor citizens now.

You have our prepared remarks. I won't go through those in the interest of time. It's been very instructive this morning and this afternoon to listen to the testimony, very informative.

And $I$ would like to take just a couple minutes to respond to some of the things that have been said here. I think it will save us time. And as $I$ mentioned, our prepared remarks are there for the record.

The perception exists that firearm safety is a big problem, that firearms accidents are a big problem, that children are being killed by guns.

In my briefcase $I$ have here a Fed-Ex'd package that $I$ got from the Pennsylvania Department of Health yesterday giving me all the statistics across the state.

We had previously pulled all the statistics for Lehigh and North Hampton Counties for the last 12 years to give you an example of what kind of problem we are faced with here.

In the past 12 years, since the records have been kept in this detail by the pennsylvanıa Department of Health, there have been 1,908 accidental deaths in Lehigh and North Hampton Counties. Of those, ten were firearms.

Firearm accidental deaths rank $15 t h$ as a cause of accidental death. Not one of those was a child 14 and under. Not one. This is 12 years in Lehigh and North Hampton counties where we have very carefully estimated over 500,000 guns in Lehigh and North Hampton County and over 200,000 gun owners.

Gun safety is not a problem. And the Legislators, which you are, should not be wasting their time on gun safety. Gun safety is safe. The gun safety has improved by 60 percent in the last 30 years while the number of guns, handguns,
has tripled.
Gun safety is not a problem. It is a bogus issue. And it is a bogus issue because there are many people who are literally against guns, for whatever their reasons.

Secondly, suicide. This has been
mentioned as a cause for some kind of gun controls. Less than half of the suicides in Lehigh and North Hampton Counties are done with guns.

One suicide is too many. One accidental death is too many. But it is important to remember that half of the surcides are done without guns.

Would the unavailability of guns have prevented suicide? No.

Let's go to Japan or Sweden where the sulcıde rates are extremely high, much higher than in the United states, and there are no guns or no private ownership of guns to speak of.

So why don't they have half the surcide rate of the United States? The reason is suicide is caused by depression. It's not caused by guns. It's not caused by poison. It's not caused by bridges. It's not caused by ropes.

It's caused by depression. It's a mental illness, and guns don't contribute to that.

If guns are not available, people will. find other means to kill themselves. They need help, and guns really have very little to do with it.

Of course if a gun is available or if a person wants to kill themselves, half of them will choose a gun.

That leads us then to crime. And this is the real problem. Gun safety is not a problem and suicides are not a problem that can be solved by gun control. But gun crime is a problem. And we have heard a lot about that today. Some of the proposals that seek to control gun crime we think are absurd.

One of them $1 s$ the notion that limitung purchases to one - by the way. If you ask me now do $I$ need or want to buy more than one handgun in any month, my answer will be no.

And most of these - oh, by the way. I want to say something about polls. You know that when Americans are polled and told that it will be possible to cut their taxes in half that 90 percent of them say that they would like that.

Polls are polls. And it depends on how the question is asked. So if you ask me if I need more than one handgun a month, $\quad$ will tell you no and I'll show up on a poll as being in favor of limiting handgun purchases.

We oppose that. And we oppose it not because anyone needs more than one handgun a month, we oppose it because it is wrong headed. It will solve no problems whatsoever.

Criminals are still going to get guns. I'll bet any of you $\$ 10,000 \mathrm{I}$ could walk out of here today and purchase a handgun from someone in law enforcement by midnight tonight. They are avaılable in the black market. If you pay enough money, you will get what you need.

So one a month, the reason this bothers us is it isn't going to solve anything at all. No. 1 and No. 2. When it does solve a problem, it will become one a year, and then it will become one every two years if you pass some test.

A couple of other things $I$ have heard here. The suggestion that kids under 21 years old not be allowed to have Constitutional rights that are available to others in this country.

I think that's wrong. I think that $I f$ we are going to say that a kid is an adult at 18, a kid is an adult at age 18. They can vote. They can join the military, and they certannly should be able to own a gun.

Some of these are working people with families, and they need to defend themselves. And are we going to tell them they can't? That's wrong.

The trigger-lock thing -- as one of the previous panelists said, trigger-locks are ridiculous. I know it's going to be politically popular to leave that in Senate Bill 167. I know 1t's going to make everybody feel good that we did something about gun safety.

But remember, gun safety is not a problem and trigger-locks will solve nothing whatsoever. Nothing, Not problems, not accidents, not suicide, and not crime. Anyway, as I understand it, it's stuck in there. I hope somebody gets it out of there. But $I$ guess the reality is it won't happen.

Next, lawsuits. I certainly hope the Senate does put in a provision barring lawsuits against gun manufactures.

I wish the prohibition would be against any government agency suing any lawful business that makes a legal product, period, unless the product is defective. Of course anyone can sue any manufacturer for a defective product.

But $I$ think it is really crazy to allow municipalities to sue law-abiding companies who are legal and are making a legal product in a legal manner, to be able to sue them for doing what they are in business to do.

And you can see where it leads from here. If this is allowed, if these lawsuits are not prevented, soon we are going to have municipalities suing the brewers and the vendors and the distillers and doing anything they can to squeeze some bucks out of legal businesses in this country. So we think that is a little bit crazy.

There was some discussion about assault weapons. I own a so-called assault weapon. It's a semiautomatic rifle. That's really what it $1 s$.

And this label has been applied to demonize guns.

People who are anti-gun are good at coming up with labels. No crime is done with
assault rifles. I think it is 1 percent. So-called assault weapons, that is military-styled semiautomatics, are not convenient for doing crimes, so criminals don't use them.
so why are we banning them? Why are we even talking about banning these things? It does not make any sense.

In summary, $I$ think the Legislature should do something to reduce what is a real problem. And by the way, as we all know now, violent crime is on the decrease and gun crime is on the decrease. Maybe not in Philadelphia, but lt is in the rest of the world.

And there are many reasons for that.
But if you want to do something to reduce violent crime in this state, in the Commonwealth, what we have to do is we have to enforce the law.

And there is a law on the books that mandates a five-year maximum prison sentence for anyone using a firearm in the commission of a felony.

DA's are not charging under - - they are not charging under that law. They are not prosecuting under that law. And for that reason
these criminals are walking.
So if you look at the criminals that are involved in robberies, rapes, and burglaries, and when we catch them, you will see that they have been caught many, many times before and they have been let go.

What we are saying is, the most dangerous person in our society is a criminal on the loose who is bent on mayhem and has a gun. We catch them, we should prosecute them and put them away for long periods of time.

The DA and $I$ have talked to the DA in Lehigh County, Jim Martin, and to the DA in North Hampton County. And they agree that most DA's around the state are not prosecuting under that law. They use it as a plea-bargaining chip to get plea agreements and to move their cases through.

Thank you very much. I appreciate your listening.

MR. WORTH: Since $I^{\prime} m$ the old guy sitting here -- my name a wallace worth. I was a prosecutor for nine years, First Assistant District Attorney in Lehigh County, and have been an active trial lawyer for over 40 years.

Going to the one gun a month, if $I$ brought one gun a month, my wife would kill me. I don't even buy one a year. But $I$ have a goodly number of guns, probably 30 - probably over 30 handguns.

I would say this, that if you pass any type of legislation requiring mandatory use of trigger-locks, you will create a new class of criminal. Because although $I$ have no criminal record, $I$ will become one.

Why will $I$ become one? Because $I$ am not going to have anything impede my ability to defend my family in my home as $I$ see fit. And if someone kicks my door - and by the way, where $I$ live, we have no police agency. That's why we only have a quarter mill municipal tax also. But we have no police department. We take care of ourselves.

And if someone would kick my door and come in, you can be sure he is not going to have a trigger-lock on his gun to handicap him. And you may rest assured $I$ will not have a trigger-lock on my firearm either.

By the way, Ma'am, you may not buy a handgun for your son. He would have to go in and
sign up himself.
So much for trigger-locks. They are not going to save lives. Smart guns, if I may and as $I$ said, $I$ am a very active trial lawyer. Mr. Browne knows me and knows my reputation.

I'll tell you some stories. And $I$ will be very brief. A man named Mohammad Ryfryd came here from Syria as an immigrant. He was employed by Lehigh county. He retired. He was a laborer with Lehigh county.

He was quite frugal. And he took his life savings and he purchased a delicatessen in Allentown. Three men came in and held him up. They were armed with a 9 millimeter handgun.

When he put his hands up, his left hand came up and his right hand came up with an employee's gun. He shot the one armed robber through the head killing him. The other two fled and were apprehended about an hour later by the Allentown Police.

That was an armed citizen killing an armed robber. I would also tell you how disgusted $I$ was when $I$ appeared in court with Mohammed. He is a nervous fellow. He speaks with an accent. His English is not perfect.

The two criminals who were still alive received $1 / 2$ to 3 years. Imagine that. They participated in a felony, a felony, armed robbery, and a life was lost in that act, yet they got 1 1/2 to 3 years.

So much for smart guns because that gun would not have gone off if it would have been a so-called smart gun programmed to be used by the owner because the owner didn't even know Mohammed picked it up.

Lawsuits. I heard -- and I'm not here to speak for the National Rifle Assocıation, but I heard it somewhat vilified. I guess that 3 million of our American citizens are bad people.

But on the bit about lawsuits, I compliment the Legislature for even considering -- and I hope that they do pass a law barring these frivolous lawsuits.

I suppose as a trial lawyer I could say, please don't pass it. Trial lawyers will make money. Then $I$ can sue the State for selling liquor causing drunken drivers on the haghway or the manufacturers of automobiles because they make cars that go well over the speed limit and go 100 mıles an hour and there is carnage on the
highway. I guess $I$ will be able to sue them also. So officially $I$ should say don't pass it. But truly, it's frivolous.

I have, as $I$ said, firearms. I don't have any that are defective. And you can sue anyone. You can sue a person for product liability for producing the defective weapon.

Straw purchases were discussed by someone awhile ago. I would tell you, straw purchases are illegal.

Now, under the law, we don't need more laws on it. But if you want to pass another one that says straw purchases are illegal, go ahead and do it. It's already there.

Assault weapons. So much for assault weapons. They were redefined. You know that assault weapons under the definitions we now have are any weapons with a bayonet lug. In other words, $a$ brown bass used in the American Revolution.

The British had a bayonet lug and it wrapped around and went around a front blade. That's an assault weapon.

I think when people in their hysteria come up with these laws, they ought to take a
look just to see what they are including and see how ridiculous it gets.

That's not semiautomatic. That's a muzzle-loader that you have to put a patch and ball in and see that you have four what they call 4 FG powder in the flash pan.

I notice the state Police exhibit. By
the way, $I$ was an instructor at the police Academy, that's the Allentown Police Academy, for years.

I noticed the number of reversals exceeded 3,000. There should be a heck of a lot more reversals. One of the leading men in Allentown was turned down for the purchase of a handgun. He is a very active man. He is a substantial citizen in the community. He didn't know he had a criminal record.

And he said, you understand this. The police won't tell me what it is. And I said, well, we will find out.

So I called the state senator who then got through to the police. And he said, well there was something up in Luzern county. So I got the complainant in and he said, yeah, I was born there, wally.

So we checked it out. I had somebody go up and get his record. It seems that he was an enlisted man in the United States Navy during the Korean War or one of the conflicts. And another fellow from Wilkes-Barre also was in the Navy. And they both served on the same battleship. He was discharged a month before the other man.

And lo and behold they met one night at the American Legion up at Wilkes-Barre. And they had too much to drink. They went out in the parking lot and they were goofing around and took two hubcaps from a car. Somebody saw them doing it and called the police.

And the police came and they said, yeah, they were drunk. And they gave the hubcaps back. The police took him to a district justice and put him in a cell overnight to sober up.

The next day they went over to the district justice's office on their own because the policeman told them where it was. And the district justice said, look, you know, technically, it's larceny, a felony.

Now, this is back when -- this took place, by the way, almost 50 years ago. They
said larceny is a felony? He said, what's a felony? Look, forget it. Go home. Don't drink as much, you guys. okay? So they left. That was their case. That was the crime.

So what happened is somebody picked up this paper - and $I$ have copies of it anytime anybody wants to see it. The man - I don't want him embarrassed. They penciled in a plea of guilty to larceny, personally sent him home, told him not to drink alcohol for a while. That man was denied a permit to have a handgun.

On June 7 th of this year, they had my picture on the front page of the Allentown Morning Call. They had it on another page. On the front page they had my picture with my helmet shownng the shrapnel holes through the helmet when $I$ was hit in the head.

Several pages back they showed my picture again with a Browning Automatic Rifle. I was a machine gunner when $I$ was 17 years old. I was in battle when $I$ was $181 / 2$ in North Africa.

The next day that same paper that is
owned by a california corporation had an editorial where they lifted me up as being a great soldier, you know, they didn't know $I$ was

Just about $171 / 2$ at that time and that weapon would fire 600 rounds a minute.

They had an editorial the next day, June $8 t h$, suggesting the Legislature should pass a law saying no one should be able to own a handgun until he is 21. Makes you wonder, doesn't it, what happened.

I have had handguns all my life. My father bought me my first. 22 rifle at about 8 or 9 years old. He taught me to shoot, the army didn't. He taught me to use guns, and $I$ have never murdered anyone yet and $I$ never committed a crime with a gun.

Thank you for your time.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank You, Mr.
Worth.
MR. BARNISKIS: My name is Andy
Barniskis. I'm the Legislative Chairman of the Bucks County Sportsmen's Coalition.

We, in one way or another, have perhaps 5,000 to 8,000 members of sportsmen's clubs in our county and are part of the developing statewide network of similar organizations, that is county coalitions growing into a - very good at communicating, anyway -- state collision.

What I'm going to speak about is gun owners' reservations regarding enforcement of exiting firearms laws.

Before $I$ go into my prepared text, which $I$ plan to only give part of and skip over some things because it will be a bit long-winded because we've gotten better data today than what I had quoted, $I$ just want to say that the object of what $I^{\prime} m$ going to talk about is really the question of definition of crime.

At this point $I^{\prime} m$ kind of going anto my prepared text in which $I$ say, almost everyone will agree with the statement that we should get tough on criminals with guns, and in that context enforce exiting firearms laws and keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

Yet we find that if you question people what they mean by that, how do they define criminals, everyone has a vision which is remarkably similar. It's usually something like the scraggly street-thug holding up a convenience store, a baggy-drawered gang-banger in a drive-by shooting, or a psychotic rapist waiting to ambush a jogger in the park.

I think we can all agree that the
accepted vision that people come up with is the violent criminal. As the words are frequently used today, the career criminal. I think we agree on that.

But starting from that shared vision, many of our associates in the firearm rights community readily endorse any legislation that purports to keep guns out of the hands of crimınals.

What they really mean, of course, is violent criminals, career criminals. And if we're talking about the stereotypes that everybody envisions, certainly we agree that sociopaths like that deserve to be punished in the most severe manner.

However, we also are in our way civil libertarians and sincere in our belief that possession of firearms is a human right, a right that our state constitution says shall not be questioned. That's a direct quote.

Like every other human right, we believe it should not be subject to lifelong forfeiture except for the most egregious violations of that right.

As with the freedom of speech, freedom
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of assembly, and all of the other civil liberties Pennsylvanians enjoy, we do not believe that Individuals should be denied the right to even bear arms simply for a record of nonviolent indiscretions or bureaucratic or political crimes.


We observe that someone convicted of inciting a riot does not subsequently lose their freedom of speech even though they have demonstratively abused that freedom. However, un Pennsylvanıa, they very likely would lose their right to own a firearm.

We recently had the opportunaty to review the draft by Representative McIlhinney of the so-called Operation Hard Time legislation. And we heard that that was widely praised by firearm rights advocates as a law that would, "crack down on criminals with guns".

We choose this as an example to speak of because, in fact, the legislation does nothing at all to enhance penalties on crimes committed with guns. It merely enhances the penalties for possession and transfer and a few other things basically involving just being in possession of guns by persons with prior convictions of certain
crimes already enumerated in section 6105 of Title 18 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statues.

So what we're talking about here is a proposal which specifically embraces the issue of enforcement of existing firearm laws which is what you are supposed to be focusing on today.

Our group did not join in the praise for this proposal because we already had observed that while the existing law did enumerate the violent and predatory crimes that we all abhor, it also listed a number of crimes that were nonviolent, bureaucratic, and in some cases entirely political.

Thus, this was an example of an existing law that we did not support as $1 t$ was, much less support more vigorous enforcement of it. Some of our - I'll just recite a couple. I have a long list. I'll jump over a lot of them.

Some of our specific objections to
listed crimes were Section 908 relating to prohubited offensive weapons. This is
essentially a weapon possession crime in the first place, not a weapon abuse crime.

This section could be easily and
quickly amended to become even worse with a so-called "assault rifle" or "sniper rifle" ban so that people who today possess a certain class of totally legal sporting weapons, they will become felons and as a result of that, of the possession of perhaps one gun which becomes bureaucratically outlawed, lose their right in Pennsylvania to own any gun.

Section 912 relatıng to possession of a weapon on school property, we say that this section involves a crime that is ambiguous in its interpretation. It may involve a totally innocent noncriminal intent on the part of the convicted person.

We observe that its interpretation and enforcement may be substantially different in different regions of the commonwealth. I think both the state Police and people testifying previously have made that point, that there are entirely different attitudes both among law enforcement and judges and courts throughout the Commonwealth.

Section 3302 relating to causing or
risking a catastrophe, this is sort of a crime.
I, too, have an antidote that $I$ want to bring
up. It does not seem to be a crime that always implies a violent intent. You could be convicted, it is my belief, without having a violent intent or even a criminal intent in what you're doing. You just do something foolish.

An example that $I$ want to make is our organization - we typıcally get maybe a call a month or every six weeks or so from someone who is in the very sort of situation that $I^{\prime} m$ gorng to talk about where they went to buy a gun, they're perhaps middle-age, and they discover that they are a criminal.

Not only do they discover they can't buy a gun, they discover that now they have to get rid of all the guns they have in Pennsylvania.

One example - the most memorable example that I've gotten was a call from someone who said, $I$ have a juvenile record. I was disbarred from buying a gun and $I$ have to get rid of the gun.

I questioned him about what happened.
I said, a juvenile record probably shouldn't affect you. They said, well, I have an arson conviction. I said, what did you do? He said, a
bunch of us were having a good time. we had firecrackers. He said, I threw a bunch of cherry bombs into a phone booth, a metal phone booth.

We got arrested primarily for disturbing the peace, but they pressed an arson conviction on me as a juvenile.

My attorney said, you are a juvenile, you have nothing to worry about. Take your medicine. Put it behind you.

So I checked the state law, and arson is a juvenile conviction that specifically carries over to adult life that bars you from owning or possessing firearms in Pennsylvania.

The point of that story being, here's someone that made a foolish mistake, a youthful prank with no - obviously not entirely good social intentions, but it was a prank that carried forward into later life and disbarred him from a fundamental human right.

Section 5515 relating to prohibition of paramilitary training, this is legislation that we say is entirely political in its nature. The definition of paramilitary training we say is political in nature.

It does not entail necessarily or
probably - $\quad$ should say probably. It doesn't entail violence. It doesn't entail actually committing aggression against anyone. Yet a conviction under this will disbar you from owning firearms for the rest of your life in Pennsylvania.

We point out that one of the problems wrth political crimes is how they are interpreted changes with attitudes. We observed that a lot of these, including this very law, were enacted In a climate of hysteria.

When they exist and they stay on the books, sometime in the future when people are hysterical about what some crazy group out west did, they might suddenly start enforcing it more strongly on people who are just getting together to play army, but still not committing aggression, not committing any damage on their neighbors, not threatening to injury anyone.

Section 6302, and this will be the last one $I$ cite, relatıng to sale or lease of weapons and explosives, once again, is this a law that can deal with genuine crime? Yes, it can. Must it necessarily? Not necessarily.

Someone who is convicted under sellung
or leases weapons and explosives illegally may not necessarily be aware that he or the person that is receiving it is going to commit violence.

So as I've stated, this is just a partial list of our concerns. We could probably expand this quite a bit after more in-depth study of the cited sections and definitions of offenses and also some questioning. We'd like to get some more phone calls. We wish we could reach everybody in the state who has a story about who was denied possession and ownership of weapons.

At this point $I$ would depart from what I already prepared to say because the statistics that the state Police provided are much more useful.

One of the observations that we make is that -- $I$ suppose a lot of criminals are stupid. You'd have to be really stupid to go into a background check system knowing you had a record, a well-documented criminal record.

As the state Police - I was going to cite some broad federal statistics. As the state Police reported, so far in Pennsylvania of people who were rejected, the 17,000 -odd people, there
were 8,306 challenges.
Now, I think it's fairly safe to say that not everyone who was rejected and could have challenged did. But let's take that number, 8,306 challenged. I guaranty that not one of those people realized that he was a criminal.

Why would they walk deeper into the system, rock the boat, rattle the cage, if they thought there was a potential criminal conviction un this waiting for them?

Obviously from the statistics, 3,333 of those were reversed. So obviously not only didn't they think they were criminals, they, in fact, weren't criminals at all.

These are the sorts of things that really concern us about the broad concept of "enhanced enforcement of existing law", getting tough on crime, cracking down on criminals.

Our position is that the mechanism for such harassment should not exist in the first place and that existing firearm laws require extensive reform in that regard before gun owners should begin to endorse stricter enforcement of those existing laws.

And we call on the Members of the House

Judiciary Committee and General Assembly to look at these things and see if reforms are needed. See if perhaps the itemized laws that disbar you from gun ownership and gun use are perhaps overstepping the bounds.

Once again, $I$ think no one has a problem with the violent criminal, the stereotype that $I$ introduced. I don't think anyone has a problem with that. The fact is, as $I$ said, we get about a call every month or six weeks from someone in Bucks County who wants information who has a story lıke this.

Not one of these persons says, I'm a bad criminal, but $I$ want to find out how to get a gun. Typically they say, I didn't know $I$ was a criminal. I went to buy my son his first gun and found out $I$ had to give up all of my guns. That happens. That is happening in Pennsylvania.

Lastly, $I$ want to depart and digress a luttle bit to a philosophical change that $I$ think we've undergone and $I$ think $I$ see gun owners in general going through which is in the past we were, and I'll use the word suckers, for the get tough on crime legislation.

One of the things that $I^{\prime}$ ve certainly
observed and other people are beginning to recognize is the reason we were supportive of anticrime legislation is first, of course, we are good citizens. Nobody supports crime. However, you can talk to a typical gun owner and he will say, these are the people that are making it bad for us. It is the criminals that are going to result in us losing our rights.

That, of course, sounds plausible.
Then we look at what happened in England. Now, if the United states could pass any laws that made it as crime-free a place as England was in the past prior to its most recent gun laws, it would be a great thing.

We're probably not going to reach that. But my point is, England had a very, very low crime rate. There was one crime, one sensational crime. As a result, everyone in England lost their long guns, their rifles,. Their handguns were confiscated. We are called paranoid because we think it might happen in the future.

The low crime late in England had nothing to do with gun rights. people lost their gun rights in spite of having a low crime rate.

I, for one, am beginning to ask a lot of my other associates around the state, why are we worrying about getting tough on crime? Why are we endorsing tools that could very well be used agannst us in the future?

I think you are going to begin seeing a change where those of us in the past that were the strongest advocates for "getting tough on crime" are beginning to reconsider that position very carefully.

Thank you.
MR. WORTH: Mr. Innantuono has referred to me with for some comments. And I know it is tough for a lawyer to be brief, but $I$ will try.

I would have a suggestion to make as far as legislation goes. I reviewed rt with Jim Martin, the $D A$ up in Lehigh county. Mr. Brinson is right that Pennsylvania has a law stating that you can receive a mandatory five-year sentence for using a firearm in the commission of a crime in addition to the sentence for the substantave crime that you're charged with, like armed robbery carries a penalty.

Now, in addition, you can receive five years mandatory at that point. But the way the
legislature drew that, they state that that can only be if the district attorney in the respective counties notifies the defense in writing that they intend to pursue that.

And what has been happening - and $I$ was a prosecutor. Everybody is rushing to clear dockets and they plea bargain that away.

I would suggest that a possible amendment could be made to the exusting law making it mandatory that the district attorney does notify the defense and that that would therefore become a mandatory additional sentence. That way you put teeth into this and you make your laws quite similar to the federal law that is now being enforced in Richmond, Virginia where armed crimes went down 65 percent because nobody wants to be caught with a gun. It's as simple as that.

You don't have to go to the Federal Act because Pennsylvania has a good act, but they have to put teeth $1 n$ it in that fashion. Now, the wording, that's up to however you all do it. One of the things about this 21 years of age being the age you have to reach before you can own a handgun, if someone came to me, $I$ would
rause an issue in representing that person who said they were denied the handgun because they are only 18 or 19 or 20.

The reason is, in Title 10 of the U.S. Code Annotated, militia is defined. And it sets forth that there are two classes of militia, one is the national guard, etc., the other is all able-bodied males 17 through 42 who are members of the unorganized militia. They also have an exception, people with prior military service, they're part of it, too.

I point that out because if you say you cannot have that type of weapon until you're 21 , You are almost flying in the face of the federal law that says, in effect, by doing what you would be dolng that way, you are disarming or telling the federal government what type of a weapon their militia can have.

I point this out to you. It is a legal point that you may want to have your solicitor take a look at because it does say 17 through 42 .

I noticed that when the state Police had their display up there, they referred to the domestic problems, protection from abuse.

I will be candid with you and tell you that is the most darned-abused law in the state of Pennsylvania and probably in the United states wherever they have enacted such legislation.

What happens, and I'm berng candid, the lawyer for the wife wants her to have the house and so forth. So he'll come in with a petition for protection from abuse. I've seen it.

The lawyers go out in the hall from the courtroom and they work it out. What the heck, he doesn't want to hit her. He says he didn't. He doesn't want to go here. They enter into that order.

I can assure you, sir, 85 to 90 to 95 percent of the orders are entered in that fashion. But what happened recently -- in Texas they have a similar act. And of course those matters are disposed of in the state courts.

And a doctor by the name of Emerson went in without counsel. It was a domestic matter. And the judge, the state court judge, said well, you say you haven't hit your wife. No, I've never hit her. Then you are not going to be near her anyway, you're breaking up. Right? Yeah. Then why don't we just have thュs
amicable order entered, and they did.
Believe it or not, the federal agents went to his house to take his weapons from him, his guns. He was quite an active hunter and so forth. It ends up in federal coure, the firearms issue, not the domestic matter.

The judge in U.S. versus Emerson ruled the Federal Firearms Act unconstitutional. He went even further than $I$ would. He said it's an individual right to bear arms. And it is a 21 or 22 page opınion. I'd be happy to see that your solicitor gets it. I can photocopy it for him and send it to him.

I point that out because we have that provision in our law now and it's worth taking a look at. They are not enforcing the federal Firearms Act in Texas, and I'm sure that this matter will go to the U.S. Supreme Court. It is really forcing the issue. By the way, this case was written up in U.S. News and World Report and Newsweek both.

You don't have to keep making laws to help the police too much. I want to help the police. I trained police. But yesterday when I got the National Law Journal, on the cover was a
picture of the District Attorney of Los Angeles County in California. They found that police have been going into the rampart section of I.A. and shooting people, taking drugs and selling them and planting drugs on other people to get convictions.

The District Attorney, needless to say, was not a part of that. And now there's a big investigation. They have suspended 19 police from that particular precinct.

I point that out to you because sometimes it is hard to tell who the good guys are and who the bad guys are. It is tough being a policeman in a free state. It is real easy to be a policeman in a police state.

I think that when the gentleman
mentioned about being tough on crime, that's what happened when the Republic started to crumble in the '30s. The National Socialist Party promised law and order, and of course we all know what happened.

The citizens were disarmed unless they were part of the National Socialist Party, and the rest is history.

I hope that was brief enough. I thank
you. I thank all of you.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you.
REPRESENTATIVE BROWNE. Thank you for your perspective in this issue. I just wanted to get your comments on one proposal that's before us and several of the comments that were made prior to your testify.

It has to do with the regulation of gun manufacturers. One of the testifyers said that gun manufacturers are the only industry, I guess, that's not regulated by the Product Safety Commission in washington. That because of that, the guns don't reflect the latest technology.

Representative Carn had mentioned that, in fact, they are not regulated under state or federal law. It results in what's called junk guns that are available to consumers.

He had proposed House Bill 1777 that allows the Attorney General to set regulations and standards for the regulation, safety regulation of guns.

Just some comments generally on that,
If you could.
MR. BRINSON: If I may, maybe one of
the reasons that firearms are so safe is that the
federal government and state governments don't regulate them. They are pretty good. There's a lot of competition. Guns are very good.

Let us remember that there are 222 million, by best estimate, 222 million guns in this county that already exist. They are already in homes and businesses all over this country.

To have Pennsylvania begin to set standards for firearms manufacturers is ridiculous. I would suggest that the state Assembly has many, many better things to do than try to regulate gun manufacturers.

MR. IANNANTUONO: I would also say just as the vagueness and arbitrary definition of assault weapon has been tossed about for many years, the whole concept of junk guns versus guns that operate more safely is just totally subject to interpretation as well.

I think many people know and admit that the whole direction of junk gun terminology was to really try to remove inexpensive guns from the marketplace. And actually it could have driven the problem that we face today by crimınals using more effective, powerful weapons than the inexpensive weapons that were used 25 years ago.

Again, that's just totally in a state of interpretation. And we feel as citizens that's being used as a means to slowly chip away at methods and ways to eliminate and eventually lead to civilian disarmament.

Also there are self-regulatory and self-governing bodies within the firearm industry which cover the design and application of fırearms which, as John said, operate very effectively.

All it takes is the responsibility to use them properly.

MR. IANNANTUONO: They are against gun manufacturers for faulty guns. There are hardly any that operate as they are supposed to operate.

By the way, very quickly, it was mentioned before that the primary purpose of guns is to kill people. I would say that's not true.

I would say that the primary purpose of guns in our society is for people to defend themselves and their families. And that is done two and a half million -- guns are used two and a half mılifon times every year by American citizens to defend themselves and therr familıes
against criminals. Two and a half million times a year.

In most cases, not a shot is fired because the gun is very effective in scaring the criminal away. We should keep that in mind.

And lastly we should remember that armed citizens kill three times as many crimınals in this country every year as the police do. The police cannot defend us. They cannot. There are too few of them. 911 won't work.

If there's a rapist or burglar in your house and armed, don't depend on 911 because it isn't going to save you. You need to defend yourself. Americans do. In most cases, as I mentioned, there are no shots fired, but the defense is effective.

MR. WORTH: You mentioned a state coming up with some regulations on safety devices, etc. That would scare the heck out of me.

I agree with John. No. I, there isn't a gun safety problem to any extent. You take a 1911 Colt, you have four separate safety devices on that gun. I don't know how in the deuce it could be made safer.

But oddly enough, when it comes to the sovereign state and the municipalities, the most popular and desired gun - and I'll never understand it - among the police are the Glock 9 millimeters.

I must tell you, in my opinion - and I've been with their factory experts - - it is the most dangerous gun going for the police. More police shoot themselves in the leg and in the thigh when they draw that gun than any other gun. There is no safety on it. And that's a weapon purchased by the sovereign states and municipalities. I'll never understand it.

MR. IANNANTUONO: I've done various things in the consumer industry and just a little bit with the automobile industry. But the one comment $I$ can make about regulation is civil litigation is a much bigger concern for manufacturers than regulation.

Regulation is clear cut. You know what the regulation is. You know how much you're going to have to spend to meet regulation. You know how much of that you are going to pass along to the consumer.

What gets a lot of discussion in
engineering terms or crossover between englneering and legal terms is we know that if we do $A$, by past experience we will get 17,842 lawsuits. If we do $B, ~ w e ' l l ~ g e t ~ f e w e r ~ l a w s u i t s, ~$ but for more money. That's the wrangling that goes on. It is all based on civil liability. I would emphasize not civil lawsuits by the city of Philadelphia or the City of San Francisco, but individuals based on an individual's experience and whether or not their claim because the car was painted red that's why they went through the windshıeld.

Those things all balance out very well in the civil system. The safe car you drive, contrary to popular mythology, is not so much because of regulation as it is because of civil litigation and that it works.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank You all for your perspectives today. Thank you very much, gentlemen, for coming before the committee as citazens representing what $I$ believe to be a very important point of view as opposed to most of the other witnesses we heard, the government's witnesses.

It is an interesting contrast when
citizenry presents their views. I thought some of your characterizations were pretty much on point. Some of the terms, bogus issue, visceral opposition, labels and hysteria, they seem to be the ingredients of the antr-gun click that has apparently embraced our government and a lot of government officials as being a solution for some of the problems that government has.

They tend to install that and say this is common sense. I'm wondering in my own mind - because $I$ heard about the one gun a month proposal today. I myself have a proposal that $I$ put forward dealing with the straw purchase issue. And $I$ think it does it in a fashion - it doesn't put another layer on our Crimes Code.

But in my own mind I'm trying to figure out how this one gun a month solves the problem that ostensively exists.

Each of you I'm assuming owns a gun or owns more than a couple. Each one of you has said you've never gone out and bought more than one gun a month. If you did - one guy said, if I went out and bought one gun a month my wife would probably shoot me.

And $I$ think you're absolutely right
when you said it's one gun a month today and, it's one gun every six months tomorrow, then it's one gun a year, chen it's one gun every other year, then finally it's no guns.

Then $I$ think we are in the situation that they are in in England where they are complainıng bitterly about an increase in crime. And when they do interviews, the blind screen interviews with criminals and they say, I have no problem. I can go into somebody's house. I know they don't have a weapon. I know they can't defend themselves. Forty percent increase in in-home crime in England. I guess Australia now is on the same route because they have disarmed their cutizenry, too.

All of these initiatives were the assault of some hysteria that occurred and you have folks out there that have this visceral opposition -- I think that's a good way to characterize it -- due to the popular hysteria that occurs as a result of a tragedy. They use that to get the government to step in and disarm the citizenry.

We have had automobile accidents every day, some of them tragic. We have buses go off
cliffs where dozens of people are killed, yet there is no cry to do away with buses.

Courts - in fact in this district, the federal court of this district has defined an automobile as an inheritedly dangerous instrumentality, and yet we don't have a cry to take the automobiles away from our citizens because that has been defined legally as an inheritly dangerous instrumentality, not merely a platform to transform people from one place to another.

I believe you're right. There are folks out there who have a visceral opposition to guns under any forum and $I$ think that their objective and their goal is to disarm our citizenry.

Let me finish. There was some questıon about why would somebody want to buy more than one gun a month. That's a bogus question because it's a Constitutional right. I have no right as a government official to question your motives for exercising a right that's guaranteed to you under the Constitution.

When $I$ have to go and say, why would you do that, that's the wrong question to ask a
citizen in this county. In other countries they do where it's easy to be a policeman because it's a police state. That was a good description. MR. WORTH: I agree with every word you said, sir. I can tell you the problem. We have many, many well-meaning citizens who are today what we might call antigun. It's because of ignorance.

What they do is their opinions are based on what they hear in the media. We had, for example, Columbine thrown at us for a week and a half on television, the same pictures of the kids running out with their hands behind their necks and a bloody little girl being carried out on a litter.

This is intentional. Last week in Allentown, right here in our own state, there was an article that appeared in the Morning Call that an armed robber was chased out of a pizza shop by the owner.

You say, holy mackerel, the guy was armed and he ran away from the owner. Yeah, because the owner shot at him. He had a gun. And they didn't once mention that in the paper.

We are solicitors for a large school
district. I get the national school safety council report. The school year that columbine took place, caused by two - I won't even describe the people that did it, only two children $1 n$ the entire Unıted States were killed by gunfire in a school environment. Three were beaten and stomped to death.

Now, where is the gun problem? By the way, the kids at columbine had bombs and everything else. They were making pipe bombs in the garage. There are catastrophes and disasters. We cannot pass laws making that impossible. You're going to have people with evil hearts and evil minds, too. You can't pass a law against that.

But another thing on the media, they showed that Columbine situation in the report $I$ handed up to you people. I said I would like to recount for you an incident about which $I$ am willing to bet none of you have any knowledge of because you never saw anything about it on television. The only national media outlet to cover the incident was the Christian Science Monitor.

I don't know, does anybody here get
that? I don't.
I'll tell you what happened. Back in 1990, December 17, it was a Tuesday, two men armed with pistols herded 20 customers and employees of Shoney's Restaurant in Alabama into a walk-in refrigerator and indicated they were going to execute the people. They locked the folks in the refrigerator and continued to hold the manager at gun point and went about robbing the restaurant.

A postal clerk by the name of Thomas Glen Carry was finishing his late night dinner with his wife when the robbers came in and took over the restaurant.

He hid his 45 caliber colt government model under his sweater not seeing any immediate opportunity to use it. He didn't want to hurt any innocent people.

His wife was one of those scheduled to be executed and herded her off into the cooler where one of the robbers proceeded to collect the wallets and jewelry of the people that were put in the cooler.

He separated himself from the other customers and got to a back door to see $1 f$ he
open it, escape and call the police. The door was chained shut.

At that point one of the robbers discovered him. When the robber drew on him, Terry pulled his own handgun out from under his sweater and returned fire incapacitating the robber who ultimately survived.

The second robber heard the exchange of gunfire and drew on carry. It was a gun fight between Carry and the second robber that resulted in the robber running out into the parking lot where he died from his wounds.

It was at this point that Carry, an armed citizen, told the store manager to phone the police. Not once was that on television. Not once did that appear in the New York Times. Not once was that given national publicity because it did not deliver the media's agenda, to be quite candid with you because our local paper Is controlled by an outfit in California. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much. Our next witness is Mr. Jon Mirowitz, Esquire, President of the Pennsylvania Fish and Game Protective Association and Deputy Sheriff Parıs

Washington from the Philadelphia Sheriff's Office.

Welcome, gentlemen. You may proceed when you're ready.

MR. WASHINGTON: Good afternoon. On behalf of John $D$. Green, Sheriff of the city of Philadelphia, $I$ want to thank you for inviting us here today to give our perspective as far as the Sheriff's Office here in the City and county of Philadelphia.

I sat here today and I've heard a lot of information, a lot of pros and a lot of cons. I can tell you from my viewpoint, not as a deputy but as a citizen, that $I$ pray that you take all of this information back and make the appropriate decision.

I'm here today to explain what the Sheriffs Office's responsibility is as far as enforcing firearms laws in the city and county of Philadelphia.

The State Police have already demonstrated what the Sheriff's Office does in reference to gun permits and the quick check.

Another responsibility of the Sheriff's Office is enforcing the laws that you have passed
in reference to protection from abuse orders.
I can tell you from my experience as
the officer in charge for Philadelphia that the orders that come from the courts where the Sheriff is ordered to remove firearms from Individuals untıl the courts have made a final decision, helps us and helps the citizenry of Pennsylvania. All sheriffs throughout the 67 counties are responsible.

I can tell you $I$ see no need for any additional legislation. The legislation presently in existence is working. And as long as the sheriffs offices have the resources and equipment to do so that, they can carry out those duties without any hindrance whatsoever.

Besides being a Deputy Sheriff, I speak to you now as a citizen of philadelphia and as a citizen of the state of Pennsylvania.

We are where we are today because our forefathers bore arms and defended this country we know today. If they had not had firearms, the British would still be in charge. So there is a purpose for firearms.

And $I$ do believe that every American
has a right to bear and have firearms for
self-protection. I am a Philadelphian. I grew up here in Philadelphia. I grew up in North Philly where there is a lot of violence.

There are some actions that have to be taken. What those actions are are up to you, the elected individuals that $I$ entrust my safety with.

I as a deputy sheriff am responsible to enforce whatever laws and provisions you pass. I just say to you, it's very difficult. There are a lot of sides to this particular argument.

But something must be done to protect not only those that have a right to bear arms, but those that have a right to live crame free, to live safely in our society.

Again, $I$ can't add any more to all the information that $I^{\prime} v e$ heard today. I think at thus point you have received tremendous input.

I just pray that you take that information and that you don't make it a political issue, you make it a people issue. And that $I$ can go home tonight sound that the elected officials that sit on this committee will do what's right for Pennsylvanians as well as Phillians. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you,
Mr. Washington.
MR. MIROWITZ: Thank you,
Representative Gannon. I want to thank the Committee for allowing me co come back. And $I$ want to commend you for your fortitude in staying the day.

I was sort of disappointed, although $1 t$ wasn't unexpected when the media followed Mayor Rendell out before anybody could answer some of his questions.

It seemed to be a real popular question, why would anybody want more than one gun a month. Let me tell you about a pistol league here in Philadelphia. Under the Federal Statute, if you by more than one gun at a time, there is a thing called a multiple gun purchase form that has to be filled out which gets sent to the ATF. Regular old-fashioned paperwork.

When we had the state Selective Committee meetings, ATF said, yeah, we get them. We can't usually bother with them. Now we've got money so we have a gun task force and they go out and do things like this.

Gentlemen, the pistol club spent a lot
of time and put a lot of effort out. They finally raised enough money to buy a bunch of guns for the club.

Well, they no sooner did this then here comes Philadelphia's finest along with ATF and other various federal law enforcement agencies and representatives knocking on the door, why are you buying all of these guns? Where are they? We want to see them.

What's the problem? What law have we violated? Anybody here prohibited? we just happen to be a pistol club. We are competitive shooters. By the way, we compete nationally, regionally, locally. We are just exercising our rights.

But that was our tax dollars at work when they talk about the one gun a month. Those are the guys. That's the money they want to use to go visit and have law enforcement go out and visit, state and local, go pay attention to that group.

Why would anybody want to buy more than one gun a month? Representative Gannon, you're absolutely right. It's nobody's business.

That's why when we sat on the state

Select Committee we provided things like confidentiality of information. If you want to buy a gun, it's not a public record. If you want to get a carrying permit, it's not a matter to be spread in the newspapers.

We saw what happened here in
Philadelphia when the Daily News printed a list of the federally licensed firearms dealers.

Most of them were cops who were trying to set up a second business so when they retired they would have a second income. All of a sudden, here's their home address in the newspaper. Not only that, but they are telling everybody, there's guns here. In other words, they are being targeted for the burglars.

That brings me back to another thing. Today's session was about what gun laws are belng enforced. When District Attorney Abraham was testifying, she was saying how bad Section 6111 G5 was. I happened to be talking to Mr. Sıegel. Mr. Siegel and $I$ and District Attorney Abraham all sat on the state select Committee. To the best of Mr. Siegel's recollection and my recollection, District Attorney Abraham was the source of 6111 G5 that she was bashing today.

Talking about going in circles. We are is seelng the same issues time in and time out.

Assault weapons. Safety preemptions.
Ban this. Ban that. Limit this. Limit that.
When I came here today, I drove through the $24 t h$ and 25 th police districts, Front and Westmoreland. That's the police district where the drugs were found in the police locker room hidden in the ceiling, where they were found in the police lockers, the unassigned lockers.

This is the bad land. It is 8 th and Butler. It is the place where the only reliable source of income is the drug dealer on the corner. And he probably got that corner from his father who got it from his father in turn.

If you want to do something about the crime, get the criminals off the street. Get the drug dealers off the street. They are there every day, day in and day out. They are the same people that are selling the guns on the street.

What we did with this Unıform Fırearms Act, Act 17 , we made that illegal transfer -- we moreased the penalties for it. But the drug dealers are still there. His cousin is still selling guns right next to him.

You talked about Operation Cease-Fıre, Operation Exile. Great ideas. You know who gets busted for that? It is the guy who goes and he's going to get into public transportation. He's kind of poor. He doesn't look real nice. He is kind of scruffy. As a matter of fact, he's probably on disability. He gets armed, goes through the turn-style. All of a sudden here comes two police officers. We see a weapon clipped to the outside of your jacket.

They arrest him. They take ham into custody. It turns out he is an insulin-dependent diabetic. What they are looking clipped outside his jacket is probably a flashlight, although they put it down in their arrest report that it's an 8 -inch knife clipped to the outside of his jacket.

In the inventory receipt being
conducted no such knife and no such weapon was there. He does happen to be carrying a firearm with various other tools including his insulin and syringes.

In any event, about eight hours later,
if $I$ remember correctly, he was finally
released. In the course of that time, what
charges? Carrying a flashlight? Carrying a pocket knife? Did the police tell him -- they wenc through a search. They took him over to the Philadelphia Police Department and they said, why are you branging him to us? And they let him go.

That's one of those gun law arrests to say nothing of the gentleman who might be going out to the gun range. Under Section 6106 B4 you can go target shooting. You don't need to have a license to go target shooting.

That section says, handgun, revolver, pistol or rifle. It doesn't say shotgun. What about the guy that goes to the range to shoot skeet? There's no provision for him. It $1 s$ one of the things we were trying to address. Everybody said, it's just mınor. No big deal. That's the guy that's going to get busted and end up in Operation Cease-Fire.

You talked about people that are prohibited who are going to get arrested. You talked about the background checks.

At my last presentation $I$ talked about the magistrate court cases. I think you heard some more of the magistrate court cases today.

That's the guy who goes in front of the magistrate.

The magistrate only gets paid a percentage of the fines and costs he collects. He has a financlal interest in making sure everybody in front of him is guilty. That's the only way he gets paid.

Is that a fair trial? Does that meet due process requirements of an impartial judiciary? Nope. That's why we got rid of the system. But those convictions are still turning up in the big system. People are still be prosecuted for being in possession of firearms upon those convictions.

Why is there so few prosecutions and so many denials? Because so many of the denials are based upon things like the check that shows up from a magistrate's court or a similar name or a similar date of birth.

A couple of other things $I$ want to talk about real quick. I know we've been here a long time. Uniform carrying permits. We talked about all of these things. What's been happening with carrying permits? You talked about rising crime rates and falling crime rates, rising death
rates. You can't tell.
Philadelphia is notorious for playing games with the crime statistics. That's why the FBI won't accept Philadelphia's crime statistics.

One thing they can't hide is the dead bodies. We have drug dealers shooting drug dealers. I think they at one point - meaning the state Police - were saying that most of them, like over three-quarters, were all drug-related. That's the dead bodies they find on the street. You can't hide them.

However, since Act 17 came $1 n t o$ effect and mandatory carrying permits were issued in Philadelphia, the body count in Philadelphia has gone down. Even such wildly pro-gun newspapers as the Philadelphia Daily News finally had to concede it in the back of a newspaper article.

Not real popular with the media. They want to follow Mr. Rendell and listen to his one gun a month and trigger locks safety issues.

Let's get guns out of kids' hands and prevent child gun accidents. Forget the fact that they are at an all-time low. As a matter of fact, child safety is furthered by programs like Eddy

Eagle which is for firearm safety. It us no longer the forbidden fruit.

Whac you are looking at with all of these gun control issues is sophistry. In logic it sounds real good, but it is a fallacious argument.

It would be like a drunk driver who plows into a bus stop and wipes out a whole bus stop full of people. The police go over and arrest the car and let the drunk driver go.

That's what gun control amounts to, concentrating on an inanimate object and ignoring the real problem which is a problem of human behavior.

The only people who really need to have crime is government. It is the single biggest justification for government, crime.

Anyway, I thank you. I will submit my written presentation at the next session. There are some other things $I$ wanted to address, but due to the time - again, I commend you for your fortitude. Thank you for the opportunity to present this.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank You, Mr.
Mirowitz. Thank you, Mr. Washington, for
attending the hearing today and sharing your
testimony with us. We appreciate it.
Our next witnesses are Dr. Shannon Frattaroli, Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health, and Mr. Peter Fiorentino, Mr. Joel Nied and Mr. James J. Mills, Executive Director of the Philadelphia Anti-Drug/Anti-Violence Network.

Thank you very much. Dr. Frattaroli, you can begin when you're ready.

DR. FRATTAROLI: Thank you. It's been a long morning. And in the interest of not turning it into a long afternoon, $I$ will forgo my written remarks, which remain with five of you, and just make two points.

The first point is that $I$ would urge you to not pass the legislation that's currently an the legislature that would give the gun industry immunity from gun lawsuits.

These lawsuits are being used to
encourage the gun industry to adopt more responsible business practices. I think there's nothing wrong with that.

An example of the spirit of these
lawsuits can be seen in the NAACP lawsuit which requests no monetary damages, but simply that the
industry reform itself.
Point No. 2, and this is actually more on point with what $I$ understood the subject matter of this hearing to be, enforcement of laws. When we talk about enforcement of laws, generally we think solely about enforcement of laws which focus on the criminal misuse of guns. That's an important function of government, to punish people who misuse guns.

However, $I$ would encourage you to expand your view of what enforcement of gun policies is to include people who aren't often thought in this mix. There's a lot of talk about illegal gun markets and illegal gun sales. We need to be looking at the people who are supplying such purchasers with guns.

I would like to respectfully disagree wath the Mayor when he said we can't do anything about the man with the sunglasses selling guns out of his trunk. I believe we can. And $I$ would encourage this committee to again expand their definition of enforcement to include the people in the systems that are supplying guns to criminals and youth who use guns to commit crimes in this city and in this state. I'll end with
that. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you.
MR. MILLS: Good afternoon. I'm a little frustrated currently. I submitted some testimony. I'm going to enter it into che record.

I have a job that -- well, let me just talk about me. I was part of the problem in this city in the ' 70 s and '60s. I'm 50 years old now. I had very good access to guns when $I$ was 14 years old. When $I$ was even younger than that I had access to guns.

In fact, $I$ was arrested for shooting folks when $I$ was 14 years old and incarcerated. All of my teenage life $I$ had access to guns from people like you in your homes. People like you. And the gangs in the streets have even more access now.

Now $I$ have a job where $I$ work with gang kids and $I$ work with all the people in the City of Philadelphia around violence. We're primarily an organization that goes around and tries to defuse violence.

So if somebody gets killed or somebody is in the hospital and gets shot, we go in and
defuse violence in an effort to keep it from snowballing because when one person gets shot, you better believe that the other people want to see the next person get shot. It just goes on and on. It is a cycle, a vicious cycle called violence.

It is exacerbated by the fact that our communities -- this is all over the city -- have been flooded with guns. There are guns everywhere. You can go outside and buy a gun. You can go not far from here and you can purchase a gun.

Now, it maybe a stolen gun, but in most instances it is in a box. It is in a box. It is a brand new gun.

My staff works in communities that is full of these brand new guns. Folks are killing folks. I don't know what you all are talking about, what these guys are talking about. I go to hospital rooms and there are folks in there bleeding from gunshots. I go to the morgue -there's a meeting at the morgue every month to talk about the kids that have been killed in my city.

Last year over 100 kids were killed in
my city under 21. That ain't no - this is bodies. These are folks that are dead. 342 people died in my city due to homicides. And over 85 percent of them died because of fırearms.

There's a problem going on here. I don't know why you don't understand that there's a problem and it is spreading because the people from Lehigh Valley are calling me up to their community to talk to them about guns and gangs and talk to them about some of the problems they are having like we are having in Philadelphia.

Not only Lehigh Valley, but Scranton and Wilkes-Barre, other places that are starting to duplicate the kind of issues that we face in our cities. This is not a problem just in Pennsylvania. I think sometimes that between Pittsburgh and Philadelphia is a place called Alabama.

I don't mean to offend nobody, but I'm kind of pissed. I'm kind of pissed because this ain't no game. It is dead folks and their families that are affected by this stuff. And we got to keep - we got to stop pussyfooting around. This $1 s$ a morale issue. It is even
bigger than our laws. I don't think you have the wherewithal to solve this. But we certainly can be a part of the solution instead of being a part of the problem. And that's what $I$ see this whole process today as being.

I'm an activist. I'm a warrior. It is my mission to make conditions better in my community. It appears to be a mission that's impossible. But every day $I$ go out with the hope that $I$ can help somebody. And I'm just a little -- I'm kind of peeved. I just think that certainly there have been some ideas about doing this, but $I$ think we got to go to higher ground because this is about a morale issue.

If kids in my community are dying, trust me -- trust me. Just like drugs, drugs started in my community and spread and lt is all over the United States. Trust me, it's the same problem about guns and violence. It is going to spread and it is going to get worse.

Why do we need to wait until it gets worse in our other communities? Why do we need to do that? Why do we need to let this thing perpetuate?

I think that we need to see this thing
as if it could happen to us, if your son got killed.

Hearing this stuff that everybody is scared about drugs is foolishness. I was just at the high school two weeks ago. You got kids standing outside the high school. Somebody comes up with an automatic weapon, shoots this kid and kills him. It got nothing to do with drugs. This is about proliferation of guns. Guns.

We have created this world for our kids. We as adults have to begin to work together irregardless or irrespective of our positions in life, irregardless of our ethnicity. If you think this thing in my city is a black thing, trust me, right now it's black, but it's going to grow like a cancer. It's going to grow and it is going to start affecting white kids. It will be more than this sporadic stuff of people killing one another. This stuff is going to spread.

I don't know why we want to wait until it spreads to your community before we do something about it. That's the end of my comments.

CHAIRMAN GANNON: Thank you very much,

Mr. Mills. Any questions?
Thank you very much for attending the hearing today and presenting your testimony. It should be very helpful in our deliberations.

I don't think there are any further witnesses. With that, the House Judiciary Committee hearing on Enforcement of Existing Gun Laws is adjourned.
(The hearing was concluded.)

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same.
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CondenseIt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Carolina - collar

| Carolina [1] | 921 | caught [5] | 8015 | 25525 |  | $12810 \quad 14112$ | 1449 | 251202528 | 25224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| carried [6] | 4822 | $9712 \quad 10323$ | 1975 | challenge [3] | 8415 | $1816 \quad 19016$ | 24723 | 25312533 | 25514 |
| $4914 \quad 9714$ | 1676 | 21917 |  | 1721317721 |  | 24725 |  | City-wide [1] | 855 |
| $21218 \quad 23315$ |  | caused [8] | 10820 | challenged [4] | 1217 | children [13] | 44 | civil [12] 102 I | 1107 |
| carrics [2] | 21212 | 1912319123 | 19124 | $18310 \quad 2154$ | 2155 | $831 \quad 13518$ | 13523 | $127 \quad 13 \quad 14022$ | 14118 |
| 21823 |  | 1912519125 | 192 | challenges [4] | 17714 | $\begin{array}{lll}14322 & 15219 \\ 15513 & 1564\end{array}$ | 15511 | $20716 \quad 2081$ | 22817 |
| carry [19] | 3018 | 2343 |  | $17716 \quad 1835$ | 2151 | $\begin{array}{ll} 15513 & 1564 \\ 18113 & 18924 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1567 \\ 2345 \end{array}$ | 22962297 | 22914 |
| 5014556 | 6513 | causing [2] | 20022 | chance ${ }_{\text {[3] }}$ | 2723 | 1811318924 | $2345$ | 22916 |  |
| 149231505 | 1677 | 21023 |  | 581 <br> 17 |  | Children's [1] | 1562 | civilian [1] | 2265 |
| 1671016715 | 16720 | Ccasc-Firc [12] | 1918 | chances [ | 107 | chilling [1] | 57 | civilly [1] | 10910 |
| 168116811 | 16812 | 86169320 | 9324 | change [9] | 614 | chip [3] 2011 | 19716 | $\operatorname{claim~}_{[2]}$ | 8015 |
| $17624 \quad 23512$ | 2369 | 9412966 | 975 | change [9] | $614$ | 2263 |  | ${ }_{22910}$ |  |
| $23610 \quad 23613$ | 23814 | 972011015 | 1117 | $\begin{array}{ll} 313 & 449 \\ 7519 & 927 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4410 \\ & 11414 \end{aligned}$ | chips [1] 1593 |  | cla | 1620 |
| carrying [15] | 511 | $\begin{array}{rr}2441 & 24519\end{array}$ |  | $21620 \quad 2187$ |  | choice [1] | 4611 |  |  |
| 7313976 | 1337 | Ccase-Fire's ${ }_{11}$ | 710 | changed [4] |  |  | $1121$ | ${ }^{\text {clanity }} \text { [2] }$ | 17916 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}1338 & 14916 \\ 16724 & 2424\end{array}$ | 16722 | ceiling [1] | 2439 | changed [4] ${ }_{91}{ }^{\text {che }}$ | 443 1462 | $\underset{2925}{\text { choose [5] }} 1534$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1121 \\ & 1929 \end{aligned}$ | 18625 <br> class [4] 8919 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}16724 & 2424 \\ 2451 & 2451\end{array}$ | 24420 24622 | cell [1] 20318 |  | changes [ 5 ] | 1462 681 | $20819$ | 1929 | $\begin{gathered} \boldsymbol{c l a s s}_{\text {[4] }}^{8919} \\ 1988 \\ 2103 \end{gathered}$ | 903 |
| $24624 \quad 24714$ |  | center ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ] | 1237 | $917 \quad 11413$ | 15714 | chose [1] | 986 | classes [1] | 2206 |
| cars [2] 1274 | 20024 | 123251243 | 24 | 2139 |  | chosen [1] | 2218 | classificatı |  |
| casc 142197 | 916 |  | 1502 | chapter [2] | 3521 | Chrıstian [2] | 1011 | 11524 |  |
| $3719 \quad 393$ | 5114 |  | 1519 |  |  | 23423 |  | clay [2] 7820 | 7824 |
| $5119 \quad 5122$ | 5210 | central | 2219 | character [1] | 1418 | Christmas [3] | 17818 | clean [1] 1623 |  |
| $5220 \quad 533$ | 534 | certain [12] | 5111 | characteristics |  | 178241807 |  |  |  |
| 5595718 | 5723 | 1121412612 | 12821 | 164216422 |  | cigarettes [1] | 1305 | clear [8] 417 <br> $10416 \quad 11112$ | $\begin{aligned} & 695 \\ & 12517 \end{aligned}$ |
| 612 705 728 725 | 6518 | $14821 \quad 15510$ | 1642 | characterizatio | ns [1] | circle [2] | 593 | $\begin{array}{ll} 10416 & 11112 \\ 1482 & 2196 \end{array}$ | 12517 22820 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}705 & 7225 \\ 7415 & 803\end{array}$ | 7414 10023 | $\begin{array}{lll}16416 & 16416 \\ 20825 & 2103\end{array}$ | 1698 | 2302 |  | ${ }_{69} 7$ |  | clearly [s] |  |
| $1109 \quad 1117$ | 11217 | cortainly [10] | 2113 | characterize [1] | 23120 | circles [1] | 2431 | $3514 \quad 163$ | 17016 |
| $11710 \quad 11711$ | 11922 | 44414519 | 15313 | charge [10] | 182 | circumstan |  | 17119 |  |
| 1192312013 | 12014 | 194419423 | 20713 | $3325 \quad 341$ | 5024 | 110916716 | 17120 | clerk [1] 23511 |  |
| $12014 \quad 12015$ | 1228 | 216252542 | 25412 | 63197718 | 925 | cite ${ }_{[2]} 21321$ | 21423 | click [1] 2305 |  |
| 126251625 | 17821 | certificate [1] | 4614 | 125222383 | 23822 |  |  |  |  |
| 179518910 | 2044 |  | 4618 | charged [6] | 6611 | cited [1] 214 |  | cliffs [1]232 |  |
| 22219 |  | certificates [2] | 4618 | 109251101 | 13111 | cities [9] 1523 | 8124 | climate [2] | 1406 |
| cases [67] | 127 | 4712 |  | 1852221822 |  | 838839 | 15310 | 21311 |  |
| $1923 \quad 2619$ | 3910 | certificd [3] | 4823 | charges [4] | 397 | 1531415315 | 16012 | clipped [3] | 24410 |
| $504 \quad 5112$ | 5115 | $4824 \quad 13019$ |  | -5012 608 | 2451 | 25316 |  | 2441324416 |  |
| 522526 | 5221 | certifies [1] | 13014 | charging [2] | 19623 | citizen [8] | 308 | clips [1] 6722 |  |
| 5223531 | 535 | certify [1] | 2571 | $19624$ | 19623 | 1992120216 | 23317 | close [1] 134 |  |
| 5535512 | 576 | chained [1] | 2362 |  |  | $23614 \quad 23714$ | 23817 |  |  |
| $5717 \quad 5725$ | 5725 | chained [1] | 2362 | charming [1] | 1028 | 23818 |  | closed [2] | 2813 |
| $5814 \quad 591$ | 6112 | Chair [1] 1074 |  | charts [2] | 403 | citizenry [5] | 2301 | 8420 |  |
| 6846810 | 6824 | Chairman [86] | 113 | 4116 |  | $23115 \quad 23123$ | 23216 | closely [1] | 822 |
| $719 \quad 7112$ | 7117 | 21.212 | 215 | chased [1] | 23319 | 2387 |  | clothing [1] | 14315 |
| $7118 \quad 7224$ | 741 | 219244 | 247 | cheap [2] | 12922 | citizens [24] | 3410 | club [3] 24025 | 241 |
| $767 \quad 797$ | 7918 | $2520 \quad 287$ | 2810 |  |  | 4654921 | 821 | 24112 |  |
| 80168120 | 8621 | $3219 \quad 3222$ | 3621 |  |  | 104212610 |  |  |  |
| 945949 | 9410 | $376 \quad 4013$ | 4025 | cheap/infe | [1] | $\begin{array}{ll}1042 & 12610 \\ 13821 & 14017\end{array}$ | 12821 14211 | clubs [2] 1892 | 20521 |
| 94179425 | 953 | 41194123 | 446 | 15324 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}13821 & 14017 \\ 1537 & 1553\end{array}$ | 142118 15618 | coaches [1] | 1286 |
| 98139822 | 9822 | 4564716 | 4723 | check [37] | 176 | 157818911 | 20014 | coalition [3] | 14525 |
| 9823992 | 1001 | 482569 | 604 | $1711 \quad 1719$ | 1721 | 2174 422322 | 2262 | 189120519 |  |
| $10019 \quad 11019$ | 11021 | 636637 | 6521 | $1722 \quad 1724$ | 4125 | $22625 \quad 2277$ | 22921 | coalitıons [1] | 24 |
| 1111511214 | 11223 | 662664 | 6615 | 133121367 | 1689 | $22625 \quad 2277$ | 22921 |  |  |
| 117411918 | 11919 | 6625675 | 689 | 168251695 | 16913 |  |  | coast [1] 1511 |  |
| $17320 \quad 18325$ | 1869 | 6947010 | 7120 | 1691616925 | 1702 | citizenship [1] | 16821 | cocked [1] | 8222 |
| $19717 \quad 20913$ | 2273 | 93710114 | 10118 | 17051728 | 17212 | city [53] 26 | 421 | code [6] 9910 | 12520 |
| $22714 \quad 24524$ | 24525 | 1161312419 | 12511 | $1749 \quad 17422$ | 1755 | 421423 | 126 | 126231301 | 2205 |
| $\boldsymbol{c a s h}_{[1]} 1615$ |  | 128251323 | 1325 | $\begin{array}{ll}17612 & 17813\end{array}$ | 17819 | $\begin{array}{lll}1214 & 1214\end{array}$ | 173 | 23015 |  |
| catastrophe [1] | 21024 | 132613725 | 1384 | $\begin{array}{ll}17825 & 17919\end{array}$ | 17923 | 1915191 | 194 | cocrced [2] | 803 |
|  |  | 138131451 | 14510 | 1801218018 | 18018 | 195331 | 7125 | 8015 |  |
| catastrophes 1 | 234 | 1451714614 | 14619 | $18025 \quad 18025$ | 18712 | 84208421 | 862 |  |  |
| catch [3] 1014 | 1974 | 146211597 | 1618 | $21420 \quad 23723$ | 24617 | $9613 \quad 9810$ | 9811 | coextensive | 8112 |
| 19710 |  | 162616212 | 16512 | checked ${ }_{[2]}$ | 2031 | 1021512111 | 12123 | Cohen [9] | 114 |
| catcgorized [1] | 1162 | $16612 \quad 17418$ | 1832 | 21210 |  | $12217 \quad 12219$ | 12223 | 222217 | 218 |
| category [2] | 49 | $\begin{array}{llll}1833 & 1838 \\ 183 & 17 & 184\end{array}$ | 18313 | checks [5] | 16810 | 1222513213 | 1386 | 2192410 | 7625 |
| 9516 |  | 183171842 | 1847 | $16813 \quad 1709$ | 1729 | 1382113824 | 1397 | 1052210524 |  |
| caucus [8] |  | 18491876 | 18711 | 24522 |  | 1391214210 | 14225 | Cohen's [1] | 468 |
| caucus [8] | 1346 | 187191881 | 1889 |  |  | 143814420 | 1456 | cold [2] 1422 | 1428 |
| 134713416 | 13521 | $18817 \quad 20515$ | 20518 | chemical [1] | 2315 | 146316725 | 2297 |  |  |
| 1361715821 | 15822 | 224222918 | 23622 | cherry [1] | 2122 | 22982376 | 2379 | collaborate [1] | 1918 |
| 16218 |  | 240124823 | 2512 | child [9] 866 | 10914 | 2371925025 | 2519 | collar [1] | 9822 |



Condenselt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$

| 2046 |  |  | 15514 | 15817 | 15818 | 11023 | 11025 | 1821 | $20217 \quad 2072$ | 2073 | dark [8] 69 | 611 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cops [3] |  | 5420 | 15820 | 16823 | 1892 | 22225 | 2268 | 23423 | $2114 \quad 21112$ | 21421 | $615 \quad 620$ | 624 |
| 2429 |  |  | 189 | 19019 | 19713 | cover |  | 11124 | 21562159 | 2167 | 1024211 | 447 |
| copy [3] |  | 1879 | 19714 | 19724 | 1999 | cover | [1] | 16815 | 2161421616 | 2275 | darned-abus |  |
| 18710 |  |  | 19910 | 20223 | 205 | cover | [1] | 962 | 25 |  | 2212 |  |
| corner |  | 117 | 21817 | 2232 | 2256 | C | 613 | 6824 | criminally [1] | 1097 | data [2] 1681 | 2067 |
| 7923 | 1394 | 24314 | 2331 | 2379 | 23719 | Cr 69 | 0 | 6824 | criminals [34] | 338 | database [1] | 17210 |
| 24314 |  |  | couple |  | 8424 | crack |  | 20818 | $3416 \quad 3516$ | 7818 | databases [1] | 1754 |
| corpora | tion [1] | 20423 | 852 | 9414 | 1389 | crack |  | 21518 | 976 <br> 1015 | 12020 | date [11] 1922 | 502 |
| corpora | tions [1] | 14314 | 1453 | 14518 | 16525 | crack | [1 | 19518 | 1561119310 | 1964 | $5123 \quad 5719$ | 15115 |
| correc | 51 | 39 | 18222 | 18917 | 19322 |  |  | 195 | 1971972 | 2001 | 162231747 | 17711 |
| 325 | 410 | 252 | 20918 | 23020 | 24620 |  |  |  | 2061420616 | 20619 | $17712 \quad 17722$ | 24619 |
| 6220 | 6525 | 941 | course |  | 71 |  |  |  | 207920711 | 20711 | daughter [1] | 15920 |
| 1235 | 17814 | 17815 | 829 | 9522 | 1799 |  |  |  | 2081821418 | 21513 | days [8] 5116 | 522 |
| 17820 | 18121 | 18319 | 18823 | 1927 | 1954 | create |  | 1818 | 2151421518 | 2177 | 547659 | 8919 |
| 1881 | 2574 |  | 20710 | 2173 | 2179 | 502 | 7018 | 864 | 225232271 | 2277 | $10217 \quad 14116$ | 17212 |
| correct | onal | 12321 | 22117 | 22320 | 24425 | 32 | 14010 | 67 | $2319 \quad 24317$ | 25024 | de [7] 5320 | 5518 |
| 12324 |  |  | court |  | 312 | Cr |  | 6711 | criteria [2] | 13522 | $614 \quad 6215$ | 6619 |
| correc | [1] | 24424 | 349 | 4524 | 485 | creat | [2] | 4923 | 1675 |  | 6910706 |  |
| correc | css [1] | 32 | 5218 | 492 | 503 549 | 140 |  |  | critical [1] | 277 | dead [8] 4913 | 4915 |
| corrupt | ion [1] | 9823 | 5518 | 563 | 5713 | creat | [ |  | cross [1] 8619 |  | 7616905 | 2476 |
| cost 11 | 15315 |  | 5817 | 609 | 6010 |  |  | 77 | crossing [1] | 14224 | $24711 \quad 2532$ |  |
| costs | 2464 |  | 6013 | 6015 | 612 |  |  | 7 | crossover [1] | 229 | [1] | 511 |
| council | [4] | 4723 | 617 | 6114 | 6114 | crime |  | $\begin{aligned} & 45 \\ & 912 \end{aligned}$ | crumble [1] | 22318 | deal [14] 74 | 106 |
| 12217 | 12219 | 2342 | 6116 627 | 6125 628 | 623 6317 | 1024 | 1312 | 2611 | cry [2] 2322 | 2326 | $\begin{array}{ll} 162 & 358 \\ 6224 & 935 \end{array}$ | $3919$ |
| council | matic |  | 644 | 645 | 6420 | 3723 | 395 | 411 | CSR-RPR [2] | 122 | 10581322 | 16415 |
| 12220 |  |  | 6421 | 653 | 655 | 436 | 545 | 7917 | 2578 |  | 165921323 | 24517 |
| counse | ${ }_{[2]}$ | 12222 | 655 | 669 | 6610 | 8611 | 9016 | 912 | Cue [1] 799 |  | dcaler [10] | 4124 |
| 22! 20 |  |  | 6611 | 6619 | 6624 | 1078 | 9822 | $\begin{aligned} & 99 \\ & 107 \end{aligned}$ | culture [5] | 973 | $9518 \quad 12522$ | 16916 |
| count ${ }^{1}$ |  | 24715 | 6710 | 6716 | 6716 | 1078 | 10722 | 110 | 14421447 | 1447 | $17019 \quad 1711$ | 17112 |
| countic | [ [28] | 67 | 6717 6824 | 6817 691 | 6822 699 | 11212 | 11213 | 11620 | 1448 |  | $18021 \quad 1884$ | 24313 |
| 5414 | 607 | 609 | 6812 | 6914 | 6915 | 12924 | 13423 | 1352 | Cunningham [2] |  | dealers [15] | 16823 |
| 6018 | 6019 | 965 | 6917 | 702 | 7011 | 1353 | 1355 | 16621 | 1222578 |  | 16941697 | 16920 |
| 1046 | 10410 | 10411 | 69 | 7411 | 754 | 19210 | 19213 | 19216 | curb [3] 216 | 148 | 169221708 | 17021 |
| 10414 | 10424 | 10515 | 759 | 759 | 7522 | 19419 | 19525 | 19612 | 205 |  | $17325 \quad 17412$ | 17619 |
| 10610 | 10615 | 1114 | 766 | 767 | 767 | 19612 | 19617 | 2044 |  | 2210 | 242824318 | 24324 |
| 11112 | 14215 | 1587 | 769 | 7611 | 7811 | 20513 | 20610 | 20923 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { curren } \\ 13516 \end{array}$ | 2210 | 24772478 |  |
| 15814 | 15815 | 1614 | 796 | 816 | 817 | 20924 | 21011 | 21024 |  |  | dealership [1] | 17516 |
| 1906 | 19013 | 19017 | 818 | 8119 | 8612 | 2111 | 21323 | 21518 | CURTI |  | dealing [16] | 313 |
| 1919 | 2193 | 2389 | 8612 | 882 | 883 | 21624 | 2174 | 21717 | custody [ 31 | 5011 | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { deal } \\ 409 & 4510\end{array}$ | 4815 |
| countri | cs [1] | 2331 | 896 | 9216 | 9314 | 21717 | 21718 | 21723 | 244 |  | 507589 | 6520 |
| country | [24] | 2425 | 9918 | 9921 | 9922 | 21725 | 2183 | 2189 | customers [2] | 2354 | 6927015 | 924 |
| 3012 | 8310 | 8518 | 11122 | 1122 | 1124 | 21820 | 21822 | 22317 | 23525 |  | 1021310318 | 10422 |
| 10222 | 1057 | 13324 | 1125 | 1144 | 1148 | 2317 | 23113 | 23914 | cut [3] 1021 | 19224 | 10561402 | 23013 |
| 13425 | 13923 | 1411 | 11415 | 11418 | 11419 | 24317 | 24624 | 246 | 22820 |  | deals [3] 551 | 13224 |
| 1413 | 1418 | 14117 | 11425 | 11425 | 1159 | 2473 | 2474 | 24815 | cycle ${ }_{[2]} 2525$ | 2525 | 1641 |  |
| 14210 | 14211 | 14313 | 11515 | 11516 | 1164 | 24816 |  |  | D[1] 2376 |  | death [9] 78 | 79 |
| 14321 | 14325 | 1447 | 1608 | 19923 | 22121 | crime-f | ree ${ }_{[1]}$ | 21712 | D.C 11 <br> 1037  |  |  |  |
| 19325 | 19517 | 2257 | 2225 | 22218 | 2324 | crimes |  | 68 | D.C[1] 1037 |  | $190 \quad 15 \quad 191 \quad 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12919 \\ & 2347 \end{aligned}$ |
| 2278 | 23820 |  | 24524 | 24525 | 24618 | 611 | 134 | 1322 | DA [12] 2712 | 3521 | $\begin{aligned} & 19015 \\ & 24625 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| county | [79] | 2110 | courtro | Om [4] | 4912 | 2524 | 2524 | 2610 | $\begin{array}{ll}3523 & 369 \\ 3817 & 3818\end{array}$ | 3720 | deaths [6] | 58 |
| 2812 | 2913 | 3714 | 504 | 5124 | 22110 | 378 | 4017 | 4113 | $3817 \quad 3818$ | 6411 | $2524 \quad 15316$ | 15622 |
| 407 | 408 | 412 | courtro | oms [1] | 5721 | 677 | 824 | 9121 | 1971219712 | 19713 | $19012 \quad 19014$ | 15622 |
| 4820 | 5010 | 5016 |  |  | 129 | 921 | 9512 | 968 | 21817 |  |  |  |
| 5113 | 5412 | 5413 | courts | 162 | 2010 | 9714 | 9910 | 1016 | DA's [7] 268 | 2722 | debate [7] | 10323 |
| 5414 | 5417 | 5424 | 263 | 269 | 2616 | 11524 | 13625 | 1501 | $3713 \quad 5819$ | 5823 | 104615621 | 15924 |
| 6219 | 6223 | 631 | 2619 | 281 | 4814 | 1645 | 17311 | 1964 | 1962319714 |  | 1592516119 | 1651 |
| 634 | 6415 | 6419 | 4815 | 5314 | 5316 5316 | 2086 | 20821 | 2091 | Dad $_{[1]} 10825$ |  | Debora [2] | 122 |
| 652 | 667 | 713 | 5613 | 5625 | 607 | 20911 | 20912 | 20921 | daily [3] 1424 | 2427 | 2578 |  |
| 8117 | 836 | 875 | 7017 | 711 | 814 | 2138 | 21916 | 23015 | ${ }_{\text {daily }}{ }_{247}{ }^{3} 71424$ | 2427 | decade [2] | 512 |
| 9118 | 964 | 10412 | 8418 | 8625 | 1022 | 25024 |  |  |  |  | 1331 |  |
| 10415 | 10418 | 10517 | 11014 | 11416 | 1545 | crımina | ${ }^{135]}$ | 323 | damage [1] |  | decades [2] | 72 |
| 10521 | 1062 | 1063 | 1549 | 16012 | 16018 | 1025 | 2618 | 2619 | damages [1] | 24925 | 1478 |  |
| 1068 | 1069 | 1071 | 16019 | 21021 | 22118 | 381 | 414 | 6612 | Dan [2] 1254 | 14625 |  |  |
| 11020 | 11311 | 11312 | 2323 | 2384 | 2386 | 7315 | 7723 | 9516 | dangerous [7] |  | December [2] | 110 |
| 11313 | 11317 | 1179 | cousin | 238 | 1802 | 979 | 1005 | 1107 | $\begin{array}{cc} \text { dangerous } 171 \\ 211 & 1102 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2024 \\ & 1978 \end{aligned}$ | 235 |  |
| 1182 | 11823 | 1195 | $\underset{24324}{\text { cousin }}$ |  | 1802 | 12811 | 16815 | 16818 | $\begin{array}{ll} 211 & 1102 \\ 2288 & 2325 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1978 \\ 2329 \end{array}$ | decide [1] | 1865 |
| 1195 | 1201 | 1207 | 24324 |  |  | 1758 | 1759 | 17510 | dangers [1] | $2213$ | decided [1] | 1225 |
| 1249 | 12415 | 1465 | cover [8] | 1415 | 7213 | 1978 | 1989 | 1989 | dangers [1] | 2213 |  |  |

Condenselt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ decides - doesn't


| CondenseIt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | dollars - establishes |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5 \quad 24513$ |  | drop [1] 1359 |  | cect $\left.{ }^{3}\right]$ | 723 | employec's [1] | 9917 | 2292 |  |
| dollars | 8521 | dropped | 13910 | $2015 \quad 24713$ |  | loyees [3] | 4616 | land [7] | 21710 |
| 24116 |  |  |  | fecting [1] | 155 | 28523 |  | 2171221716 | 21719 |
| domestic [3] | 22025 | drove | 2435 | effective [11] | 723 | ing | 10515 | 217232316 | 23113 |
| 221202226 |  | drug [14] 80 | 8814 | $2617 \quad 4112$ | 4417 | enact [2] 13413 | 1551 | English [1] | 9925 |
| done [221647 | 74 | 9121921 | 958 | $\begin{array}{ll}8123 & 15115 \\ 1551 & 22524\end{array}$ | 1522 | enacted ${ }^{51}$ | 13222 | enhance ${ }_{\text {[4] }}$ | 379 |
| 667669 | 748 | $\begin{array}{ll}959 & 9518\end{array}$ | 9522 | 1551 22716 | 2274 | 1481115012 | 21310 | $13219 \quad 13610$ | 20821 |
| $794 \quad 8223$ | 949 | $\begin{array}{lll}17312 & 24313\end{array}$ | 24318 | 22716 |  | 221 |  | enhanced [3] | 2620 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}11114 & 11215\end{array}$ | 11323 | 43232477 | 2477 | effectiv | 20 | enactmen | 15112 | 38621517 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}14422 & 14425 \\ 15413 & 1855\end{array}$ | $15 i 19$ | drug-related [1] 24711 |  | 799 |  | 1574 |  | enhances [1] 20822 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}19114 & 19525\end{array}$ | 22622 | drugs [15] |  | effectiveness [3] |  | encompass [1] encourage [5] | 17210 | enjoy [11208 2 |  |
| $22814 \quad 23912$ |  | $\begin{array}{lll}9122 & 924 \\ 928 & 9523\end{array}$ | $926$ | 31114817 | 15122 |  | 12725 | enlightening [1] 18815 |  |
| door [9] 2311 | 298 | 525223 | 2235 | efficiency | 311 | 1282424920 | 25010 | enlisted [1] | 2033 |
| 71137114 | 19814 | 43825416 | 25416 | ${ }_{1772}^{\text {efficicacy }}[2]$ |  | 25021 |  | enrichment [1] 11016 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}19819 & 23525\end{array}$ | 2361 | 25542558 |  | eff | 1733 | encouraged [1] |  | ensure [2] | 79 |
|  |  | ${\underset{2487}{\text { drunk [3] }}{ }_{248} 10}^{20316}$ |  | effort [6] | $\begin{array}{r} 1919 \\ 8579 \end{array}$ | aging [1] |  | 014 |  |
| doubled |  |  |  | 241885 |  | end [13] 320 | 1820 | entail [3] | 21225 |
| 14 |  |  | 200 | 24112521 |  | $5710 \quad 90$ | 10217 | 21322132 |  |
| doubt ${ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ | 822 | 25 |  | efforts [9] | 83 | $\begin{array}{llll}1439 & 14616 & 24518\end{array}$ |  | entails [1] 5318 |  |
| 821292 |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}8710 & 10610 & 1364\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{llll}25025 & 25523\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { enter }_{54} 514 & 1215 \\ 445 & 221 & 12 & 2515 \end{array}$ |  |
| Douglas [1] | 257 |  |  | $17319 \quad 17325$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| down [32] | 102 | 246924820 |  | egregious [1] | 20723 | $\begin{array}{\|ccc\|} \hline \text { endemic } & \text { [4] } & 6821 \\ 10417 & 10516 & 10614 \end{array}$ |  | entered [4] 125 |  |
| 157176 | 1716 | du | 3212 | eight [4] 420868 |  | $\underset{21523}{\text { endorse }_{[2]}} 2077$ |  | Enterprise [2] 14310 |  |
| 1814356 | 3512 | duplicate | 25315 | either [13] |  | 21523 |  | 14311 |  |
| $4213 \quad 5422$ | 587 | duplicate | 25315 2033 |  |  | endorsed [5] |  | enthusiastically [1] |  |
| 892894 | 8917 | during [1] | 2033 | $536 \quad 553$ | $5718$ | $1216 \quad 1495$ | 15019 |  |  |
| 1141342 | 1391 | dutics [2] | 7314 | $6610 \quad 958$ | 10212 | 1536 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}15813 & 15818 \\ 1621 & 1624\end{array}$ | 16120 | 23815 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}118 & 19 & 15114\end{array}$ | 16223 | endorsing [1] | 2184 | entire [4] |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}1621 & 1624 \\ 17920 & 17925\end{array}$ | 1761 | duty [1] 7813 |  | 175181801119823 |  | ends [1] 2225 |  | $\left.\begin{array}{\|ccc} 1511 & 15424 & 2345 \\ \text { entirely } 151 & 13311 \\ 20914 & 210 & 20 \end{array}\right) 21216$ |  |
| 1851820214 | 20818 | Dwight [3] | 1039 | elected ${ }_{[6]}$ | 420 | enforce [9] | 284 |  |  |
| 2151821916 | 24415 | 12425140 |  | $4819 \quad 573 \quad 75$ |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 388 & 8424 & 1546 \\ 15410 & 17415 & 19618 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| 4716 |  |  |  | $2396 \quad 23922$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 21224 \\ 212 \end{array}$ |  |
| do |  |  |  | ${ }_{18822}^{\text {election }}$ [2] 732 |  | $20615 \quad 2399$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { entitled [1] } 18414 \\ & \text { entreprencurial }{ }_{[1]} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| downtow | 5011 |  | 2481 |  |  | enforced [4] | 8622 |  |  |
|  |  | ca |  | Eleven [1] 1612 |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 1522 & 21915 & 24218 \end{array}$ |  | $901$ |  |
| dozens [1] |  |  |  | elicit [1] 324 |  | enforcement [61] |  | enumerate [1] 20910 enumerated $[2] 16625$ |  |
| Dr[3] 249 | 2498 |  | 7 | eligibility [3] | 168 | $\begin{array}{lll}14 & 23 \\ 35 & 310\end{array}$ | 34 412 |  |  |
| Dris 249 |  | cars [1] 103 |  | $1696 \quad 16918$ |  | $35 \quad 310 \quad 412$ |  |  |  |
| draft ${ }_{[2]} 78$ | 20814 |  |  | cligible [4] |  | $\begin{array}{lll}419 & 86 & 813 \\ 125 & 141 & 156\end{array}$ |  | nvironment [11234 6 |  |
| drafted [2] | 716 | casicr [2] 15 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}18023 & 18125 \quad 18210\end{array}$ |  | 156 |  |  |  |
| 262 |  |  |  | $$ |  | 2023 |  | envision $[1] \quad 7013$ |  |
| draw | 8221 | easily [2] 3 |  |  |  | 2285622 |  | $\text { epidemic }_{[2]} \quad 15317$ |  |
| - |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 13915 & 14424 & 1557 \\ 2264 & & \\ \text { eliminated } 121 & 7910 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| drawer [1] | 155 |  |  |  |  | 1262 |  | $16221$ |  |
| drawing [1] | 804 | $$ |  | eliminates ${ }_{[1]} 11$ |  | 13641361114 |  | equipment ${ }_{[1]} 23814$ equivalent $[2] \quad 1911$ 1912 |  |
| drawn [1] | 82 |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}15122 & 1523 & 16616\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| dresser [1] | 15523 | 113 |  |  |  | eliminating [1] 13310 elimination [3] 14913 |  | $16621 \quad 17020$ | 1721 | equivalent [2] 1911 <br> 1912 |  |
| drew [3] 219 | 2364 | casy [101 161 |  | elimination [3] 14913 |  | $17322 \quad 1745$ |  | eroding [1] 844 |  |
| 2369 |  | $1915 \quad 206$ | 358 | Elk [2] 8117 |  | $19313 \quad 2062$ | 209 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { escape }[1] & 2361 \\ \text { especially }[6] & 4911\end{array}$ |  |
| Dr | 139 | $\begin{array}{lll} 3517 & 3518 & 154 \\ 22314 & 2332 & \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { elongated }_{[1]} & 5520 \\ \text { elsewhere } & {[3]} \\ 3715\end{array}$ |  | 209172101621021 |  |  |  |
| drink [3] 203 | 2042 |  |  | $21517 \quad 21523$ | 2416 |  |  |  |  |
| 20410 |  | economic $_{[1]}$ 46 <br> Eddy $[1] 24725$  <br> Edcnburg $\left.^{2} 2\right]$ 8313 <br> 8315   <br>   |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}24119 & 2504 & 2505\end{array}$ |  | quire 14510 |  |
| , |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { elsewhere [3] } 3715 \\ & 7324 \quad 11115 \\ & \text { embarrassed }{ }_{[1]} 2048 \end{aligned}$ | 250625011 | 25022 | ${ }_{16522}^{\text {Esquire }}$ |  |
| drive-by [1] | 20622 |  |  | embrace $_{[1]}$ 15619 <br> embraced $[1]$ 2306 <br> embraces $[1]$ 2095 <br> Emerson $_{[2]}$ 22119 |  | enforcement's [1] |  | essence [2] 9812 |  |
| driven | 1622 | Edinboro [1] $^{\text {Editorial }}{ }_{[2]}$ 15916 <br> edi $^{205 ~ 3}$ 20424 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | enforcements [1] | essential ${ }_{[1]} 913$ |  |  |  |
| dr | 2487 |  |  | 4313 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24810 driver's |  | $2053$ |  |  |  | enforcing [6] | 96 | $\text { establish }_{[2]} \quad 9420$ |  |
| driver's [2] | 1713 | educating[1] 43 <br> education [3] 13519 |  |  |  | emphasize [2] 17515 |  | $\begin{array}{lllll} 1117 & 21315 & 222 & 16 \\ 23719 & 237 & 55 & \end{array}$ |  | 14015 <br> established 151943 |  |
|  |  |  |  | $2297$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| drivi | 3813 |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{emphasized}_{[2]} & 1527 \\ \text { employed }_{[1]} & 1998 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { engaged }[3] \\ & 8514 \quad 911 \\ & \text { engincering }[2] \\ & 2291 \end{aligned}$ |  | 1308 1689 16823 <br> 1735   <br> establishes $[1]$ 1674  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ward [1] | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Condenselt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$

| estımate | 2255 | executed [1] | 23520 | extraordinarily [1] |  | favor [6] 14 | 269 | $\begin{array}{cc} 15210 & 1761 \\ 20823 & 22710 \end{array}$ | 18724 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| cstımated [1] | 19018 | cxecution [1] | 784 | 763 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 328 \\ & 1935 \end{aligned}$ | 1132 |  | 24615 |
| ctc[5] 3823 | 18016 | Executive [2] | 16522 | extraordinary |  |  |  | fewer [1] | 2294 |
| 18412207 | 22719 | 2496 |  |  |  | favorable [2] | 6023 | FG[1] 2026 |  |
| ethnic [1] | 1501 | excmpt [3] | 16719 | extremely [5] | 3216 |  |  | fictitious [1] | 1716 |
| cthnıcity [1] | 25514 | 1791817922 |  | 11 |  | ored [3] | 14 | ficld ${ }_{[1]} 2615$ |  |
| cuphemism [1] | 9923 | exempting [1] | 1338 | face [5] 3022 |  | FBII[ ${ }_{\text {l }} 493$ | 2474 | fifteen [1] | 11111 |
| Evans [15] | 10218 | exercise [1] | 5618 | 22014 225 | 25315 | feature [1] | 153 | fight [2] 8115 | 2369 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}1039 & 12425 \\ 13816 & 143\end{array}$ | 1324 | exercised [1] | 10514 | faced [1] 1908 |  | features [1] | 16415 | figure [4] | 9615 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}13816 & 1433 \\ 14619 & 1598\end{array}$ | 1451 | excrcising [2] | 23222 | facia [1] 751 |  | Fed-Ex'd ${ }^{\text {fli }}$ | 16415 | $1469 \quad 16017$ | 23016 |
|  | 1612 | 24114 |  |  | 6024 | Fed-Ex'd [1] | 190 | figures [6] | 818 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 1616 & 16110 \\ 16514 & 16516 \end{array}$ | 1611 | exhibit [1] | 2027 | 6921 |  | federal [71] | 1210 | 859859 | 11815 |
| Evans' [1] | 222 | Exile[5] 985 | $986$ | facility [3] | 12215 | 8698612 | 8625 | 120213920 |  |
| Evansburg [1] | 8313 |  |  | 123412322 |  | 945946 | 9411 | file [3] 2519 | 389 |
| evening [1] <br> cvent [1] 24423 | 17519 | ex |  | facing [2] | 3721 | 94139416 | 9511 |  |  |
|  |  | 21520225 |  | 10621 |  | $9524 \quad 9814$ | 9814 |  |  |
| cvents [2] | 1481 | existed ${ }_{11}$ | 12517 | fact [23] 36 | 14 | $\begin{array}{ll}99218 \\ 10318 & 10325\end{array}$ | 11118 | $16820 \quad 17512$ |  |
| crent ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |  | existence | 9325 | 4823 55 |  | 11221129 | 11216 | fill [6] | 18116 |
| eventually [1] | 2264 | 94713312 | 23812 | 1361214813 | 1512 | 1121811224 | 1135 | $18118 \quad 18120$ | 18613 |
| cverybody [17] | 4812 | existing [21] | 14 | $1527 \quad 18218$ | 20820 | 12119 | 1237 | 18717 |  |
| 5628113 | 14216 | $23 \quad 36$ | 412 | 215142169 | 22415 | $\begin{array}{lll}12310 & 12313 \\ 1243 & 12411\end{array}$ | 12321 | filled [3] 12024 | 18715 |
| $14217 \quad 14219$ | 14417 | 2854120 | 421 | 23232446 | 24723 | $\begin{array}{lll}124318 & 12916\end{array}$ | 1241 | 24018 |  |
| $14417 \quad 16311$ | 19414 | 42312513 | 12516 | 2472425113 | 2527 | $\begin{array}{lll}12518 & 12916 \\ 1303 & 14719\end{array}$ | 13 | filling [4] | 1818 |
| $20713 \quad 21411$ | 2196 | $13220 \quad 15425$ | 16617 | factory [1] | 2287 | $\begin{array}{lll}16818 & 17014\end{array}$ | 17015 | 1812318123 | 18212 |
| $24214 \quad 24517$ | 2466 | 209620910 | 20916 | facts [1] 6825 |  | 17131719 | 17219 | filtered ${ }_{[1]}$ | 3512 |
| 2553 |  | $21517 \quad 21521$ | 21524 |  |  | 1732217414 | 18015 |  |  |
| cverybody's [1] 1408 |  | 21992567 |  | fail [1] 8118 |  | $18120 \quad 1862$ | 1867 | $1494 \quad 15016$ | 2386 |
| cverywhere [1] | 25210 | exists [3] | 1873 |  |  | 186818612 | 21423 | finally | 7614 |
| evidence [7] | 618 | 1892223018 |  | fair [3] 822 | 1366 | 2191421919 | 22014 | 88259022 | 2314 |
| $6022 \quad 6025$ | 6920 | exitin | 2063 |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}22017 & 2222\end{array}$ | 2225 | 2412244 | 24717 |
| 692210416 | 2572 | 20615 |  | fairly [1] | 2152 | 2228522216 | 22416 | financial [1] | 2465 |
| evident [1] | 1723 | expand [3] | 2147 | fall [8] 49 | 5822 | 2251 2416 | 24015 | financing [1] | 1319 |
| cvil [3] 16511 | 23414 | $25011 \quad 25021$ |  | 892894 | 8917 | 2416 |  |  | 1319 |
| ${ }_{23414}$ |  | cx | 25 |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { federa } \\ 2428 \end{array}$ | 7 | finding [3] $13018 \quad 14316$ |  |
| cxaccrbated [1] | 2527 |  |  | ${ }_{248}^{\text {tallacious }}$ |  | fee [1] 14 |  | fine $_{[2]} 317$ | 73 |
| cxact [1] 1202 |  | $\exp _{166}$ |  | falling [1] | 24625 | fcel-good | 152 | fined [1] 1276 |  |
| cxactly 11$]$ | 98 | experience [7] | 5525 | false [2] 171 | 17324 | 15421 |  | fines [1] 24 |  |
| cxamıne [1] | 15319 | $7515 \quad 7516$ | 13217 | falsification | 18615 | feeling [1] | 8123 | finest [1] | 2415 |
| cxample [20] | 1719 | 22932299 | 2382 | families [6] | 4915 | fees [2] 1709 | 17010 | finish ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ 1 | 1452 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}224 & 2621 \\ 3510 & 984\end{array}$ | 352 | cxperiences [1] | 9625 | fam1 1947 | 22622 | feet [1] 585 |  | $23217{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}3510 & 984 \\ 11920 & 14819\end{array}$ | 10524 | expertise [1] | 11216 | $22625 \quad 25323$ |  | fellow [3] | 10717 | finishing [1] | 23512 |
| 153116117 | 1907 | experts [3] | 1025 | family [9] | 1624 | 199242035 |  | Fiorentıno [1] | 2495 |
| 2081920915 | 2116 | 130232287 |  | $4310 \quad 4711$ | 17920 | fclon [5] 3118 | 4217 | fire ${ }_{[2]} 2052$ | 2366 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}21117 \\ 249 & 21 & 2118 & 23311\end{array}$ |  | expired ${ }_{[1]}$ | 16713 | $\begin{array}{lll}1801 & 1804 \\ 181 & 11 & 19813\end{array}$ | 1818 | 435.7724 | 1143 | firearm [73] | 513 |
|  |  | explain [3] | 2017 | 1811119813 |  | felonies [10] | 719 | 68 7612 | 614 |
| examples [4] | 169 | $2313 \quad 23717$ |  | fan [1] 3717 |  | 128622 | 6611 | $720 \quad 385$ | 898 |
| $6714 \quad 1282$ | 16025 | explana | 461 | far [13] 3518 | 4417 | 68186918 | 1121 | $8913 \quad 9410$ | 9413 |
| cxceed ${ }^{111}$ | 10517 | 9920 |  | $4418 \quad 5412$ | 7517 | $18511 \quad 18513$ | 18521 | 94169513 | 9519 |
| exceeded [1] | 20212 | explode [1] | 227 | 2231083 | 10812 | felons [5] | 322 | 9520976 | 9711 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { cxcellent }[2] \\ & 1115 \end{aligned}$ | 1112 | explosives [2] | 21322 | $21424 \quad 21816$ | 2378 | 871918 | 956 | 1081910921 | 11811 |
|  |  | 214 |  | 23718252 |  | 2105 |  | 1251412918 | 1345 |
| cxcept ${ }^{51}$ |  |  |  | Farmers [1] | 1286 | felony [28] | 822 | 134713420 | 1362 |
| 167820723 | 867 |  |  | fashion [10] | 162 | $5014 \quad 5022$ | 5025 | 136913617 | 1502 |
|  |  | express [1] | 17411 | 5545825 | 749 | $626 \quad 6312$ | 679 | 16771678 | 16715 |
|  |  | expressed [1] | 12925 | 742110618 | 1774 | $7717 \quad 7720$ | 8613 | 167241681 | 1684 |
| cxception [6] | 3821 |  | 4721 | 2192122116 | 23014 | 9191162 | 1173 | 1681116823 | 1694 |
| 4521468 | 479 | $18124 \quad 18212$ | 4721 | FAST [1] | 866 | 1201416712 | 1685 | $1696 \quad 16918$ | 16919 |
| 70822010 |  |  |  | FAST [1] | 866 | 17061717 | 18417 | $16925 \quad 17010$ | 17014 |
| exchange [3] | 1733 | extensive [3] | 7610 | father [4] | 1404 | 1861418616 | 18622 | 170211713 | 1716 |
| 173172368 |  | 1721621522 |  | 2059243 | 243 | 196222003 | 2003 | 1711117114 | 17117 |
|  | 15722 | extent [5] | 8419 | father's [3] | 1382 | 203232041 | 2042 | 171221737 | 17325 |
| $\operatorname{cxxcited}_{[1]}$ | 17022 | 489717 | 15023 | 13819 |  | felt [2] 4924 | 15822 | 174917412 | 17611 |
| exclusivel | 60 | 22722 |  | fathom [2] | 4621 | few [14] 84 | 9223 | $\begin{array}{lll}18017 & 18017 \\ 1847 & 1855\end{array}$ | 1846 |
| execute [1] |  | ra [1] 18724 |  | 4623 |  | 112201248 | 1282 | $\begin{array}{lll}19014 & 19621\end{array}$ | 18922 19823 |
|  |  | extract ${ }_{[1]}$ | 582 | faulty [1] | 22614 | 12931481 | 1528 | 207620812 | 20817 |


| 2096 | 215 | 21820 | 872952 | 952 | forgo [1] 24912 |  | 7823 |  |  | 662567 | 68 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2267 | 24420 | 2481 | 9514981 | 10011 | forgo | 1014 | frigh | ned | 843 | $694 \quad 7010$ | 7120 |
| fircarms | [119] | 58 | 1112511322 | 21824 | forgotten [1] | 12318 |  |  |  | $726 \quad 7625$ | 937 |
| 518 | 61 | 619 |  |  | form [30] | 224 | frivol | [ [2] | 20018 | $14621 \quad 16512$ | $1833$ |
| 623 | 714 | 1617 | five-mont | 1014 | 389 | 16911 | 2013 |  |  |  |  |
| 3710 | 508 | 5215 | five-year ${ }^{\text {3 }}$ [1 | 9520 | 1711917124 | 18117 | front [19] |  | 4010 | $\begin{array}{lll}1838 & 18313 \\ 1842 & 1847\end{array}$ | 18317 |
| 6312 | 6315 | 6320 | 1962021819 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}18118 & 18119 & 18120\end{array}$ |  | $5020 \quad 5210$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 531 \\ & 658 \end{aligned}$ | 1842 | 1849 |
| 6325 | 643 | 6414 | fixed [1] 1679 |  | 182218222 | 18223 | 5815 | 613 |  | 1881188 | 20515 |
| 6419 | 9113 |  |  |  | 1822418612 | 186131877 | 67236911 |  | 7111 | 224222918 |  |
| 951 9610 | 956 | 9510 |  |  |  | 186141876 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14110 \\ & 20415 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}2242 \\ 2401 & 22918 \\ 2404\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24123 \\ & 25525 \end{aligned}$ |
| 9610 | 9612 | 9614 | flash [1] 2026 | 2441 | $\begin{array}{lllll}18713 & 18718 & 18719\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{lllll}7118 & 11722 & 1 \\ 20122 & 20413 & 20\end{array}$ |  |  | 24823 |  |
| 971 | 9714 | 9715 | 2451 |  | $18720 \quad 18722$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 18723 \\ & 1886 \end{aligned}$ | 2436 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 | 99 | 9911 | flat ${ }_{[1]} 368$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10018 1049 | 10021 | 10025 |  |  | $\begin{array}{lllll}1888 \\ 188 & 24018 & 1886\end{array}$ |  | frugal [1] |  |  | garage $_{[1]}$ | 23411 |  |  |
| 1049 | 11223 | 11517 | fled ${ }_{[11} 19918$ |  | formal 11 | 10711 |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { gate }[1] & 69 & 11 \\ \text { gee } & 121 & 10\end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| 1161 12614 | 12523 12616 | 1263 | flooded [1] | 2529 | formed [2] | 1348 | fruit | 2222 | 2482 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12624 | 1278 | 12910 | ${ }_{1292}{ }^{\text {floor }[5]} 52$ | $2413$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14822 \\ & \text { former [s] } \end{aligned}$ |  | frustrated ${ }_{[1]}$ |  | 2514 | gee [2] 10 general [30] | 413 |  |  |
| 1303 | 13119 | 1329 |  |  |  | $682$ | frustrates (1) |  | 1069 | ${ }_{1112}{ }^{\text {general }}$ [30] ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 143 |  |  |
| 13220 | 13316 | 13521 | fluctuations [1] | 11316 | $\begin{aligned} & 7410 \\ & 14025 \end{aligned}$ |  | ${ }_{\text {frustrating }}^{\text {I41 }} 671$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 521 \\ & 764 \end{aligned}$ | $2622 \quad 272$ | 276 |  |  |
| 13524 | 14721 | 15010 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3114367 | 379 |  |  |  |
| 15017 | 15111 | 15118 | flying [1] | 22014 | forms ${ }^{\text {[7] }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1575 \\ & 18116 \end{aligned}$ | frustration ${ }_{[1]}$ |  |  | 764 | $3824 \quad 7521$ | 916 |
| 15122 | 1587 | 16617 | focus [4] 955 <br> 13412507 | 13223 | $\begin{array}{lll}1698 & 1713 \\ 18123 & 1822\end{array}$ |  | frustrations [1] |  | 517 | 120121265 | 1001613010 |  |  |
| 16620 | 16623 | 1673 |  |  |  | 1886 |  |  | 1742 |  |  |  |  |
| 1674 | 1675 | 16710 | focused ${ }_{[1]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 717 \\ & 411 \end{aligned}$ | Forrest ${ }_{[1]}$ |  | fugitives [2] |  |  | 13017130 | 1313 |  |  |
| 16720 | 16721 | 16722 | focuses [2] |  |  | 11311 |  |  | $123$ | 1317131 | 131172161 |  |  |
| 16812 | 1691 | 1692 |  |  | Fort [1] 4810 |  | full ${ }_{[9]} 218$ |  |  | 133211341 |  |  |  |
| 16922 | 1704 | 1707 | ${ }^{356}$ focusing |  | forth [4] 15321 |  | 1243 1246 <br> 1283 1295 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12721 \\ & 2489 \end{aligned}$ | $21622 \quad 22419$ |  |  |  |
| 17014 | 17016 | 17025 | folded [1] | 2097 |  |  | General's [1] | $264$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1725 | 17218 | 17219 |  | 779 | fortitude [3] | 15616 |  |  | 25217 |  |  |  |  |
| 17223 | 1731 | 17313 | folks [23] | $\begin{aligned} & 311 \\ & 5918 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | fully [2] 7313 Fumo [3] |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2572 \\ & 820 \end{aligned}$ | 224222506 |  |  |  |
| 17416 17622 | 18522 | 17623 | $\begin{array}{ll} 593 & 5911 \\ 6218 & 648 \end{array}$ | $687$ | Forty [1] 23112 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fumo }_{16112}^{[3]} 16213 \\ & x_{162}^{820} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | gentleman [5] | $1258$ |  |  |
| 17822 | 1891 | 18923 | $\begin{array}{ll}7118 & 1423 \\ 1426 & 1421\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1425 \\ & 14220 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Fumo's [3] 1020 |  |  | $2458$ | 22316 |  |  |
| 19013 | 2014 | 2063 | $\begin{array}{lll} 1842 & 231 \\ 2358 & 251 \end{array}$ |  | forward [10] | 6715 | 426 16312 <br> function  <br> 11  |  |  | gentlemen ${ }_{[6]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 534 \\ & 22920 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 20615 | 20718 | 21213 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 23213 \\ & 25217 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} 16513 & 18815 \\ 2373 & 24025 \end{array}\right.$ |  |  |  |
| 2135 | 2225 | 2228 | 2521825322 252202532 |  | 14841579 | 16420 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22217 | 22425 | 2259 |  |  | 1852421218 | $\begin{aligned} & 23013 \\ & 128 \end{aligned}$ | fundamental ${ }_{[2]} 16619$ |  |  | genuine ${ }_{[1]} 21323$ |  |  |  |
| 2269 | 23719 |  | follow [81 2410 |  | found ${ }_{[18]}$ |  | 21219 |  |  | George ${ }_{[2]}$ | 118 |  |  |
| 23821 2428 | 23823 | 23825 | $\begin{array}{cc}388 & 9923 \\ 1136 & 1137\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 240 \\ & 11014 \\ & 1138 \end{aligned}$ | $1412 \quad 2717$ | $\begin{aligned} & 128 \\ & 4411 \\ & 706 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 1082 |  |  |  |
| 2428 | 24321 | 24613 |  |  | 5319618 |  | 9419 | 9420 |  | Germantow |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 24720 |  | 8969518 | 11918 | fundin |  | 9024 | 1011 |  |  |  |
| fired ${ }^{121}$ | kers | 2122 | follow-up [1] | 1737 | 1391315524 | 15918 | $\text { rundil } \begin{array}{r} \text { rund } \end{array}$ |  |  | gesture [1] | 8512 |  |  |
| fired ${ }^{2} 1$ | 2273 | 22715 | followed [4] | 8017 | $\begin{array}{lll}1853 & 21617 \\ 2438 & 2439\end{array}$ | 223 | fun |  |  | gift [5] 46 | 4614 |  |  |
| fircfight | ters [1] | 1286 | 984.9919 | 2409 | $\begin{array}{cc}2438 & 2439 \\ \text { foundation }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{4614} 4617$ | 4712 |  |  |
| fires [1] | 3823 |  | following [8] | 3525 | foundation [1] | 8522 | furnis | ing |  | girl ${ }_{[1]} 23314$ |  |  |  |
| firm [1] | 1410 |  | 423515 | 5120 | four [8] 1810 | $\begin{aligned} & 745 \\ & 11424 \end{aligned}$ | furthe |  |  | girlfriend ${ }^{11}$ | 3320 |  |  |
| first ${ }_{\text {I }}{ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | 173 | 13522 | $11618 \quad 2025$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11424 \\ & 22723 \end{aligned}$ | furthe |  |  | given [11] |  |  |  |
| 76 | 1214 | 2012 | 14913 |  |  | 1363 | furthe |  | 24725 | $4925 \quad 5012$ | 618 |  |  |
| 2814 | 488 | 4818 | follows [2] | 1108 | Fourth [1] | 1363 | fut |  |  | 8768810 | 8811 |  |  |
| 5117 7214 | 5118 | 5211 | 1757 |  | frame [1] | 111 | 1322 | 13619 | 21313 | 8812913 | 9925 |  |  |
| 7214 8917 | 811 | 851 | food ${ }_{[1]} 1306$ |  | framework [1] | 161 | 21722 | 2185 |  | 23617 |  |  |  |
| 8917 11618 | ${ }_{13219}$ | 9317 | foolish [2] | 2115 | Francisco [1] | 2298 | G5 [4] |  | 771 | giving |  |  |  |
| 11618 13620 | 13216 13813 | 13522 | 21215 |  | FRANK ${ }_{[1]}$ | 115 |  | 24225 |  | ${ }_{2718} \quad 4816$ | 494 |  |  |
| 13115 | 14511 | 15123 | foolishness [1] | 2554 | frankly [8] | 682 | Gabri | 's [1] | 8911 | $14420 \quad 14422$ | 1903 |  |  |
| 16012 | 16717 | 1752 | forbidden ${ }_{[1]}$ | 2482 | 7410786 | 8319 | game | 123624 | 25322 | $\operatorname{glad}_{121} 5616$ | 1583 |  |  |
| 19723 | 2059 | 20924 | force [6] 94 | 1611 | 993 | 11223 | games |  | 247 | glasses [2] | 102 |  |  |
| 21520 | 21616 | 2173 | $4224 \quad 454$ | 16316 | 12012 |  | gang [1] | 25119 |  | 4212 |  |  |  |
| 24915 |  |  | 24023 |  | Frattaroli ${ }^{[3]}$ | 2493 | gang | anger | 2062 | Glen 1123512 |  |  |  |
| Fish ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 23624 |  | forced ${ }_{[1]}$ | 389 | 24982491 |  |  |  | 25117 | Glock [1] | 2284 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Frsher}_{121}$ |  | 4317 | forcing [4] | 3818 | free [4] 12322 | 12521 | 25310 |  |  | Gloria [1] | 15920 |  |  |
| 9913 |  |  | $5725 \quad 5725$ | 22219 | $22314 \quad 23914$ |  | Ganno |  |  | Gloria | 15920 |  |  |
| Fishcr's | [10] | 413 | forefathers [1] | 23820 | freedom [4] | 20725 | 21 | 215 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1112 | 1119 | 143 | forever [1] | 9012 | 20725208 | 2081 | 2520 | 287 | 3219 | goal $_{148} \quad 4418$ | 12911 |  |  |
| 2622 367 | 272 | 3114 | forfeiture | 23 | frequent ${ }^{11}$ | 14816 | 3621 | 4013 | 4119 |  |  |  |  |
| 367 fit | 379 | 916 | (11 |  | frequently ${ }_{[1]}$ | 2072 | 4123 | 446 | 456 | goals [1] 12822 |  |  |  |
| fit 111 | 19813 |  | ${ }_{5}{ }^{\text {get }}$ [5] |  | friend $[1]$ | 86 | 4716 | 482 | 569 | God [4] 140 | 10 |  |  |
| five 151 | 719 | 721 | ${ }_{215}^{815}{ }^{141}$ | 204 | frend (1] | 86 | 604 | 637 | 6521 | 14011144 |  |  |  |
| 2719 | 5317 | 5721 |  |  | friends [2] | 593 | 662 | 664 | 6615 | God-fcaring [1] | 14012 |  |  |

CondenseIt
Godshall - handle


| CondenseIt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | handlcd - improve |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 579591 | 6017 | 147241486 | 1556 | 175917510 | 22324 | host [2] $3216 \quad 1304$ | identity ${ }^{\text {[1] }}$ | 448 |
| 6227023 | 735 | 16621664 | 1878 | hit [4] 20417 | 22111 | hour [4] 578 [ 578 | idcological [1] | 32 |
| 1785 |  | 188181898 | 24825 | 2212222123 |  | 1991920025 | orance [1] | 2338 |
| handled ${ }^{51}$ | 6112 | 25042553 | 2563 | hobby [1] | 5913 | hours [1]244 23 | gnoring | 24812 |
| 81208621 | 9123 | 25 |  | hold [8] 584 | 611 | house [32] 11 | 1llegal [14] | 179 |
| 17 |  | hearings [11] | 23 | $6610 \quad 6921$ | 811 | 21.22152 | $3424 \quad 459$ | 4516 |
| handout [1] | 1754 | $6115 \quad 6117$ | $6613$ | 81214723 | 2358 | $\begin{array}{llll}52 & 1016 & 144\end{array}$ | 7959510 | 11921 |
| hands [10] | 3516 | $\begin{array}{ll}7612 & 1169 \\ 15714 & 15725\end{array}$ | 14613 | holders [1] | 1339 | $\begin{array}{lll}158 & 2112 & 3019\end{array}$ | 13651677 | 20110 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}7919 & 1542\end{array}$ | 15511 | 16214 | 16212 | holding [2] | 208 | $\begin{array}{llll}7623 & 8217 & 8316\end{array}$ | 2011324322 | 25014 |
| 157719915 | 20616 | hearts [1] |  | $20621{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 208 | $\begin{array}{lllll}10911 & 11121 & 12019 \\ 12620 & 12711 & 127\end{array}$ | 25014 |  |
| 207823313 | 24722 | hearts [1] | 23414 | holes [1] 20416 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}12620 & 12711 & 12717\end{array}$ | illcgally ${ }_{[10]}$ | 3311 |
| happening [8] | 2511 | heavily [1] | 103 | holes [1] 20416 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}1293 & 13116 & 13217 \\ 14622 & 15210 & 16615\end{array}$ | $3412 \quad 3421$ | 424 |
| 837838 | 1415 | heck [3] 20212 | 22110 | holiday [2] | 4611 | $\begin{array}{llll}14622 & 15210 & 16615 \\ 21525 & 2216 & 222\end{array}$ | $4510 \quad 1016$ | 10815 |
| 1591421618 | 2195 | 22719 |  | 4614 |  | 21525 2216 2223 <br> 22418 22712 23110 | 1732518218 | 2141 |
| 24623 |  | heckled [1] | 2014 | holy [1] 23321 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 22418 \\ & 2566 \end{aligned}$ | illegally-ow |  |
| happy [5] | 10113 | heightened [1] | 13510 | homage [1] | 852 |  | 333334 |  |
| 10310 22211 | 18910 | held [11] 6817 | 699 | home [8] 3111 | 1106 | House' S [1] 1518 <br> hubcaps [2] 20313 | illness [1] | 1922 |
| ${ }^{22211}$ |  | 691712313 | 12316 | 1422119813 | 2042 | $\mathrm{20316}^{\text {hubcaps }}$ [2] 20313 | imagine [5] | 5615 |
| harassed [1] | 3822 | $12317 \quad 1249$ | 12412 | 204923922 | 24212 |  | 577599 | 6625 |
| harassment [1] | 21520 | 157251731 | 19913 | homes [5] | 4323 | $\begin{array}{cll}\text { human [5] } & 898 \\ 20718 & 20721 & 21219\end{array}$ | 2002 |  |
| hard [5] 2312 | 3125 | helmet [2] | 20415 | $\begin{aligned} & 441 \\ & 25116 \end{aligned} 901$ | 2257 | $24813$ | immediate [3] | 1711 |
| 91720815 | 22312 | 20416 |  | $25116$ |  | hundred [4] | 1361823516 |  |
| hardly [1] | 22614 | help [15] 1420 | 204 | homicide [13] | 613 4916 |    <br> 886 12313 13922 | immediately | 110 |
| harm[1] 10820 |  | $2024 \quad 2824$ | 296 | $\begin{array}{ll} 192 & 199 \\ 7916 & 8721 \end{array}$ | 4916 899 | hundreds [2] 711 | $9119 \quad 1031$ | 15014 |
| Harrisburg [8] | 258 | 629 995013 | 8424 | $\begin{array}{ll} 7916 & 8721 \\ 11217 & 13825 \end{array}$ | 13910 | $\left.\right\|_{7913} ^{\text {hundreds }[2]} 711$ | 1745 |  |
| 32713811 | 1483 | $\begin{array}{ll}995 & 10619 \\ 1925 & 22223\end{array}$ | 22223 | $13914 \quad 13917$ | 13918 | hunt [4] $2924 \quad 2924$ | 1mmigrant [1] | 1998 |
| 151251547 | 15411 | 25410 |  | homıcides [17] | 512 | 301316 | 1mmunity [11] | 12713 |
| 16013 |  | helpful [6] | 4719 | 514517 | 1521 | hunter [3] 317 | $12718 \quad 12722$ | 12724 |
| hat [2] 3818 | 474 | ${ }_{5617} 743$ | 1123 | 1982916 | 404 | 5942224 | 128412816 | 12817 |
| Hatch [1] | 12719 | 188132564 |  | 4015823 | 8319 | hunters [3] 2923 | 1281812822 | 1295 |
| hate [2] 5420 | 1793 | helping [1] | 2321 | $\begin{array}{ll}969 & 9612 \\ 13912 & 13925\end{array}$ | 1398 | 3016 7819  <br> 19   | 24918 |  |
| Hawaii [1] | 8318 | helps [4] 8524 | 10618 | 13912 2533 | 1407 | hunting [8] 2813 | impact [4] $982 \quad 14123$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7817 \end{aligned}$ |
| hawk [1] 4315 |  | 23872387 |  | HON [12] | 113 | $\begin{array}{llll}2814 & 303 & 303\end{array}$ | impartial [1] | 2469 |
| Hawkins [1] | 798 | hemiplegic | 909 | $\begin{array}{cc}113 & 114\end{array}$ | 114 | 305 14220 | impede [1] |  |
| head [7] 1517 | 2021 | herded [2] | 2354 | $115 \quad 115$ | 116 | hu | impedime |  |
| 42131119 | 15919 | 23520 |  | $116 \quad 117$ | 118 | hu |  |  |
| $19918 \quad 20417$ |  | hereby [1] | 2571 | $119 \quad 119$ |  | hurdles [1] 703 | impediment |  |
| hcaded [1] | 1938 | hersclf [1] | 1715 | honest [3] | 1592 | hurt [5] 14210227 |  |  |
| headlines [1] | 1152 | hey [5] 1011 | 116 | 15941591 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}3122 & 15513 & 23517\end{array}$ | implement [2] | 719 |
| health ${ }_{\text {\|7 }}$ | 16817 | 311 6514 | 1153 | honestly [1] | 16021 | husbands [1] 832 |  |  |
| $16820 \quad 17314$ | 17511 | hid [1] 23515 |  | Honorable [5] | 25 | Hygiene [1] 2494 | implementati $1302 \quad 15120$ |  |
| 190319011 | 2494 | hidden [2] | 448 | 4837124 | 12424 | hypothetical [3] 1795 |  |  |
| hear [10] 1025 | 146 | $2439{ }^{\text {[2] }}$ | 448 | homored |  | $18020 \quad 18121$ | implemented [2] $130 \quad 13 \quad 150 \quad 10$ |  |
| $3010 \quad 3218$ | 6011 | hide [2] 2476 | 24712 | honored [1] | 10721 | hysteria [5] 20124 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}6823 & 8411 \\ 16116 & 23310\end{array}$ | 1599 | Higgins [1] | 247121 | $\operatorname{Hood}^{\text {[3] }} 892$ | 895 | $\begin{array}{llll}21311 & 2304 & 23117\end{array}$ | implies [1] | 2112 |
| $16116 \quad 23310$ heard [35] |  | high [7] 511 | 512 | 8918 |  | 23120 | 1mportance [1] | \% |
| $6420 \quad 6421$ | 652 | $9117 \quad 1407$ | 19118 | hope [12] 326 | 567 | hysterical [1] 21314 | $1223 \quad 15$ |  |
| 93219421 | 967 | 25552556 |  | $688 \quad 8614$ | 13125 | i.e [1] 538 | 7298511 | 8524 |
| 9699721 | 9723 | high-reward [1] | 885 | $19423 \quad 20017$ | 22325 | IANNANTUONO [3] | 865936 | 988 |
| $9825 \quad 13212$ | 13213 | high-risk [1] | 885 | 254 |  | $\begin{array}{llllll}22513 & 22613 & 22814\end{array}$ | 1272513317 | 1438 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}13214 & 13215\end{array}$ | 13318 | higher [4] | 423 |  | 8820 | idea [8] $1017 \quad 345$ | 1911322922 | 2508 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}1375 & 14223 \\ 15812 & 159\end{array}$ | 1586 | $\underset{1532519118}{\text { higher [4] }}$ | 25413 |  | 8820 1123 | $\begin{array}{llll}4317 & 4414 & 4415 \\ 7011 & 7011 & 782\end{array}$ | importantly [1] | 15622 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}15812 & 15922 \\ 1667 & 18625\end{array}$ | 16319 19214 |  | 25413 422 | hopefully [2] 681 | 1123 | $\begin{array}{llll}7011 & 7011 & 782 \\ \text { ideas } & \end{array}$ | impose [4] | 3724 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}1667 & 18625 \\ 19322 & 20011\end{array}$ | 19214 | $\underset{1522 \quad 1620}{ }$ | 422 192 |  |  | ideas [4] $10716 \quad 10724$ | 5313548 | 10711 |
| 1932220011 | 20013 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1022 & 1020 \\ 615 & 8721 \end{array}$ | 192 | hoping [3] | 9024 | 244225412 | imposed [2] | 5320 |
| $20816 \quad 22923$ | 23011 | 615 ${ }^{87} 21$ |  | $4 \quad 1637$ |  | identification [4] | ${ }_{105}{ }^{2}$ | 532 |
| 2368 24524 | 23917 | highlight [2] | 1528 | Hopkins [1] | 2493 | $\begin{array}{llll}1714 & 1717 & 5215\end{array}$ |  |  |
| hearing [39] | 12 | highway [2] | 20022 | horrendous [2] | 5815 | 17116 | impossiblc |  |
| 4112014 | 5020 | 2011 |  |  |  | Identificatıons [1] | 1018427 | 747 |
| $5224 \quad 608$ | 6017 | himself ${ }_{[2]}$ | 1991 | horrendously [1] |  | 16521 | 78117924 | 14816 |
| 6322657 | 6511 | 23524 |  |  |  | identified [5] 4215 | 234132549 |  |
| 6518665 | 668 | hindrance | 23815 | horror [1] | 6823 | $\begin{array}{lll}1258 & 1671 & 1742\end{array}$ | impractical [1] | 9215 |
| 67246913 | 6916 |  | 23815 | hospital [4] | 13922 | 1748 |  |  |
| 6919709 | 7414 | historically [1] | 14814 | 156325125 | 25220 | identifies [1] 171 20 | impression [2] | 16 |
| $7423 \quad 7425$ | 11012 | history [7] ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 5915 | hospitals [1] | 908 | identify [1] 108 |  |  |
| $12421 \quad 14019$ | 14718 | 1681516819 | 1758 |  |  |  | improve [1] | 1321 |




| 820 | 21221 | 21624 | rtarians [1] | 20717 | lists [1] 18722 |  | 692285 | 141 | 187 | 18810 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2173 | 21816 | 2214 | liberties [1] | 2081 | Lita [2] 114 | 219 | 1411414323 | 14520 | m | [10] | 2923 |
| 23811 | 23811 | 24916 | library [1] | 14021 | literally [2] | 624 | 1561 |  | 3311 | 13324 | 13418 |
| legislat | Ons [1] | 14424 | license 113 | 14021 | 1914 4 | 624 | looking [15] | 513 | 1356 | 13612 | 13723 |
| legislat | ive [16] | 1525 | Hicense 1131 | 1676 | litigatıon | 153 | $5115 \quad 542$ | 6024 | 1482 | 16120 | 1798 |
| 6425 | 999 | 10414 | $16710 \quad 16713$ | 16715 | $22818 \quad 22917$ |  | 625676 | 7925 | make |  | 275 |
| 10618 | 1073 | 11225 | $167 \quad 20 \quad 16812$ | 17623 |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}814 & 14020 \\ 16420 & 1654\end{array}$ | 1415 | 3217 | 3217 | 3710 |
| 12425 | 1252 | 13419 | 17781779 | 24511 | live 51905 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}16420 & 1654 \\ 2483 & 25015\end{array}$ | 24413 | 6916 | 1953 | 2056 |
| 1403 | 14814 | 1495 | licensed [7] | 7621 | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { live[5] } & 905 \\ 198 & 15 \\ 239\end{array}$ | 15514 23915 | 248325015 |  | mak |  | 1493 |
| 16216 | 16523 | 20518 | $12522 \quad 1681$ | 1693 |  |  | looks [2] 696 | 16510 | male |  | 2208 |
| lcgislatively [1] 9022 |  |  | 17021 17111 | 2428 | lives [3] 852413414 |  | loopholes [1] | $167$ | man [13] 1517 |  | 2021 |
| legislator [6] |  | 1423 | licensing [2] | 16719 | living [1] | 1093 | loose [2] 11922 | $1979$ | 435 | 7916 | 7918 |
| 2823 | 3210 | 3216 |  |  |  |  | Los [1] 2231 |  | 7925 | 1997 | 20215 |
| 1403 | 16315 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { lies [1] } & 43 \\ \text { Licutenant } & \\ {[1]} & 4810\end{array}$ |  | lo [1] 2039 |  | lose [6] 7210 | 8010 | 2033 | 2038 | 2047 |
| legislators [9] |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5622 \\ & 1084 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | load [1] 6711 |  | $924 \quad 2088$ | 20811 | 2041 | 25019 |  |
| 10712 | 10717 |  | life [10] 312 | $10816$ | loaded [2] | 15524 | 2107 |  | man | cn | 818 |
| 1409 16013 | 14110 19022 | 14122 | $\begin{array}{rrr}\text { life[10] } & 312 \\ 19912 & 2004\end{array}$ | 10816 2058 | 1677 |  | losing [1] | 2178 | ma | [2] | 2359 |
| legislature [46] |  |  | $21212 \quad 21218$ | 2135 | lobbied [1] | 3125 | loss [1] 10816 |  | 236 |  |  |
| 710 | 87 | 1419 | $25115 \quad 25513$ |  | lobby [1] | 2212 | $\begin{array}{\|rll} \operatorname{lost}_{[4]} & 1872 \\ 217 & 19 & 21724 \end{array}$ | 2004 | mandate [3] |  | 1273 |
| 2011 | 2212 | 234 | lifelong [1] 20722 |  | lobbying [2] $^{[10}$ | 2120 |  |  | 152 | 152 |  |
| 2623 | 2822 | 375 | lifted [1] 20424 |  | $1472$ |  | lots [2] 598 | 8525 | mand | ed ${ }^{11}$ | 6021 |
| 3722 | 625 | 1006 | light [6] 67 | 620 | local [23] | 1919 | Lott [1] 127 |  | mand | cs [2] | 12712 |
| 11525 | 13112 | 1332 | $624 \quad 6022$ | 6922 | 853869 | 994 | love [1] 78 |  | 1962 |  |  |
| 1479 | 14716 | 1483 | 1481 |  | 1031810421 | 1132 | loved [4] 49 |  | mand | ng [2] | 12813 |
| 1507 | 1509 | 15013 | lightens [1] | 67 | $12018 \quad 1225$ | 12316 | oved [4] |  | 1536 |  |  |
| 15118 | 15124 | 1522 | likelihood | 1097 | 13341335 | 13315 | 11424 |  | mand | ory [53] | 718 |
| 15215 | 15217 | 15218 | likelihood [1] | 1097 | $1363 \quad 14719$ | 1508 | low [5] 9117 | 21717 | 720 | 1116 | 274 |
| 1548 | 15412 | 15417 | likely [7] | 1422 | $15015 \quad 15810$ | 15822 | 2172321725 | 24724 | 278 | 2713 | 2715 |
| 15423 | 15425 | 1554 | 152153 | 329 | $17321 \quad 17413$ | 23619 | lowest [1] | 198 | 2719 | 2725 | 3115 |
| 1559 | 15613 | 15615 | 8720888 | 20811 | 24120 |  | Luckily [1] | 687 | 3115 | 3116 | 3118 |
| 15710 | 15717 | 16317 | limit [7] 1216 | 12116 | locally [1] | 24114 |  | 1564 | 3119 | 3121 | 368 |
| 17524 | 1969 | 20016 | 13721374 | 20024 | located [1] | 1721 |  |  | 3611 | 372 | 3717 |
| legitım | 2191 |  | 24342434 |  | location [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 12214 \\ & 15512 \end{aligned}$ | - 20118 |  | 3720 | 3722 | 3815 |
| legitımate [12] |  | 16 | limitation [1] | 1053 |  |  | lug [2] 20118 | 20121 | 3819 | 391 | 3911 |
| 1617 4624 | 225 | 225 | limited [6] | $\begin{aligned} & 1613 \\ & 12722 \end{aligned}$ | lock [3] 152 |  | lump [1] 4021 |  | 4316 | 5922 | 6212 |
| 4624 10519 | 4713 | 10525 | $\begin{array}{ll} 514 & 5810 \\ 1284 & 1295 \end{array}$ |  | locked ${ }_{[3]}$ | 50 | Luzern [1] | 20223 | 6224 | 631 | 7215 |
| 1056 | 14412 |  |  |  |  |  | Lynne [6] | $\begin{aligned} & 318 \\ & 9422 \end{aligned}$ | 7217 | 7223 | 7225 |
| Lehigh [13] |  | 18825 | limiting [ 7 ] | 1415 | locker ${ }^{11}$ |  | 712594 |  | 872 | 9914 |  |
| $\begin{array}{cccc}1906 & 19012 & 19017\end{array}$ |  |  | 1425 13524 <br> 1431 19217 | $\begin{aligned} & 13525 \\ & 1935 \end{aligned}$ | lockers [2] | 24310 | 9917 101 | 9312 | 11125 | 1163 | 12621 |
| 19019 | 1919 | 19713 |  |  | lockers [2] |  | Lynne's [1] |  | 14924 | 1529 | 15323 |
| 19724 | 1999 | 19910 | 1431 19217 1935 <br> limits [2] 9322  |  |  |  | M1 [1] 649 |  | 15625 | 1987 | 21819 |
| 21817 | 2539 | 25313 |  |  | locks [15] | 454 | Ma'am [1] | 19824 | $\begin{array}{llll}21825 & 21910 & 219 & 12\end{array}$ |  |  |
| length | length 11 | 7611 | Lincoln ${ }_{[2]}$ |  |  |  | MacDonald [1] | 11815 | 24714 |  |  |
| leniency 16$]$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 349 \\ & 3712 \end{aligned}$ | 14025 |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 12813 & 12815 \\ 1432 & 15213 \end{array}$ | 12714 | machin | 20420 | Manderino [23] |  | 60 |
| 3520 | 3522 |  | $\begin{array}{\|cc\|} \hline \text { line }[5] & 31 \\ 5019 & 587 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 496 \\ & 11212 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12817 \\ & 15216 \\ & 1531 \end{aligned}$ | machin | 20420 | 6056113 | 606 | 6014 |
| 3714 | 3924 |  |  |  | $15218 \quad 152$ |  | Macel |  |  | 6118 | 6122 |
| lenient [1] |  |  | lineage [1] | 1805 |  |  | 855 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6210 \\ & 1787 \end{aligned}$ | 6217 | $\begin{aligned} & 635 \\ & 17823 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{clll}\text { less [6] } & 131 & 14 \\ 153 & 12010 & 191 \\ 20917 & & \end{array}$ |  |  | lincs [3] 318 1026 |  |  |  |  |  | 17816 |  |
|  |  |  | long-winded [1] 2066 |  | Madam [1] magazine [1] | 11616 | 1796 18011 | 1803 |  | 1809 |  |
|  |  |  | link 111018 | 14312 |  | 18122 | 1826 | 18117 |  |  |
| lessor [1] 1142 |  |  |  |  | linked [1] | 926 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 3012 & 7610 \\ 11423 & 11518 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 814 \\ & 10010 \end{aligned}$ | magistrate [4] | 24524 | 1831 |  |  |
| lethal [5] |  | $\begin{aligned} & 10824 \\ & 10920 \end{aligned}$ | lion's [1] | 997 | 18724 | agistrate's [1] 24618 |  | manner [3] |  | 1517 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}10916 & 10919 \\ 1106 & \end{array}$ |  |  | liquor [1] | 20022 | 2482 |  |  | 1959 | 20715 |  |  |
|  |  | list [6] 764 <br> 7613 20919 <br> 2427  | $\begin{aligned} & 768 \\ & 2146 \end{aligned}$ | look [41] 613 | 3015 |  |  | maimed [1] | 4322 | Mansion[1] 15417 |  |  |
| letter [1] 9111 |  |  |  | 326387 | 4912 | maintain [2] $\quad 16920$ |  | $\lim _{398}$ |  |  |  |
| lettıng[1] 3419 |  |  |  | $5825923 \quad 6022$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| level [15] |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 564 \\ & 626 \\ & 1005 \\ & 13421 \\ & 1541 \end{aligned}$ | 2427listed141 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}791 & 8118 & 82 \\ 8520 & 9010 & 91\end{array}$ |  | 1708 |  | manufacturer [1] |  |  |
| 565 | 6024 |  |  | 511920912 | $\begin{aligned} & 5115 \\ & 20921 \end{aligned}$ | 10822114 |  | maintained [1] 1771 |  | 1955 |  |  |
| 6924 | 971 | listen [4] |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1153 \\ & 24720 \end{aligned}$ | MAITLAND [1]$114$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1167 | 12612 | 1891118915 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}1411 \\ 1410 & 14123 & 14213\end{array}$ |  | 2123 | 2221 | 2423 |
| 1371 | 13718 | $\begin{array}{ccc}\text { listened } \\ 8316 & 1899 & 8315\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{lll}14214 & 14222\end{array}$ | 1445 | major [21] | 7717 | 848 | 1023 | 10215 |  |
| 15924 | 1772 |  |  |  | 146215124 | 15425 | $7817 \quad 792$ | 12921 | 1435 | 14421 | 15221 |
| luability [7] |  | $\begin{aligned} & 14719 \\ & 10812 \\ & 12713 \\ & 2296 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} 8316 \quad 1899 \\ \text { listening }[1] \end{array}\right.$ | 19720 | 165518425 | 18519 | 1431314321 | 15025 | 1534 | 15311 | 15313 |
|  |  | listing [5] <br> $5118 \quad 5211$ <br> 1754 | $\begin{aligned} & 5117 \\ & 15110 \end{aligned}$ | 19722021 | 20322 | $16519 \quad 16610$ | 16612 | 1615 | 20023 | 2249 |  |
| 10819 | 1108 |  |  | 20422161 | 21710 | $17421 \quad 17512$ | 17514 | 22410 | 2259 | 22512 |  |
| 12722 | 2017 |  |  | 2202122216 | 2445 | 175211784 | 17916 | 22614 | 22819 |  |  |
| liberal |  |  |  | 291 | looked [8] | 641 | 184161863 | 18610 |  |  |  |



Condenselt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ motion - offense




| plea [4] | 537 | 19717 | $\begin{array}{lll}16614 & 1687\end{array}$ | 16814 | 1801620718 | 20823 | $6411 \quad 714$ | 8516 | probation [10] | 538 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2048 | 2197 |  | $17017 \quad 17023$ | 17221 | 2082420923 | 2106 | $9622 \quad 10015$ | 1254 | $768 \quad 7612$ | 875 |
| plea-barganning [1] |  |  | $1737 \quad 17315$ | 17321 | 210921412 | 24613 | $14025 \quad 14625$ | 23624 | 88119025 | 11522 |
| 19716 |  |  | 17411 19815 17713 | 17724 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{cc} \operatorname{possible}_{[3]} \\ 19224 \quad 2198 \end{array}\right.$ | 1509 | Presidential [1] | 15924 | 117911713 | 11924 |
| plead [3] 212 |  | 2119 | 1981519817 | 19920 |  |  | pressed [1] | 2125 | problem [78] |  |
| 14213 |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}2027 & 2028 \\ 20219 & 20222\end{array}$ | 20314 | $\mid \operatorname{possibly}_{794}{ }^{[3]}$ | 6423 |  | 7424 | 63617 |  |
| pleadı | [1] | 14122 | $20315 \begin{array}{ll}20317\end{array}$ | 21018 |  |  | pretrial [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 7610 \\ & 199 \end{aligned}$ | 2323 | $\begin{aligned} & 96 \\ & 2322 \end{aligned}$ |
| plcas [17] |  | 541 | $21415 \quad 21422$ | 21424 | postal ${ }_{[1]} \quad 23511$ |  | pretty [9] |  | $\begin{array}{lll}2323 & 2325 \\ 3023 & 3711\end{array}$ | $292$ |
| 5410 | 5519 | 6015 | $22023 \quad 22223$ | 22224 | potential [4] | 8713 | 531256 | 566 | $38!93916$ | 3920 |
| 612 | 644 | 6421 | 222242232 | 2239 | 892115323 | 2159 | $6518 \quad 6815$ | 10613 | $3922 \quad 3924$ | 3925 |
| 652 | 6619 | 6624 | 223152278 | 2279 | powder [1] | 2026 | 22522302 |  | 403405 | 4310 |
| 6716 | 7411 | 759 | 22842288 | 2289 | Power [2] | 14118 | prevail [1] | 13513 | 43115425 | 5425 |
| 766 | 769 | 9314 | 23332361 | 23615 | 17423 [2] |  |  | 2421 | 6111 | $\begin{aligned} & 6819 \\ & 8117 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11515 |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}23721 & 2436 \\ 2438 & 24310\end{array}$ | 2437 |  |  | prevent 7810 173 13685 |  | 71158116 |  |
| pleasu |  | 727 | $\begin{array}{ll}2438 & 24310 \\ 2452 & 2454\end{array}$ | 2449 2479 | powers [1] | 2424 | 1368 15 | 24722 | $8117 \quad 10417$ | 1061 |
| plenty [1] 9018 |  | 9018 | $\begin{array}{llll}2452 & 2454 & 2479 \\ 2489 & & \end{array}$ |  | powers [1] practical [2] |  | preventative [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 24722 \\ & 8825 \end{aligned}$ | 1062211324 | 13323 |
| Plesco [27] |  | 16522 | policeman [4] | 20321 | P14715 | 92 | preventative $[1] 8825$ <br> prevented ${ }_{[2]} 19116$ |  | 14216 | 14221 |
| 16610 | 17418 | 17815 |  | 2332 |  | 747 | 19513 [ 13 (1) |  | $\begin{array}{lll}14225 & 1489 \\ 16211 & 1622\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14812 \\ & 16223 \end{aligned}$ |
| 17821 1808 | 1793 18010 | 17910 18014 | $22314 \quad 22315$ | 1279 | P79 24 |  | prevention [5] | 4 | 1649 | 1651 |
| 1818 | 18114 | 1822 | $1314 \quad 13114$ | 25012 | practice [1] | 5613 | $8716 \quad 13225 \quad 13325$ |  | 18923189 | 1908 |
| 18216 | 18221 | 1837 | policy [10] | 381 | $\underset{24921}{\text { practices [2] }} 1318$ |  |  |  | 19021 | 19211 |
| 18312 | 18316 | 18319 | 38139621 | 9624 |  |  | previous [3] |  | 19211 | 19214 |
| 1845 | 1848 | 18612 | 1001310225 | 10423 | practicing [1] | 126 | 187819411 |  |  |  |
| 1878 | 18714 | 18721 | 105415811 | 16523 | praise [1] praised [1] | 2098 | previously [5] | 7751905 | $22722 \quad 23017$ | 23110 |
| 1885 | 18810 |  | political [10] | 2422 |  |  | 941811920 |  | $2335 \quad 2348$ | 24110 |
| plows [1] 2488 |  |  | 75251023 | 15422 |  |  | prima [3] |  | $24813 \quad 24813$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2518 \\ & 25316 \end{aligned}$ |
| plus [3] | 207 | 67 | $2085 \quad 20914$ | 21222 | prank [2] 21216 |  |  |  | $2536 \quad 2538$ |  |
| 8619 |  |  | 12242138 |  |  |  | 6921742 |  | 254425419 |  |
| pneum |  | 1422 | politically [1] politicians [2] | 1941 | pray [2] 23714precinct [1] | 23919 | primarily [2] |  | problematic [2] 10412 |  |
| 1428 |  |  |  | 72 |  | precinct [1] 22310 | $25121$ |  | 10412 |  |
| pocket |  | 1615 | $1603$ |  | preclude [1] <br> precluded [1] | 1302 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12918 \\ & 22620 \end{aligned}$ | problems [37] | 93 |
| 8013 | 2452 |  | poll ${ }_{\text {[8] }} 1411$ | 1412 |  | 14925 | $17415 \quad 22618$ |  | 11171125 | 204 |
| pocket |  | 1621 | $\begin{array}{ll} 235 & 326 \\ 15617 & 15617 \end{array}$ | 15617 | predatory [1] | 20911 | prime [1] 21 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}2825 & 298 & 382\end{array}$ |  |
| point |  | 521 |  | 1934 | preempt [1] <br> preempted [1] | 1539 | print [1] 12218 |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 4813 & 544 & 5416 \\ 5418 & 5614 & 656 \end{array}$ |  |
| 522 | 1824 | 457 | polled [1] | 19223 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 15015 \\ & 1043 \end{aligned}$ | printed [1] ${ }_{\text {prioritızed }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2427 \\ & 1349 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}6616 & 6712 & 6718\end{array}$ |  |
| 10325 | 13422 | 1591 | polling [1] | 10 | Preemption [1] |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}686 & 692 & 7014\end{array}$ |  |
| 17423 | 18624 | 20611 | polls [4] 32 I |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 1043 \\ 12433 \end{array}$ | $\underset{1739}{\text { prioritızed }_{[2]}} 1349$ |  |  |  |  |
| 21019 21413 | 21214 | 2137 21825 | 19311931 |  | preliminary [21] 5020 |  | priority [1] |  | 10614 |  |
| 22012 | 22019 | 22020 | poor [2] 18911 | $\begin{aligned} & 2445 \\ & 12922 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { priors [1] } \\ \text { priol } & 588\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{llll}14416 & 14517 & 148\end{array}$ |  |
| 22214 | 22311 | 22922 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { poorly [1] } & 12922 \\ \text { pop [1] 473 } & \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{llll}5114 & 6117 & 6322\end{array}$ |  | prison [45] | 815 | 15521562015620 |  |
| 2303 | 2359 | 2363 |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}657 & 6511 & 6518 \\ 665 & 668 & 6613\end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}816 & 1210 \\ 3119 & 368\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}1939 & 19418 & 213 \\ 22025 & 2308 & 253\end{array}$ |  |
| 23613 | 23918 | 2478 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1212 \\ & 876 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24915 | 2502 | 2503 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 19413 \\ & 23120 \end{aligned}$ |  | $6724$ |  | $\begin{array}{lll}8818 & 9115 & 9118 \\ 1179 & 11716 & 11718\end{array}$ |  | procedure [1] |  |
| pointed | [1] | 5922 | popular [6] <br> $2283 \quad 22915$ |  | 69197422 |  |  |  |  | Procedures [1] | 1735 |
| ${ }_{24914}^{\text {points }}$ [2] |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll} 240 \quad 12 \quad 247 \quad 19 \end{array}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}1182 & 11819 & 118\end{array}$ |  | proceed [8] | $\begin{aligned} & 211 \\ & 7217 \\ & 18816 \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  | population [2] | 815 | preosecutorial $^{[1]}$ |  | $\begin{array}{llll}11822 & 11823 & 119\end{array}$ |  | $3613 \quad 725$ |  |
| poison [1] |  |  |  |  |  |  | 119611916 | 1201 | 72231259 |  |
| police |  | 28 | porch [1] | 3821 | 393 |  | 12041205 | 1207 | 2373 |  |
| 516 | 913 | 1014 | portion [1] | 6125 | 1891218920 | 2064 | 120 |  | procecded [1] | 23521 |
| 126 | 138 | 1611 |  |  | 2061221414 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}12112 & 12119\end{array}$ | 12124 | proccedings [3] | 16217 |
| 1821 | 195 | 197 | position [6] $10017 \quad 1031$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10014 \\ & 13413 \end{aligned}$ | prescribed [1] | 1318 | $1224 \quad 12213$ | 12220 | 25712574 |  |
| 1910 | 211 | 224 | 100171031 |  | prescriptions |  | 122241231 | 1232 | process [12] | 5520 |
| 236 | 4111 | 4222 |  |  | 10618 |  | 123241243 | 1246 | 672707 | 7916 |
| 431 | 454 | 4818 | ons | 15714 | present [7] |  | 1241619620 |  | 791714615 | 16825 |
| 499 | 5016 | 5123 | positive [1] | 15714 | 12023 18015 | 17818 | prisoners [7] | 12111 | 172817621 | 17623 |
| 5515 | 5720 | 6020 | possess [5] | 9125 | $\begin{array}{lll}12023 & 13815 \\ 1807 & 1899\end{array}$ | 17822 | prisoners [7] 12311 12316 | 12311 | 24692545 |  |
| 7812 | 7910 | 7912 | 154316918 | 17913 | presentation | 24822 1661 | $12324 \quad 12411$ | 12311 12417 | produce [ | 23.7 |
| 7913 | 7915 | 7919 | 2103 |  | presentation | 1661 | $12324 \quad 124$ | 1241 |  |  |
| 7921 | 7922 | 804 |  |  | 174241751 | 1762 | prisons [11] | 3117 | produced [3] | 312 |
| 807 | 8011 | 8023 | possessin | 1502 | $\begin{array}{lll}245 & 23 & 24818\end{array}$ |  | $3120 \quad 3414$ | 3415 | $2222 \quad 2316$ |  |
| 862 | 8714 | 8718 |  | 172 | presented [2] | 2120 | $365 \quad 6219$ | 6220 | producing [1] | 2017 |
| 8722 | 883 | 952 |  |  | 7710 |  | 901312019 | 12023 | product ${ }_{[10]}$ | 4010 |
| 9719 | 9823 | 1019 | possession [25] | 795 | presenting [4] | 18 | 12210 |  | 841849 | 12915 |
| 12521 | 12525 | 13021 | 8613871 | 897 | 1242218811 |  | private [2] | 16914 | 19531954 | 195 |
| 13214 | 1336 | 13319 | $8912 \quad 8913$ | 918 |  |  | 19120 |  | 19582016 | 22411 |
| 1351 | 1375 | 13911 | 9239217 | 956 | presently [1] | 230 | pro-gun [4] | 14824 | products [7] | 1026 |
| 1454 | 1545 | 1549 | 9599513 | 9519 | presents [1] | 2301 | 149115711 | 24716 | $1268 \quad 126$ | 1026 1274 |
| 1644 | 16522 | 16524 | 1091711811 | 12811 | President ${ }_{[10]}$ | 494 |  |  |  |  |


| 130515223 | 15225 | 97241098 | 18423 | publicly [1] | 1296 | $1198 \quad 13312$ | 144 | 2062322711 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| profession [1] | 1191 | 185124613 |  | pull [2] 4116 | 1879 | 1532119424 | 19710 | rate [7] 423 | 192 |
| proficiency [1] | 12612 | prosecuting [5] | 776 | pulled [5] | 102 | $\begin{array}{ll} 19915 & 2024 \\ 2129 & 21913 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20318 \\ & 21921 \end{aligned}$ | $199 \quad 13825$ | 19122 |
| profits [2] | 1621 | $8620 \quad 18618$ | 19625 | 4213156 | 1905 | $\begin{array}{lll}2129 & 23013 & 23015\end{array}$ | 23522 | $217 \quad 17 \quad 21725$ |  |
| 1622 |  | 15 |  | 2365 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}23013 & 23015 \\ 2411 & 24415\end{array}$ | 23522 | rates [5] 40 | 19118 |
| program [15] | 1213 | prosecutio | 11 | pulls [1] 6720 |  | puts [1] 5812 |  | 2462524625 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}1215 & 1216\end{array}$ | 2618 |  | 128 | nısh [1] | 2509 |  |  | rather [4] | 84 |
| $8615 \quad 8712$ | 8713 | 13231132 | 128 | punished [1] | 20714 | 7047524 | $11913$ | 11922132 | 13218 |
| 881989 | 892 |  |  | punishment [1] | 13224 | QAYYUM ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ |  | rattle [1] 2158 |  |
| 891596 | 9723 | prosecutions [2] |  | purchase [30] | 1612 | QAYYUM [1] | 13812 | reach [6] 4419 | 8013 |
| 1111311116 |  | $964 \quad 24615$ |  | purchase ${ }^{\text {30] }} 1614$ | 1612 | quadriplegic | 909 | 108221410 | 21715 |
| programmed | 008 | prosecutor [8] | 3718 | $\begin{aligned} & 1614 \\ & 1712 \end{aligned}$ | 178 339 | quadrupling | 417 | 21924 |  |
| programs [7] | 44 | $\begin{array}{ll}397 & 558 \\ 6511 & 683\end{array}$ | 657 19723 | $\begin{array}{ll}1713 & 183 \\ 413\end{array}$ | 4425 | qualified [1] | 9814 | reached [2] | 1371 |
| 8538891 | 11116 | 2196 | 23 | $12712 \quad 13712$ | 17025 | qualify [1] | 18320 | 14910 |  |
| $13115 \quad 14920$ | 24725 | 2196 |  | 1751617520 | 1778 | quality [3] | 15214 | reaching [1] | 4418 |
| prohibit ${ }^{\text {[1] }}$ | 1614 |  |  | 17791788 | 1804 | $15216 \quad 15324$ |  | reaction [1] | 11225 |
| prohibited [15] | 1625 | prosecuto $\text { : } 3913 \text { 92 }$ |  | 18051824 | 18413 | quality/safe |  | read [1] 182 |  |
| 1831334 | 1335 | 13 |  | 185518514 | 18516 | qualit |  |  | 61 |
| 16711675 | 16723 | prosecutors [6] | 1919 | $19312 \quad 20214$ | 23013 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ead1 } \\ & \hline 077 \end{aligned}$ | 61 |
| 1712117125 | 1724 | 394543 | 5811 | $24017 \quad 25211$ |  | quarter [2] | 1896 |  |  |
| $17218 \quad 18617$ | 20922 | $5825 \quad 6515$ |  | purchased [11] | 910 |  |  | reading [6] | 6020 |
| 2411124521 |  | protect [8] | 439 | $1320 \quad 3321$ | 834 | questio | 207 | 695111 | 14 |
| prohibiting [3] | 17311 | $8113 \quad 1289$ | 1314 | $12618 \quad 17912$ | 17914 | 211 |  | $14310 \quad 17123$ |  |
| $17314 \quad 18723$ |  | $\begin{array}{lll}13115 & 13517\end{array}$ | 14016 | $17917 \quad 1814$ | 19912 | questioning [1] | 2149 | ready [11] | 211 |
| prohibition [2] | 195 | 23912 |  | 22812 |  | questions [12] | 216 | 312048 | 6623 |
| 21220 |  | protecting | 2214 | purchaser [6] | 99 | 361568 | 5610 | 7257413 | 8222 |
| project ${ }_{16]}$ | 8724 | 13523 |  | 115116 | 1617 | 932210113 | 11018 | 125918816 | 2374 |
| 8868824 | 985 | protection [12] | 82 | 1781117813 |  | 118161336 | 1785 | 2499 |  |
| 986981 |  | 13091311 | 13118 | purchasers [10] | 1225 | 240112561 |  | real [22] 203 | 5919 |
| projected ${ }_{[1]}$ |  | 1312216816 | 16820 | 133135 | 1313 | quick [4] | 2119 | $7412 \quad 7416$ | 7821 |
| projected [1] |  | $17312 \quad 17511$ | 22025 | 13161613 | 1623 | 105223723 | 24621 | 7824904 | 905 |
| projects [1] | 11224 | protections [1] 13121 |  | 101314918 | 25016 |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}11318 & 13810\end{array}$ | 13811 |
| prolifcration [2] |  |  |  | purchases [27] 1311 |  | 2216243 | 788 | 144416015 | 19211 |
| 29212559 |  | Protective [1]provable $[1]$ | 23625 | 13141415 | 1425 | $\begin{array}{llll}1038 & 2101 & 22617\end{array}$ |  | $10 \quad 22314$ | 12 |
| prolong [1] 161 |  |  | 97 | $1625 \quad 179$ | 3013 | quite [8] 1616 | $\begin{aligned} & 682 \\ & 2147 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 2445 & 24621 \\ 2485 & 24812 \end{array}$ | 24719 |
| prominent [1] | 12718 | provable [1] |  | 4022412 | 4114 | 18417 19911 2147 <br> 21914 2224 23619 |  |  |  |
| promised [1] | 22319 | prove [6] |  | 411745 | 10020 |  |  |  | realities [1] | 1561215415 |
| promote [2] | 917 | $7714 \quad 9216$ |  | $\begin{array}{lll}12621 & 136 \\ 14915 & 155\end{array}$ | 1373 | quiz[1] 472 |  | ${ }_{\text {reality [3] }}$ |  |
| 1362 |  | proven [2] | 712 | 1871418716 | 18716 | quizzes [1] | 473 | $\begin{gathered} \text { realize }_{[2]} \\ 1723 \end{gathered}$ | 17 |  |
| promoting [1] | 13518 |  |  | $192181935 \quad 201$ |  | quote [1] 20720 |  |  |  |  |
| promulgated | 698 | provide [8] | 10620 | $20110 \quad 20113$ |  | quoted [1] |  | realized ${ }_{[2]}$ | 18323 |  |
| proof 11751 |  | 1241512621 | 1271 | purchasing [5] | 4414 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| proper ${ }^{11]}$ | 14015 | $12721 \quad 16620 \quad 1732$ |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 13710 & 17812 \\ 1815 \end{array}$ | 17817 | race[1] 8010 |  | really [40] | 249 |  |
| properly [1] | 22612 | provided ${ }_{[10]}$ | 5514 | purport [1] |  | radical [4] $11413 \quad 1154$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11412 \\ & 1155 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 275 & 5424 \\ 558 & 5821 \end{array}$ | 5425 |  |
| property [2] | 16725 | $10514 \quad 12725$ | 1283 | purports [1] | 2078 |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 558 & 5821 \\ 7412 & 7419 \end{array}$ | 5923 8025 |  |
| 21010 |  | $12820 \quad 13010$ | 13125 | purports [1] | 2214 | radio [2] 7912 | 7921 | 8121 842 | 843 |  |
| proposal [15] | 9912 | $17116 \quad 21415$ | 2421 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2214 \\ & 1166 \end{aligned}$ | raise [5] 2624 | 977 | $8524 \quad 878$ | 932 |  |
| 107112213 | 12219 | provides [4] | 1712 | 1661916925 | $\begin{aligned} & 1703 \\ & 22618 \end{aligned}$ | 9991066 | 2201 | $977 \quad 9725$ | 9922 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}12814 & 12818\end{array}$ | 13114 | 127131682 | 1684 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1705 & 18014 \\ 22620 & 23823 \end{array}$ |  | raised [6] | 7212 | $10118 \quad 10410$ | 1053 |  |
| 13721495 | 1499 | providing [2] | 12512 |  |  | 7741062 | 11920 | $1128 \quad 11310$ | 14020 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}2095 & 2099 \\ 23012 & 23012\end{array}$ | 2245 | $17324$ |  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & 226 \\ & 11423 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll}1468 \\ \text { aises [1] } & 2412 & \\ \text { cas }\end{array}$ |  | 1412314615 | 1582 |  |
| $23012 \quad 23012$ |  |  | 112 |  |  |  |  |  | 158818514 |  |
| proposals [7] | 999 | proving [1] provision [S] |  |  | 1865 | raising [3] |  | 195619521 |  | 2069 |
| 100413515 | 15322 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 12715 \\ & 22215 \end{aligned}$ | pursue [2] |  |  |  | $20710 \quad 21419$ | 21516 |  |
| 158115824 | 19215 | $\begin{array}{lll} 12718 & 19424 \\ 24515 & \end{array}$ |  | push [1] 13521 |  | Rally 21382 |  | 2221922521 | 24814 |  |
| propose [1] | 1493 |  | 9915 | push [1] 13521 |  | Rally [2] 1382rampart [1] | $\begin{aligned} & 13820 \\ & 2233 \end{aligned}$ | rcason [26] | 823434 |  |
| proposed [5] | 14724 | provisions [3] <br> 151 $15 \quad 2399$ |  |  |  | 2382622 |  |  |  |  |
| 151915319 | 1575 |  | 20623 | 1589 |  |  | ran [1] 23322 |  | 4474519 | 4610 |
| 22418 |  | psychotic [1] |  | pushing [1] | 1589 | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { random }_{[1]} & 1514 \\ \text { range }[4] 10724 & 1127 \end{array}$ |  | $4624 \quad 4713$ | 5368025 |  |
| proposition [1] | 165 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { public } \\ 5819 \\ {[11610} \end{gathered}\right.$ | 123 13512 | pussyfooting [1] |  |  |  | 7416 8610 ${ }^{74} 20$ |  |  |
| pros[1] 23712 |  |  | 13512 |  |  | $8610 \quad 989 \quad 11621$ |  |  |  |  |
| prosector [2] | 763 | $\begin{array}{llll}15725 & 16724 & 16725 \\ 2423 & 2444 & 2494 \\ 2579 & & \end{array}$ |  | put [34] $1716 \quad 2312$ |  |  |  | $2459 \quad 24514$ |  | $\begin{array}{llll}11714 & 12711 & 133 \\ 1521 & 16011\end{array}$ |  |
| 9924 |  |  |  |  |  | 2324343 | 359 | ranking [1] | 8722 | $\begin{array}{llll}19316 & 19625 & 2172 \\ 2204 & \end{array}$ | 2172 |
| prosccute [5] | 1920 | public/priva |  | $\begin{array}{llll}363 & 3818 & 4022 \\ 5220 & 6715 & 7021\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { ranking [1] } \\ \boldsymbol{r a p}_{[1]} & 14315\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 283392 | 9220 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 884 \\ \text { publicity }[1] & 23617 \end{array}\right.$ |  | $\begin{array}{lll}5220 & 6715 \\ 716 & 9412\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7021 \\ & 053 \end{aligned}$ | rapes [2] 11220 <br> rapist [3] | $\begin{aligned} & 1973 \\ & 7719 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reasonable [15] } \\ & 2012 \quad 3112 \\ & 359 \quad 461 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1022 \\ & 3211 \\ & 9218 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 19710 |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 716 & 9412 & 953 \\ 10814 & 11515 & 118 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| prosecuted [6] | 1925 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Condenselt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$
reasons - result


| 13 | 1310 | 1313 | $23825 \quad 23913$ | 23914 | 17819179 | 18418 | $22015 \quad 221$ | 24512 | $5420 \quad 2186$ | 23516 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66 | 8821 | 1035 | 2392424124 | 24325 | running [4] | 258 | scare [1] 22719 |  | 2431 |  |
| 224 | 13116 | 17320 | 255 |  | $17718 \quad 23313$ | 23611 |  | 2554 | seek [1] 19215 |  |
| 1748 | 2105 | 2178 | rightfully [1] |  | rural [6] 1417 | 328 | scaring [1] | 2274 | seem [4] 6514 | 1521 |
| 21718 | 23121 |  | rights [15] |  | 3281094 | 14317 |  | 2274 | 21112304 |  |
| resulted [2] 1175 |  | 1175 | 238307 | 3016 | 14322 |  | scene [1] 5017 |  | seize [1] 1823 |  |
| 23610 |  |  | $3017 \quad 12719$ | 13721 | rushing [3] 489 |  | scheduled [1] | 23519 | scize [1] | 1822 |
| results [7] |  | 312 | 1411819324 | 2076 | $4810 \quad 2196$ |  | scheduling [1] | 546 | 331 |  |
| 95 | 1218 | 1219 | $\begin{array}{llll}20817 & 2178 & 21724 \\ 21725 & 24 i 15\end{array}$ |  | Ryfryd [1] 1997 | 1997 | school [11] | 493 |  |  |
| 2620 | 2710 | 22416 |  |  | sad [3] 3217 |  | $8924 \quad 1285$ | 21010 | seizure [2] | 8021 |
| retired ${ }^{31}$ |  | 4818 | riot [1] 2088 |  | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { sad [3] } \\ 6714 & 3217\end{array}$ | 3217 | $\begin{array}{llll}23325 & 2341\end{array}$ | 2342 |  |  |
| 1999 | 242 |  | rısing [2] | 24624 | safe [7] 88 | 12910 | 2346 2556 | 2555 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sclect [4] } \\ & 15320 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14820 \\ & 24222 \end{aligned}$ |
| return [1] |  | 1669 | ${ }_{24625}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} \text { sate } \begin{array}{rl} \text { sat] } & 883 \\ 15515 & 190 \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $2152$ | 2556 |  | selection 11 | 24222 |
| return |  | 711 | risk [1] 977 |  | $22425 \quad 22914$ | 1368 | schools [4] 833 | 2812 8925 | Scle | 24020 |
| $2366$ |  |  | risking [1] 2102 |  | safeguards [1] |  | Science [1] <br> score [2] 9113 | 23423 | self-certification [1] |  |
| returning [1] |  |  | roads [1] 1193 |  | safely ${ }^{[3]}$ |  |  | 11817 | 17114 |  |
| reveale |  | 177 | rob [1] 117 |  | $22517 \quad 23915$ |  | scores | 9116 |  |  |
| reversals [2] |  |  | robber [10] | 7719 | ${ }_{22725}$ |  |  |  | 2267 |  |
|  |  |  | 1189199 | 19922 |  |  | 9117 |  | self-protection [1] |  |
| reversed [4] |  |  | 233192364 | 2367 | safety [56] | 12519 | scraggly [1] | 25313 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { serf-p } \\ 2391 \end{array}$ |  |
| 17717 | 1831 | 21512 | $2368 \quad 23610$ | 23611 | $125 \quad 23126$ | 12614 | Scranton [1] |  |  |  |
| review [7] |  | 899 | robberies [13] | 520 | 1261612617 | 12622 | screen [1] | 2318 | self-regulatory [1] <br> 2266 |  |
| 945 | 953 | 11118 | 520524 | 525 | 126241273 | 12712 | scruffy [1] | 2446 |  |  |
| 12516 | 18517 | 20814 | $619 \quad 2716$ | 2916 | 1271412813 | 12914 |  | 13511 | self-test [1] | 13016 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { revicwed } \\ & 21816 \end{aligned}$ |  | 9912 | $404 \quad 4015$ | 9613 | 1291612920 | 1302 |  | 1351 | sell [10] 823 | 9 |
|  |  |  | $11221 \quad 15517$ | 1973 | 130413012 | 13020 |  |  | 4120 4416 | 4512 |
| $\left.\right\|_{\text {revicwing [2] }} ^{14724}$ |  | 951 | robbers [3] | 23513 | 132101345 | 1347 | search [5] | 8020 | 776841 | 1015 |
|  |  |  | 23521236 |  | $\begin{array}{llll}13411 & 13420 \quad 13\end{array}$ |  | 8024812 | 11921 | $14317 \quad 1788$ |  |
| revisions [1] |  | 1493 | robbcry [7] | 341 | 13518 | 1362 | 2453 |  | seller [4] 1620 |  |
| revisited [1] |  | 7816 | 7916109 | 1201 | 15223 | 13617 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { searches } \\ 17210 \end{array}$ | 16814 | $7722 \quad 7725$ |  |
| Revolution [1] |  | 201 | 15521 | 21823 | 1741618923 |  |  |  | selling [10] | 42 |
|  |  | 201 | robbery-convicted [1] |  | 19023 | 19024 | season [3] | 2813 | 4221002 | 1673 |
| revolv | [ [1] | 24512 | 4216 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}1912 & 192 \\ 19416 & 224\end{array}$ | 19415 | $2814 \quad 30$ |  | 2002121325 | 2234 |
| rhyme |  | 7420 | robbing [1] | 2359 |  | 22420 | seat [2] 2125 | 1274 | $24320 \quad 24325$ | 25019 |
| Richmond [4] |  | 1215 | Roberts [3] | 245 | 22718227 | 22723 | seatbelt [1] | 1275 | $\begin{array}{\|ccc} \hline \text { sells [4] } & 42 & 12 \\ 7721 & 143 & 17 \end{array}$ | 4215 |
| 985 | 9812 | 21915 | $246 \quad 2513$ |  | 22811234 | 239 | Seattle [2] | 1415 |  |  |
| rid [3] | 21115 | 21120 | rock [1] 2158 |  | $243324721 \quad 247$ |  | 14115 12 |  | semiautomatic [3] |  |
| $24610$ |  |  | $\text { rocks [1] } 3822$ |  | Saint [1] 8910 |  | second [11] | 217 | 1482119521 | 202 |
| ridiculo | ous [3] | 19412 | rocks [1] 3822 | 1055 |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}715 & 1214\end{array}$ | 4522 | semiautomatics [1] |  |
| 2022 | 22510 |  |  |  | sale [15] 429 |  | $5211 \quad 914$ | 9110 | Senateria |  |
| rifle [12] 2419 |  | 253 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ronald [2] } \\ & 16522 \end{aligned}$ | 16519 | $\begin{array}{lll}16910 & 16912 \\ 1703 & 1712\end{array}$ | 16921 | $\begin{array}{llll}2368 \\ 24211 & 23610 & 24210\end{array}$ |  | Senate [16] | 717 |
| 1021 | 1497 | 15522 |  |  |  | 17113 |  |  | $\begin{array}{llll}2413 & 789 & 8411\end{array}$ |  |
| 19521 | 20012 | 20419 |  |  | $17118 \quad 17621$ | 18017 | Secondly [4] $13525 \quad 1857$ <br> section [15] | 433 |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}2059 & 2102 & 2102 \\ 24513\end{array}$ |  |  | room [12] | $\begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 5812 \\ & 11813 \\ & 14018 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}18224 & 1877 & 188 \\ 21321 & & \end{array}$ |  |  | 1916 | $\begin{array}{llll}12717 & 14910 & 14921\end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  | 5117 5120 <br> 1181 1186 <br> 11916 14012 |  |  |  | 821 | $\begin{array}{ll}1518 & 1539 \\ 1871\end{array}$ | 1611 |
| rifles [2] $1961 \quad 21719$ |  |  |  |  | sale/transfer [1] 17621 |  |  | $16711 \quad 1721$ | 2091 | 18719413 | 19424 |
| right [75] 615 |  | 1218 |  |  | sales [4] 1317 | 13715 | 209212092 | 2109 | Senator [9] | 820 |
| 202 | 203 | 236 | $\begin{array}{\|rr} 11916 & 14012 \\ 14020 & 2438 \\ \text { rooms rat } \end{array}$ | 6612 | samaritans [1] 1285 |  | 2101121023 | 21220 | 1020426 | 867 |
| 236 | 3520 | 4422 | rooms [3] 6612 |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 21320 & 2233 \\ 2459 & 24512 \end{array}$ | 24219 | $\begin{array}{llll} 943 & 16115 & 162 \\ 16312 & 20221 & \end{array}$ |  |
| 452 | 459 | 5214 | roots [1] 1472 |  |  |  | 1631220221 |  |  |
| 5320 | 549 | 5518 |  |  | San [1] 2298 |  |  | sections [ | 2148 | Senators [1] | 5014 |
| 575 | 5913 | 614 | ropes [1] 19] 25 |  | sanctions [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 548 \\ & 618 \end{aligned}$ | secure [1] | 3018 | $\begin{array}{\|cccc} \operatorname{send} & {[4]} & 23 & 108 \\ 118 & 12 & 222 & 13 \end{array}$ |  |
| 614 | 6110 | 6216 | rose [3] 58 1352 |  |  |  | See [43] 1722 | 1811 |  |  |
| 6315 | 6412 | 654 |  |  | $622$ |  | $2218 \quad 3712$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3714 \\ & 5411 \end{aligned}$ | sending [1] 645 <br> sends [3] 1120 |  |
| 6618 | 6719 | 6815 | rotate [1] | 304 | sat [5] |  | $3716 \quad 4913$ |  |  |  |
| 6 | 7015 8621 | 7019 922 | rough [2] 1110 |  | Saturday [2] | 478 | $5413 \quad 5514$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5411 \\ & 5515 \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{1122}{ }{ }^{\text {sends }}{ }^{3} 2320 \quad 1120$ |  |
| 10421 | 1065 | 10619 |  |  |  |  | $5714 \quad 8323$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8817 \\ & 904 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}1122 & 2320 & \\ \text { sensational }\end{array}$ |  |
| 12724 | 1374 | 13720 | $\underset{411}{\text { roughly }} \underset{17714}{ } 40$ |  | 8924 <br> save [7] $85 \quad 24 \quad 9017$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8818 \\ & 10018 \end{aligned}$ |  | sense [20] | 3023 |
| 13722 | 14420 | 14422 |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|clll} \hline \text { save }_{[7]} & 85 & 24 & 9017 \\ 11813 & 13414 & 18919 \end{array}$ |  | 10018 | $\begin{aligned} & 904 \\ & 10616 \end{aligned}$ | $3025 \quad 3711$ |  |
| 14612 | 1504 | 15310 | rounds [1] 2052 |  |  |  | 11019 | $1455$ | 10771096 | 1196 |
| 17522 | 17910 | 1826 | route [1] 23114 |  | $1993 \quad 22713$savings |  | $\begin{array}{llll}1974 & 19813 & 2021\end{array}$ |  | 13451347 | 13513 |
| 18216 | 18312 | 1853 |  |  | savings [1] 19912 |  | $2021{ }^{2} 2025$ | 2047 | 1351413520 | 13617 |
| 19916 | 20718 | 20718 | rule [s] 518 | 525 | Saw [3] 20313 | 23421 | $\begin{array}{ll}2021 \\ 2162 & 2163\end{array}$ | 21621 | 14121604 | 1604 |
| 20721 | 20724 | 2083 | $\begin{array}{lll}5222 & 7115\end{array}$ |  | 2426 |  | $22211 \begin{array}{ll}235 \\ 2165\end{array}$ | 216210 | 160516015 | 1968 |
| 20812 | 2107 | 21219 | rulcd [1] 2227 |  | Says [14] 1021 | 119 | 22211235 |  | 23010 |  |
| 21818 | 22125 | 22210 | rules [2] 34 11 | 13220 | $119 \quad 3724$ | 3810 | 2544 |  | sensible [1] | 817 |
| 23025 | 23212 | 23220 | run [8] 5015 | 809 | $4225 \quad 4517$ | 9924 |  |  |  |  |
| 23220 | 23222 | 23317 | $9317 \quad 10811$ | 17813 | $20113 \quad 20719$ | 21613 | seeing [5] | 52 | $555 \quad 9424$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3616 \\ & 15416 \end{aligned}$ |



| specd |  | 7511 | 118231192 | 1207 | stayed [1] | 18819 | Straw [6] 10019 | 1013 | $5217 \quad 2514$subsequently ${ }_{[2]}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7512 | 20024 |  | 1241512518 | 12521 | staying [2] | 11623 | 20182019 | 20113 |  |  |
| spen |  | 12124 | 1252412617 | 12625 | 2406 |  | 23013 |  | 185252088 |  |
| 228 |  |  | $\begin{array}{ll}1276 & 1278 \\ 1287 & 129\end{array}$ | 1284 | stays [2] 6222 | 631 | streamline ${ }_{[1]}$ | 6124 | substantial | 9925 |
| spen | 323 | 1562 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1287 \\ 1301 & 12911 \\ 1303 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12916 \\ & 13021 \end{aligned}$ | stems [1] | 14813 | streamlining | 16123 | 20216 |  |
| 240 |  |  | 13131321 | 1336 | $\boldsymbol{s t c p}[6] 202$ | 203 | street [16] | 17 | substantially |  |
| sp1rit | 24923 |  | 13391351 | 14017 | $2012 \quad 18321$ | 18324 | 1151321 | 3419 | 21016 |  |
| spiritu | $1{ }^{\text {[3] }}$ | 14015 | 1421014719 | 1507 | 23122 |  | 3634122 | 4123 | substantive | 21821 |
| 14414 | 14418 |  | 157221643 | 16521 | step-up [1] | 412 | $\begin{array}{ll} 7923 & 882 \\ 1154 & 1199 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 902 \\ & 24317 \end{aligned}$ | subtract ${ }_{[1]}$ | 1839 |
| spitc ${ }^{1}$ | 21725 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}16524 & 16614 \\ 16814 & 17017\end{array}$ | 1687 17022 | STEPHEN ${ }_{[1]}$ | 114 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1154 & 1199 \\ 24318 & 24320 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 24317 \\ & 24712 \end{aligned}$ | suburban [2] | 1417 |
| spoke |  | 881 | $\begin{array}{lll}16814 & 17017 \\ 17118 & 17221\end{array}$ | 17022 1737 | stepped-up [2] | 94 | street-thug [1] | 20621 | 15514 |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}17315 & 17321\end{array}$ | 17410 | 141 |  | streets [9] | 924 | suburbs [2] | 11022 |
| spoke | man [1] | 1475 | $17414 \quad 17619$ | 17620 | steps [2] 42 | 73 | $1619 \quad 2024$ | 4211 | 14322 |  |
| spon | [1] | 2113 | $\begin{array}{lll}17713 & 17724 \\ 1886 & 1895\end{array}$ | 18614 | stereotype [1] | 2167 | $4513 \quad 4914$ | 7315 | success [1] | 983 |
| spons | d [1] | 718 | $\begin{array}{lll}1886 & 1895 \\ 19617 & 197 & 15\end{array}$ | 1904 | stereotypes [1] | 20712 | $16725 \quad 25117$ |  | successes [1] | 9321 |
| sporad | [1] | 25518 | $\begin{array}{lll}196617 & 19715 \\ 2027 & 20221\end{array}$ | 20021 | Stiber [1] | 10024 | strength [1] | 4315 | successful [4] | 2220 |
| sport | 7825 |  | 2071921018 | 21210 | Stiles [24] | 112 | strengthen [3] | 414 | $7020 \quad 734$ | 17 |
| sport | g [1] | 2104 | $21411 \quad 21415$ | 21422 | 121721 | 7418 | 15510423 |  | successor [1] | 2223 |
| sports | nen [1] | 7819 | $21423 \quad 2182$ | 2191 | 8648616 | 938 | strengthens [1] | 1115 | such [21] 167 | 1625 |
| sports | men'S [2] | 20519 | $\begin{array}{lll}22023 & 2212\end{array}$ | 22118 | 93910115 | 10123 | strenuously [1] | 4922 | 183513 | 797 |
| 20521 |  |  | $22121 \quad 22314$ | 22315 | 1021110216 | 10321 | stress [3] | 5818 | $\begin{array}{ll}797 & 8613 \\ 127 & 19\end{array}$ | 1274 |
| spread |  | 5920 | $\begin{array}{llll}22415 & 2251 \\ 2261 & 22717\end{array}$ | 228 | 105 11018 | 16 | $12812 \quad 1363$ |  | $12719 \quad 12810$ | 1305 |
| 2425 | 25417 | 25420 | 233323317 | 23721 | 12341236 | 12310 | stressed [2] | 5711 | 1852321520 | 2214 |
| 25520 |  |  | $23818 \quad 24020$ | 24120 | 124512421 |  | 5711 |  | 2441924419 | 24716 |
| spread | [1] | 2538 | $24125 \quad 24222$ | 2479 | Stiles' [1] | 1925 | stretch ${ }_{\text {I }}$ | 1081 | 25016 |  |
| spread |  | 25522 | 25025 |  | still [26] 516 | 818 | stretches [1] | 10613 | suckers [1] | 21623 |
| square |  | 6620 | state's [4] ${ }_{\text {d }}$ | $12525$ | 8191117 | 363 | strict [1] 13615 |  | sudden [2] | 24212 |
| squee |  | 19516 | 13141315 | 18613 | 401579 | 6214 | stricter ${ }_{[2]}$ | 14916 | 2448 |  |
| squirr |  | 1095 | state-wide [1] | 3813 | 62186314 | 6319 | 21523 |  | suddenly [1] | 21315 |
| squi | [1] | 1093 | statement [4] | 7215 | $\begin{array}{ll} 6324 & 771 \\ 11622 & 1376 \end{array}$ | 11315 16316 | strictly [1] | 602 | Sue[14] 236 | 236 |
| staff ${ }_{16}$ | 1746 | 1806 | statements |  | $\begin{array}{lll}16913 & 19310\end{array}$ | 2001 | strike [1] | 14610 | 2381023 | 10215 |
| 252 |  |  | statements |  | $21317 \quad 23822$ | 24324 | Strom [1] | 12720 | $\begin{array}{lll}1435 & 1442 \\ 1957 & 1959\end{array}$ | 4 |
| stand | 83 |  | states [36] | 121 | 2432424611 | 24612 | strong [5] | 418 | $\begin{array}{ll} 1957 & 1959 \\ 2011 & 2015 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20021 \\ & 2016 \end{aligned}$ |
| standa | ${ }_{[2]}$ | 14916 | $\begin{array}{lll}18 & 15 & 189\end{array}$ | 2420 | stipulated [1] | 537 | 738 | 207 | sucd [2] | $910$ |
| 1532 |  |  | $2511 \quad 7018$ | 722 | stolen [11] | 1013 | 4413 |  | sucd [2] | 10819 |
| standa | ds [5] | 12616 | $8112 \quad 8517$ | 8618 | $\begin{array}{lll}1013 & 1015 \\ 1018 & 132\end{array}$ | 1017 | stronger [2] | 124 |  |  |
| 12914 | 13020 | 22420 | $9123 \quad 9312$ | 9421 | $1018 \quad 132$ | 1621 | 273 |  | suffered [1] | 15522 |
| 2259 |  |  | 94239622 | 9623 | $4225 \quad 8218$ | 1872 | strong | 2188 | sufficient [1] | 1856 |
| standi | g [2] | 5017 | 9818991 | 10016 | 13 |  | strongly [3] | 14911 | suggest [9] | 2518 |
| 2556 |  |  | 102211055 | 1307 | stomped [1] | 23 | 151421316 |  | $366 \quad 3917$ | 5624 |
| standp | nt ${ }_{[2]}$ | 18619 | 13011 13020 <br> 19119 19122 | 13415 2033 | stood [2] 732 | 1394 | structure [1] | 10516 | $\begin{array}{ll} 786 & 1003 \\ 2198 & 225 \end{array}$ | 16413 |
| 18620 |  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}19119 & 19122 \\ 21711 & 2213\end{array}$ | 20312 | stop [10] 2114 | 3014 | struggle [3] | 10519 | 2198225 |  |
| start [1 | 13023 | 4816 | 234525418 | 22812 | $\begin{array}{lll}3512 & 4625\end{array}$ | 795 | 1052010623 |  | suggested ${ }^{[31}$ | 265 |
| 5419 | 5714 | 771 |  | 104 | 1371614411 | 2488 | stuck [2] 1792 |  |  |  |
| 8014 | 1426 | 1427 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { States [2] } \\ & 16818 \end{aligned}$ | 104 | $2489 \quad 25324$ |  | $\text { study [4] } 828$ | $8210$ | suggesting [1] | 2054 |
| 160 ll | 21315 | 25517 | statewide ${ }_{[6]}$ |  | stopping [2] | 2124 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Study [4] } 828 \\ 141 \quad 23 \end{array}$ | 82 | suggestion [3] | 414 |
| started | [11] | 1514 | statewide [6] | 1413 8824 | 2917 |  |  |  | 1932321815 |  |
| 1811 | 8522 | 8713 | $\begin{array}{ll} 151 & 8513 \\ 932 & 20523 \end{array}$ | 8824 | store [15] | 99 | stuff [8] 432 $7023 \bigcirc 8014$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6814 \\ & 25323 \end{aligned}$ | suicide [8] | 831 |
| 8723 | 974 | 1342 | 93220523 |  | 916115 | 116 | $\begin{array}{ll} 7023 \\ 2553 & 8 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 191619111 | 19116 |
| 1381 | 1383 | 22318 | stating [1] | 21818 | $118 \quad 1612$ | 1623 | 2553 |  | 1911819121 | 19123 |
| 25417 |  |  | statistic [1] | 88 | 101510911 | 1572 | stupid [3] | 7825 | 19419 |  |
| startın | [4] | 5822 | statistics [11] | 56 | 178101805 | 1828 | $\begin{array}{lll}21418 & 21419\end{array}$ |  | suicrdes [4] | 824 |
| 6620 | 2075 | 25314 | 234 7111 | 1783 | $20622 \quad 23614$ |  | Styles [1] | 725 | 1918 1911 | 19212 |
| starts | 1707 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}1904 & 1906\end{array}$ | 21414 | stored [2] | 15217 | sub-machine [ |  | suing [7] 2123 | 2225 |
| state ${ }_{1}$ | $2]$ | 611 | 214231515 | 2473 | 1521 |  | 493 |  | 2312422 | 1614 |
| 722 | 810 | 1423 | 24 |  | stores [1] | 858 | Subcommittees | [1] | 195219514 |  |
| 1713 | 187 | 1812 | Statues [1] | 2093 | stories [2] | 6823 | 219 |  | suit [2] 2519 | 15422 |
| 219 | 2325 | 268 | status [3] | 1738 | 1996 |  | subdivisions [3] |  | summary [4] | 767 |
| 299 | 2923 | 3011 | 1752117522 |  | story [5] 1222 | 1224 | $2422 \quad 8420$ | 1023 | $1017 \quad 12525$ | 1969 |
| 353 384 | 354 | 3517 | statute [4] | 1020 | 2121421411 | 21612 | subject [4] | 17011 | sunglasses [2] | 44 |
| 384 | 3924 | 572 | $1021 \quad 1301$ | 24016 | strange [1] | 1272 | $20722 \quad 22517$ | 2503 | 25019 |  |
| 8612 | 633 945 | 866 94 | statutes [3] | 796 | strategies [2] | 1916 | subjected [1] | 8914 | supervision [3] | 8810 |
| 9910 | 9918 | 1042 | 9511 15322 |  | 3 |  | subjects [1] | 1127 | 10241028 |  |
| 10514 | 10517 | 1124 | stay [4] 6812 | 717 | stratcgy [2] | 13420 | submit [1] | 24817 | supplement ${ }_{\text {I }}$ | 996 |
| 1125 | 11225 | 11718 | $1568 \quad 21312$ |  | 15313 |  | submitted [3] | 64 | supply [2] | 205 |


| 18717 |  |  | $6 \quad 10717$ | 1582 | testifying [4] | 217 | thinks | 11525 | tiered [1] | 11420 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| suppl | [2] | 25016 | tail [3] 778 | 7711 | $7724 \quad 21018$ | 24219 | 3617 |  | tiger [1] 27 |  |
| 250 |  |  | 9214 |  | testimony [14] | 220 | third [6] 499 | 1361 | mely [4] | 554 |
| suppo |  | 2817 | takes [5] 3823 | 5010 | $\begin{array}{lll}372 & 4719\end{array}$ | 12422 | 167121685 | 1706 | 5825748 | 1733 |
| 2824 | 296 | 329 | 63318421 | 22611 | $12512 \quad 13815$ | 17421 | 1718 |  | times [11] | 1518 |
| 5824 | 753 | 7622 | taking [10] | 813 | $\begin{array}{lll}185 \\ 189 & 15 & 18625\end{array}$ | 18811 | Thomas [17] | 113 | $5015 \quad 5113$ | 1144 |
| 7623 | 771 | 844 | 578679 | 8223 | 18915 2563 | 2515 | 11910315 | 10512 | 1272416320 | 1975 |
| 8614 | 8617 | 879 | $711 \quad 11320$ | 1385 | 2563 |  | 107110810 | 10823 | 226242271 | 2277 |
| 8925 | 916 | 999 | 40822215 | 223 | tests [2] 748 | 7416 | 1091611616 | 1468 | 23616 |  |
| 9913 | 10017 | 1018 |  | 1518 | Texas [2] | 22116 | $15720 \quad 16024$ | 1613 |  |  |
| 1279 | 1356 | 13722 | tampers [1] | 1518 | 22217 | 221 | 161716111 | 16114 | $\underset{211}{ }{ }_{\text {Timmoney }}{ }^{[23]}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27 \\ & 92 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1507 | 16217 | 16621 | tape[1] 96 |  | text[2] 2064 | 20612 | 23511 |  | 1591510 | 216 |
| 17413 20917 | 17415 | 20916 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \mathbf{t a r g e t}[3] \\ 245 \quad 10 \quad 245 \end{array}$ | 16411 | thank [101] | $212$ | Thomas's [1] | 1396 | $2117 \quad 3223$ | 3225 |
| support |  |  |  |  | $1510 \quad 1511$ | 214 | thought [13] | 1218 | $335 \quad 3310$ | 3317 |
| ${ }_{14}{ }^{\text {suppo }}$ | cd [4] ${ }^{\text {c }} 18$ | 821 | geted [1] | 24215 | $215 \quad 218$ | 2111 | 223255 | 3820 | $3320 \quad 3324$ | 344 |
| 1424 | 12718 | 1498 | targets [1] | 7820 | 242246 | 247 | 4515466 | 4610 | $3425 \quad 3618$ | 402 |
| suppo | g [2] | 1292 | task [4] 94 | 1611 | $2522 \quad 282$ | 286 | $4714 \quad 7211$ | 16321 | $4717 \quad 5213$ | 744 |
| 151 |  |  | 45424023 |  | 2893221 | 3223 | 21592301 | 25013 | 11614 |  |
| suppor | c [1] | 2172 | taught [2] | 20510 | $3620 \quad 3624$ | 4013 | thoughtful ${ }_{[2]}$ | 3215 | Timmone | 17214 |
| suppor | [1] | 2174 | 20511 |  | $4716 \quad 4722$ | 482 | 7813 |  | tinkers [2] | 1548 |
| sup |  | 20019 | tax [4] 128 | 17011 | 488 635 | 569 | thoughts [3] | 7122 | 15412 |  |
| 21418 |  |  | 19816241 |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 635 & 63 \\ 7120 & 93 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6521 \\ & 937 \end{aligned}$ | 12423132 |  | Title [4] 4420 | 12520 |
| suppo |  | 2097 | taxes [1] 19224 |  | $939 \quad 9310$ | 10114 | thousand [1] | 8521 | 20922204 |  |
| 22615 |  |  | teach [2] 595 | 1567 | 1011710121 | 10320 | thousands [4] | 746 | tobacco [5] | 2125 |
| suppre |  | 57 | teachers [1] | 1566 | 1032111010 | 11610 | 7467913 | 13924 | 222517013 | 1731 |
| suppres | d | 8018 | T |  | $\begin{array}{lll}11612 & 12417\end{array}$ | 12419 | threat [2] | 3420 | 16 |  |
| 8019 |  |  | technically | 3825 | $\begin{array}{lll}12420 & 12510 \\ 1291 & 1323\end{array}$ | 125 | 34 |  | today [39] | 24 |
| Suprem | C [5] | 7811 | 181520323 | 3825 | $\begin{array}{lll}1291 & 1323 \\ 1326 & 1381\end{array}$ | 1324 13814 | threatening [1] | 21319 | $\begin{array}{lll}1512 & 3617 \\ 6422 & 8121\end{array}$ | 386 <br> 11012 |
| 796 | 816 | 8119 | technıques | 14313 | $\begin{array}{lll}13818 \\ 138 & 1459\end{array}$ | 14617 | three [17] | 189 | $\begin{array}{ll}6422 & 8121 \\ 1169 & 12421\end{array}$ | 114124 |
|  |  |  | technology | 15225 | 1461914621 | 15712 | 9421957 | 9514 | 1571917811 | 17811 |
| surc | ge [1] | 170 | 22413 |  | 1571815825 | 1597 | $9816 \quad 1007$ | 10 | $1812 \quad 18112$ | 18811 |
| surpris | $\mathrm{d}_{[1]}$ | 10118 | tecnage | 48 | 1611316512 | 17710 | $\begin{array}{lll}1111 & 1112\end{array}$ | 14917 | 1921519312 | 2067 |
| surroun | ding | 12513 | 25115 | 4 | 1772317725 | 1786 | 189119913 | 2277 | 20732097 | 2103 |
| 16616 |  |  | teeth [2] 219 |  | 18311833 | 1889 | 2346 |  | $\begin{array}{lll}22523 & 22919\end{array}$ | 23012 |
| surviv |  | 2367 |  |  | 18810188 |  | three-mont |  | 2336 | 2378 |
| suspec |  | 8412 | television | 9723 | 20515 21811 | 22325 | three-quart |  | 2382123917 | 24225 |
| suspen | ded [1] | 2239 | $23312 \quad 23422$ | 23615 | 22412242 | 2243 | 832124710 |  | 243524525 | 24825 |
| suspici | [1] | 807 | telling [4] | 925 | $\begin{array}{lll}229 & 18 & 22919\end{array}$ | 23620 | threw [1] | 2122 | 25452563 |  |
| swear |  | 18614 | $2525 \quad 220$ | 24213 | $\begin{array}{lll}23622 & 237 \\ 2401 & 240\end{array}$ | 23925 | through [39] | 324 | today's [2] | 411 |
| sweater |  | 23516 | tells [8] 2423 | 7515 | $\begin{array}{llll}24017 & 17 & 248 \\ 248 \\ 248\end{array}$ | 24823 | 5644124 | 543 | 24217 |  |
| 2366 |  |  | $7516 \quad 1077$ | 1096 | 248242498 | 24910 | 5596617 | 672 | together [10] | 5621 |
| Swede |  | 19117 | 18231824 | 1883 | 25112512 | 25525 | 6912703 | 8515 | $7021 \quad 716$ | 857 |
| sweep | g [1] | 1493 | ten [10] 1522 | 1813 | 2562 |  | 8522893 | 1045 | 9412954 | 13823 |
| Syria | 1998 |  | $9313 \quad 9917$ | 1036 | thanking I | 214 | $\begin{array}{ll}1695 & 16915\end{array}$ | 17025 | 21 | 2 |
| syringe | [1] | 24422 | $1399$ | 138 | thanks [2] | 9422 | 1702517111 | 1728 |  |  |
| system | [49] | 312 | te |  | 1875 |  | 1721117215 | 17424 |  |  |
| 810 | 1711 | 1721 |  |  | Thanksgiving [1] | [1] | 176121884 | 18913 |  |  |
| 1724 | 349 | 3419 | CY [1] | 14120 | 7711 |  | 1971819918 | 20222 | tomorrow [3] | 2518 |
| 506 | 5116 | 527 | tenure [1] | 162 | theft ${ }_{[1]} 2718$ |  | $20416 \quad 21622$ | 2208 | $5814 \quad 2312$ |  |
| 5215 | 552 | 552 | term [2] 715 | 16320 | thefts [1] | 18512 | $\begin{array}{ll} 22021 & 22911 \\ 2448 & 2453 \end{array}$ | 2435 | tone [1] 14113 |  |
| 557 6820 | 565 | 642 | terminology | 22520 | themselves [9] | 909 |  |  | tonight [2] | 19313 |
| 6820 7014 | 6822 942 | 692 1125 | terms [8] 83 | 948 | 153141924 | 1928 | 38470 |  | 23922 |  |
| 7014 11420 | 942 1367 | 1125 1608 | $1116 \quad 1132$ | 1337 | 194722622 | 22625 | $\begin{array}{ll} 384 & 7018 \\ 7812 & 8125 \end{array}$ | 1336 | tons [1] 323 |  |
| 1689 | 1702 | 17422 | $2291 \quad 2292$ | 2303 | 228923112 |  | 210212388 |  | tool24] 3517 | 3520 |
| 1755 | 17523 | 1765 | terrible [1] | 2321 | thereafter [1] | 17519 | throw-down | 11921 | $3522 \quad 4011$ | 4315 |
| 1766 | 17612 | 17616 | terrific [1] | 9023 | therefore [10] | 5021 | throwing [2] |  | $4924 \quad 656$ | 8819 |
| 17618 | 1771 | 1773 | Terry [1] 2365 |  | $5122 \quad 5722$ | 701 |  |  | 922210614 | 10918 |
| 1775 | 1776 | 17718 | $\begin{array}{rl} \operatorname{test}[4] & 7421 \\ 3019 & 19320 \end{array}$ | 12611 | 9259219 | 1001 | 8014 |  | $12012 \quad 13615$ | 1488 |
| 18018 | 18019 | 18025 |  |  | 119121768 |  | thrown [2] | 511 | 186219111 | 19112 |
| 1811 | 21420 | 2158 | 1301919320 |  |  |  | 23311 |  | 2031121025 | 22011 |
| 22914 | 24611 | 24612 | testified ${ }_{[2]}$ | 218 | they ve [1] |  | throws [1] 5018 | 5018 | $\begin{array}{lllll}22223 & 22710 & 23115\end{array}$ |  |
| $\text { systematically }[1]$$13314$ |  |  | testıfy ${ }^{5]}$ $106 \quad 7722$ | $\begin{aligned} & 98 \\ & 16615 \end{aligned}$ | thigh [1] 2281 |  | Thurmond [1] 12720 |  | took [11] 326574 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| systems |  | 25023 |  |  | thinking [5] | $\begin{aligned} & 3023 \\ & 1156 \end{aligned}$ | THURSDAY [1] |  | 62614523 | 19911 |
| T [1] | 616 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} 2247 \\ \text { testifyers [1] } \end{array}$ | 2249 | 1633 |  | ticked ${ }_{[1]}$ <br> tied ${ }_{[1]} 7920$ | 465 | $\begin{array}{lll}20312 & 20317 \\ 2343 & 23513\end{array}$ | 20324 245 |
| table [5] | 2125 | 778 |  |  |  |  |  |  | tool [2] 7417 | 7420 |


|  | Condenselt ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | tools - Valley |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| tools [2] 2184 | 24421 | transferring [1] | 1673 | 154 | 12114 | 164 | 801 | 9720 | 98 | 4011 | 454 | 457 |
| toothless [11 | 275 | transfers [1] | 16914 | 16413 | 17516 | 17613 | 9910 | 12818 | 13715 | 509 | 5124 | 524 |
| top [4] 1812 | 1119 | transform [1] | 23210 | 23016 | 2429 | 24516 | 16623 | 16625 | 17113 | 557 584 | 5510 | 584 |
| $1315 \quad 1753$ |  | transport [1] | 16721 | Tuesda |  | 2416 | 17212 17913 | 17218 | 17911 | 584 678 | 649 6812 | 6525 |
| tossed [1] | 22515 | transportation |  |  |  |  | 18614 | 18615 | 18616 | 6910 | 7511 | 7512 |
| total [3] 12 | 17710 | 2444 |  | turkey |  | 778 | 18622 | 18622 | 19016 | 804 | 833 | 867 |
| 18317 |  | transported | 12413 |  |  |  | 19323 | 19623 | 19624 | 894 | 906 | 9011 |
| totally [4] | 2104 | trash [1] 6721 |  | turn [3] | 2118 | 10815 | 19625 | 19715 | 20111 | 9413 | 979 | 10021 |
| 2101222517 | 2261 | trashated ${ }^{\text {d2] }}$ | 64 |  |  |  | 20117 | 2134 | 21325 | 1043 | 1111 | 11325 |
| tough [17] | 86 | treated | 6415 | turn-st | yle ${ }_{11}$ | 2448 | 22415 | 23214 | 23223 | 11810 | 121 | 12214 |
| 439529 | 558 |  |  | turned |  | 5114 | 23516 | 236 | 24015 | 12322 | 12323 | 1391 |
| $6510 \quad 7117$ | 1148 | treatment [2] | 8815 | 5121 | 1414 | 20214 | 2459 | 2531 |  | 14514 | 15818 | 16316 |
| 1361413621 | 20614 |  |  | turning | [3] | 45 | unde | ne [1] | 21621 | 1661 | 1663 | 1767 |
| 2151821624 | 2183 | tree [4] 17920 | 1801 | 24611 | 24912 |  | unders | tand [21] | 2120 | 1768 1818 | $\begin{aligned} & 1769 \\ & 18111 \end{aligned}$ | 1797 |
| 2188821814 | 22313 | 1819 |  | turns | 134412 |  | 3212 | 3213 | 589 | 1934 | 19525 | 1991 |
| 22317 |  | tremendous [2] | 13824 | twelve |  | 154 | 6523 | 683 | 696 | 19913 | 19915 | 19916 |
| tout [1] 841 |  | 23918 |  | 3019 | 415 | 2 | 717 | 10220 |  | 19916 | 20010 | 20125 |
| touting [1] | 2111 | Trent ${ }_{[1]} 12719$ |  | 4423 | 462 | 4624 | 13318 | 14415 |  | 20223 | 2032 | 20310 |
| toward [2] | 18223 | trial [38] 4819 | 503 | 476 | 12120 |  | 19420 | 16424 | 228 | 20318 | 2045 | 20424 |
| 18224 |  | $5110 \quad 5115$ | 5117 | Twent | three |  | 22813 |  |  | 20621 | 2071 | 2111 |
| towards | 4418 | 5120525 | 5210 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 21617 | 21817 | 21922 |
|  |  | 5218533 | 534 | twice | 15113 |  |  | (1)od [1] |  | 22024 | 22124 | 2225 |
| towns [1] | 838 | 541055 |  |  | 72 | 15 | undou | tedly |  | 22220 | 22718 | 23418 |
| toy ${ }_{[2]} 858$ | 858 | 6110 6125 | 646 | 1524 | 161 | 304 | unexp | cted [1] | 2409 | 2392 24210 | 239219 | 2395 24612 |
| toys 1111305 |  | $6524 \quad 663$ | 6612 | 498 | 774 | 8216 | unfort | nately |  | 24617 | 25 | 7 |
| trace [7] 98 | 134 | 66186623 | 699 | 8617 | 8917 | 9422 | 16 |  |  | upgra | [1] | 13 |
| 1364021 | 4023 | $5{ }^{5} 714$ | 752 | 11420 | 1478 | 14915 | 6312 | ${ }_{6315}$ | 6319 | upheld |  | 18315 |
| 21842 |  | $9920 \quad 12312$ | 12313 | 14925 |  | 16025 | 6325 | 643 | 6413 | 18320 |  |  |
| tracing [1] | 98 | 12412 20019 20020 | 2468 | 1616 | 17420 | 17521 | 6419 | 1049 | 10423 | upper |  | 14215 |
| track [3] 67 | 90 | trials [7] 575 |  | 18116 | 19320 | 19918 | 10511 | 15016 | 15111 | upset ${ }_{[1]}$ | 1427 |  |
| 10421 |  | ${ }_{6120} 20614$ | 867 | 2001 | 20313 | 2206 | 15117 | 1587 | 15811 | upsett | [1] | 1442 |
| tractor-traile |  | $8610 \quad 947$ |  | 22623 | 22623 | 2271 | 16620 | 16623 | 1674 | urba |  | 617 |
| 2316 |  | tribute [1] | 515 | 2343 | 2344 | 2353 | 1691 | $1707$ | 17016 | 14315 | 14317 |  |
| trade [1] 1318 |  | tried [5] 129 | 464 | twofol | [1] | 12021 | 17416 | 24321 | 24622 | urban/r | ural ${ }_{[ }$ | 14516 |
| traditionally ${ }_{12}$ | 88 | 4659418 | 1144 |  |  |  | unifor | nity |  | urge [3] |  | 13422 |
| 15515 |  | tries [2] 11219 | 25122 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { type } \\ & 2710 \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 113 \\ 455 \end{array}$ | 1042 | 1469 | 15813 | 24915 |  |  |
| traffickers [3] | 1924 | trigger [3] | 3825 | 6820 | 18115 | 1987 | UNIO | ${ }_{[1]}$ | 17 | urging |  | 2112 |
| $959 \quad 9510$ |  | 156224721 |  | 22013 | 22017 |  | unique |  | 7311 | used | 182 |  |
| trafficking ${ }_{171}$ | 324 | trigger-lock [5] | 12623 | types | 5914 | 6725 | 1059 | 1108 | 14224 | 1011 | 1023 | 1312 |
| 13111414 | 1425 | 1451919410 | 19821 | 711 | 12824 |  | 15313 |  |  | 1321 | 149 | 2117 |
| 00 | 1365 | 19823 |  | typical | ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 2175 | unit | 52 | 9024 | 3011 | 4113 | 5612 |
| tragedy ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 231 | trigger-locks [7] |  |  |  | 11 | United |  |  | 8218 | 8225 | 1013 |
| tragic [2] | 15520 | 1281413620 | 13624 | 21615 |  |  | 721 |  |  | 1016 | 1149 | 12923 |
| 23125 |  | 1941119417 | 1988 | U.S ${ }_{[20]}$ |  |  | 8618 | 9123 | 9312 | 16320 | 1645 | 16924 |
| train [1] 7210 |  | 1992 |  | $\mathrm{U}_{944} \mathrm{~S}_{4}$ | 9619 | 10224 | 9421 | 9423 | 9622 | 17119 | 2008 | 20119 |
| traned ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | 22224 | tripled [1] | 1911 | 1056 | 1058 | 11023 | 9623 | 9818 | 991 | 2073 |  |  |
| trainıng [10] | 8812 | trips [1] 904 |  | 1111 | 11615 | 12420 | 10015 | 10221 | 1055 |  | 26 |  |
| 12631264 | 1266 | trouble [3] | 11418 | 12716 | 12717 | 13214 | 19119 | 19122 | 2033 | useful |  | 21416 |
| 135191363 | 14924 | 115218219 |  | 15922 | 1864 | 2204 | 21711 | 2213 | 2345 | useless |  | 77 |
| 165621221 | 21223 | true [6] 519 | 4119 | 2227 | 22218 | 22220 | 25418 |  |  |  |  |  |
| transaction $\left.{ }^{3}\right]$ | 1701 | 1262013424 | 1873 | ultima | ely [2] | 8417 | units | 1173 |  | user [1] | 12810 |  |
| 171317213 |  | 22619 |  | 367 |  |  | Univ | Sity [1] | 2493 | uses [3] | 05 | 108 |
| transactions [4] | 16911 | truly [1] 2013 |  | unable |  | 177 | unless |  | 6218 | 12815 |  |  |
| 1701017119 | 17616 | trunk [2] 4417 |  | unassig | ned [1] | 24310 | 7518 | 9924 | 15615 | using 9 | 61 | 10523 |
| transcript ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ | 2574 | trust [4] 25416 |  | unauth | orized [1] |  | 16712 | 16725 | 1953 | 16012 | 1672 | 18013 |
| transcripts ${ }^{11}$ | 6720 | $\begin{array}{llll}254 & 18 & 25515\end{array}$ |  | 10 |  |  | 22322 |  |  | 18112 | 19621 | 218 |
| transfer 117 | 1692 | try [14] 262 | 2619 | unavai | abil |  | $701$ |  |  | usually |  |  |
| 169221703 | 17025 | $3610 \quad 788$ | 9424 | 19115 |  |  |  |  |  | 5013 | 77 | 20620 |
| 17751789 | 17922 | 1121611217 | 11222 | unbelie | vable |  |  |  |  | 24022 |  |  |
| 1801618124 | 1829 | 1151411515 | 18520 | 89 | 5818 |  | unorga | nized |  | utilizes |  | 12823 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}18210 & 18213 \\ 18414 & 1883\end{array}$ | 18214 | $21814 \quad 22512$ | 225 | uncons | titution | $\mathrm{l}_{[1]}$ | nswo | [1] | 18614 | vaguene | s | 22514 |
| 18414 24322 |  | trying [22] | 1916 | 2228 |  |  | unwor | able [1] | 785 | vain ${ }_{[1]}$ | 18411 |  |
| transferred [5] | 12321 | $\begin{array}{lll}3213 & 4014\end{array}$ | 3216 57 | ${ }_{41}$ under | ${ }_{43}$ | 2210 525 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1019 \\ & 2324 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1814 \\ & 2410 \end{aligned}$ | valid [4] | 7920 | 16710 |
| $17914 \quad 18022$ | 18218 | $6719 \quad 6725$ | 694 | 5820 | 6021 | 6316 | 3022 |  | 359 | 16715 | 16720 |  |
| 18219 |  | 10271037 | 10423 | 659 | 7114 | 7918 | 3514 | 3525 | 377 | Valley |  | 18825 |


| 253925313 |  | 91 |  | walk-in [1] | 2356 | 474 | wishes [1] | 13417 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| value [2] 2612 | 2617 | violence [43] | 216 | walked [2] | 17810 | Wednesday [1] 2416 | within [18] | 352 |
| values [1] | 1406 | 22543 | 415 | 1813 |  | week [14] 2121 | 5111546 | 6223 |
| variety [8] | 7018 | $\begin{array}{ll}422 & 54 \\ 75 & 817\end{array}$ | 74 | walking [3] | 7113 | 24174811493 | 8451014 | 1029 |
| 821312212 | 1268 | 751817 | 149 | $7114 \quad 1971$ |  | 8288468411 | $\begin{array}{lll}12024 & 12514 \\ 16617 & 16713\end{array}$ | 14721 |
| 14841508 | 15518 | $\begin{array}{lll}1513 & 1921 \\ 2916 & 2917\end{array}$ | 2916 3922 | walks [1] | 414 | $\begin{array}{llll}8919 & 10214 & 10217 \\ 175 & 21 & 17615 & 23311\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}16617 & 16713 \\ 1693 & 17212\end{array}$ | 1687 18222 |
| 1648 |  | $4 \begin{aligned} & 16 \\ & 4419\end{aligned}$ | 4814 | Wallace [1] | 19722 | $\begin{array}{llll}175 & 21 & 17615 & 23311 \\ 23316 & \end{array}$ | 22672573 |  |
| various [10] | 378 | 55237016 | 741 | wallets [1] | 23522 |  | without [14] | 925 |
| 126212722 | 13013 | 836865 | 8723 | Wally [1] | 20225 | $\begin{array}{cll}\text { weeks [12] } \\ 12025 & 1293 & 304 \\ 14518\end{array}$ | $273 \quad 422$ | 825 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}151 & 15 & 15320\end{array}$ | 1575 | 9711255 | 13421 | wants [10] | 3017 | $\begin{array}{lll}12025 & 1293 & 14518 \\ 1482 & 1528 & 15210\end{array}$ | $10020 \quad 12314$ | 1676 |
| $22814 \quad 2416$ | 24421 | 13691385 | 1448 | wants [10] ${ }_{4411} 1225$ | 3017 15121 | $\begin{array}{llll}1482 & 1528 & 15210 \\ 1562 & 18223 & 2118\end{array}$ | 167917123 | 17125 |
| vast [6] 2922 | 2922 | 144241471 | 15715 | $16420 \quad 1928$ | 2047 | $21610 \quad 2555$ | 191142113 | 22120 |
| $2923 \quad 3310$ | 13324 | $17311 \quad 2132$ | 2144 | $\begin{array}{lll}161611 & 21917\end{array}$ | 22 | weight [1] 9523 | 23815 |  |
| 1356 |  | 239325121 | 25123 | war 131 14022 | 1448 | weight [1] 9523 | witness [4] | 483 |
| vehicle [3] | 1276 | 25212526 | 25419 | war [3] 14022 | 1448 | welcome [7] 486 | $7716 \quad 16519$ | 23623 |
| 167716721 |  | violence-pro |  |  |  | 724 1256 15718 <br> 16517 16614 2373 | witnesses [17] | 25 |
| vendors [1] | 19514 | 887 |  |  | 1720 |  | 45225123 | 547 |
| ventures [1] | 884 | violent [22] | 7818 |  | 1720 | 21421 | 55156622 | 704 |
| verdicts [1] | 712 | $\begin{array}{ll}824 & 859 \\ 955 & 958\end{array}$ | 8510 |  |  |  | 712412424 | 16320 |
| verified [2] | 1744 | 9681008 | 13423 | w | 2546 |  | $\begin{array}{ll} 1663 & 1665 \\ 22923 & 22924 \end{array}$ | 1667 |
| 17517 |  | 13521353 | 1355 |  | 254 | 23 | $2566$ |  |
| verse [1] 3522 |  | 1852119612 | 19616 |  |  | West [3] 1517592 | wives [1] | 1 |
| versed [1] | 4919 | 207220711 | 20911 | Washington [8] | 1036 | $21314$ |  |  |
| version [4] | 2420 | 21122114 | 2167 | $\begin{array}{lll}152231 & 16014\end{array}$ | 2402 | Westmoreland [5] | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Womanan }[3] \\ & 3821 \\ & 7925 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| $15016 \quad 15018$ | 1781 | Virginia | 20 | 24824 |  | $2812 \quad 2913 \quad 407$ | women [3] | 10720 |
| versus [9] | 797 |  |  |  | 9222 | 54132437 | $11425 \quad 13924$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll}798 & 799 \\ 1295 & 15813\end{array}$ | 802 |  | 427 | wasting [ | 19022 | whatsoever [3] 1939 | wonder [2] | 3812 |
| 129515813 | 18219 | virtually 148 | 427 |  | 5817 | 1941823815 | 2056 |  |
| $2227 \quad 22516$ |  | visceral |  |  |  | wherever [1] 2214 | wonderful | 5811 |
| vest [1] 394 |  | visceral $[3]$ $23118 \quad 232$ | 2303 |  |  | wherewithal [1] 2542 | 852 |  |
| vests [1] 5422 |  | visible [1] | 42 | $15018$ |  | white [8]8020 8023 | wondering [1] | 23010 |
| v1a [1] 513 |  | vision [3] | 20619 | ways [7] 215 | 411 | $\begin{array}{llll}9822 & 1426 & 14319\end{array}$ | Wonderland | 42 |
| $\underset{2525}{\text { VIC1OUS }}$ [2] | 912 | 20712075 |  | $2714 \quad 8114$ | 13013 | $\begin{array}{llll}1441 & 14410 & 25517\end{array}$ | word [4] 2117 | 10216 |
|  |  | visit [3] 8821 | 24119 | 132 J 2264 |  | hole [15] 3117 | 2334 |  |
| victim [1] |  | 24120 |  | wayside [1] | 5221 | 54 | wording [1] | 21922 |
| victims [3] | 561 | visits [1] 8813 |  | weaken [1] | 15413 | $\begin{array}{llll}15125 & 1566 & 159\end{array}$ | words [5] | 7718 |
| $13918 \quad 139$ videos |  | voice [1] 10223 |  | weakens [1] | 13516 | $\begin{array}{llll}17425 & 22516 & 22520\end{array}$ | 1841820119 | 2072 |
| Videos [1] | 8510 | void [1] 1818 |  |  | 15611 | 24882544 | 24214 |  |
| V1ew [12] | 1034 1288 | volume ${ }_{[8]}$ |  |  | $4120$ | wholcheartedly [1] | worked [2] | 309 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}10725 & 1081 \\ 13024 & 13412\end{array}$ | 1288 13620 | volume [8] 526 | 5716 | weapon ${ }^{[28]}$ 421 422 | 4120 5014 | 8617 | 1478 |  |
| $\begin{array}{lll}13024 & 13412 \\ 1459 & 1468\end{array}$ | 13620 16015 | $\begin{array}{lll}526 & 5222 \\ 5810 & 5815\end{array}$ | 5716 5818 | 421 <br> 511 <br> 128 | 5014 10916 |  | workers [2] | 882 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}1459 & 1468 \\ 22922 & 25011\end{array}$ | 16015 | 5810 7117 | 5818 | $\begin{array}{ll}511 & 549 \\ 12811 & 14917\end{array}$ | 10916 16323 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Wide [2] } 7018 & 10724 \\ \text { widely }[1] & 20816\end{array}$ | $8813$ |  |
| $22922 \quad 25011$ |  | 7117 |  | $\begin{array}{ll}12811 & 14917 \\ 18413 & 18414\end{array}$ | 16323 | widely [1] 20816 |  | 8 |
| viewpoint [3] | 1410 | voluntarily [1] | 18819 | $\begin{array}{lll}18413 & 18414 \\ 19520 & 2017\end{array}$ | 1883 | wife [8] 972214115 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { works [3I } \\ & 22917{ }_{25216} \end{aligned}$ | 8 |
| 1501123713 |  | voluntary [3] | 2221 | $\begin{array}{lll} 19520 & 2017 \\ 2051 & 20923 \end{array}$ | 20924 | $\begin{array}{llll}1982 & 2216 & 22122\end{array}$ | 2291725216 |  |
| views [2] | 4721 | 25439 |  | $21010 \quad 22013$ | 22017 | $\begin{array}{llll}23023 & 23513 & 23519\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { norld [3] } \\ & 22220 \quad 25510 \end{aligned}$ | 614 |
| 2301 |  | Volunteer [1] | 1285 | $22515 \quad 22812$ | 23111 | wild [1] 11316 |  |  |
| vigorous [1] | 20917 | vote [8] 1423 | 2818 | 244924419 | 2557 | wildly [1] 24716 | worry [1] | 12 |
| vilified [1] | 20013 | 145211615 | 1618 | weaponry [2] | 4919 | Wilkes-Barre [3] | worrying [1] | 2183 |
| villages [1] | 839 | 163918822 | 1943 | 5915 |  | $2035 \quad 20310 \quad 25314$ | worse [3] | 2101 |
| violate [4] | 37 | voted [2] 14518 | 1611 | weapons [38] | 87 | Willıam [2] 854 | $25420 \quad 25422$ |  |
| 314157 | 4619 | voters [7] | 328 | $4017 \quad 4415$ | 491 | 855 | worst [2] | 196 |
| violated [1] | 241 | 32913613 | 13623 | 5961106 | 12923 | Williams [8] 119 | 1914 |  |
| violated [1] |  | $1377 \quad 13713$ | 13717 | 133413611 | 13716 | $2521 \quad 2522 \quad 282$ | worth [7] | 19721 |
| violation [14] | 385 | votes [1] 1503 |  | 1371914821 | 14924 | $\begin{array}{llll}11010 & 11120 & 1165\end{array}$ | 1972220516 | 21812 |
| 38256213 | 6312 |  |  | 1501315324 | 1544 | 1344 | $22215 \quad 22717$ | 2334 |
| $6314 \quad 6319$ | 6325 | $\left.\underset{2515}{\text { voting }}{ }^{3}\right] 13714$ | 1420 | 154181558 | 15517 |  | worthy [1] | 8425 |
| 1671116716 | 1684 | $\begin{array}{lll}2515 & 13714\end{array}$ |  | 157216325 | 1651 | $\underset{910}{ } \quad \underset{9}{\text { Wiliamsport }}[2]$ | wounded |  |
| 17051717 | 1861 | Wait [3] 5513 | 25421 | 165719520 | 1962 | $910 \quad 923$ | wounded [1] | 13922 |
| 1867 |  | 25521 |  | 2011520116 | 20117 | willing [2] 106 | wounds [1] | 23612 |
| violations [14] | 3710 | waiting [5] | 13310 | 2011820922 | 2104 | 23420 | wrangling [1] | 2295 |
| 507643 | 6413 | 1331114914 | 20623 | 213212141 | 21412 | windshicld [1] 22912 | wrapped [1] | 20122 |
| 6419768 | 7612 | 21510 |  | 222322524 | 22525 | wipes [1] 2488 | 3423 |  |
| $9113 \quad 9911$ | 11713 | Waiver [1] | 663 | 2433 |  |  | (1) 3423 |  |
| $11713 \quad 17223$ | 18523 | walk [5] 5813 |  | wear [1] 1275 |  | wish 4715 | Writing [1] | 2194 |
| 20724 |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{c\|c} \text { Walk [5] } & 5813 \\ 18111 & 19311 \end{array}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5814 \\ & 2157 \end{aligned}$ | wearing [5] |  | Wish [5] 4715 145 19 | written [7] | 11617 |
| V10lators [2] | 911 | 1811119311 | 2157 | $4211 \quad 4213$ | $\begin{aligned} & 101 \\ & 447 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}18819 & 1951 & 21410\end{array}$ | $1715 \quad 17324$ | 17523 |


| $22220 \quad 2$ | 24818 | 24913 | 25111 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wrong [14] |  | 2115 | yourself [2] | 1258 |  |  |
| 2115 | 241 | 3019 | 22714 |  |  |  |
| 1122 | 14220 | 1577 | youth [6] | 8723 |  |  |
| 1622418 | 1882 | 1938 | 8813899 | 8910 |  |  |
| 1941 | 1949 | 23225 | $9020 \quad 25024$ |  |  |  |
| 24922 |  |  | youthful [1] | 21215 |  |  |
| Wrote [1] |  | 9111 | $\mathrm{Z}_{[1]} 1655$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{X}_{111}$ | 1655 |  | Z 1105 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Y}_{111} 1$ | 1655 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ycar [56] 2 | 221 | 55 |  |  |  |  |
| 513 | 76 | 154 |  |  |  |  |
| 1514 | 1516 | 1812 |  |  |  |  |
| 1823 | 196 | 199 |  |  |  |  |
| 1912 | 1914 | 1922 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 301 | 3020 |  |  |  |  |
| 3021 | 315 | 3116 |  |  |  |  |
| 3118 | 328 | 3213 |  |  |  |  |
| 3611 | 4425 | 454 |  |  |  |  |
| 6224 | 632 | 733 |  |  |  |  |
| 93259 | 941 | 949 |  |  |  |  |
| 9411 | 9413 | 9416 |  |  |  |  |
| 974 98 | 9820 | 11217 |  |  |  |  |
| 1348 | 1356 | 1377 |  |  |  |  |
| 1391 | 1391 | 1548 |  |  |  |  |
| 154121 | 15923 | 19319 |  |  |  |  |
| 19832 | 20412 | 22624 |  |  |  |  |
| 2272 | 2278 | 2313 |  |  |  |  |
| 23142 | 2342 | 25225 |  |  |  |  |
| year-long | ge [1] | 215 |  |  |  |  |
| years [62] |  | 48 |  |  |  |  |
| 4194 | 420 | 721 |  |  |  |  |
| 848 | 811 | 1810 |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 2019 | 2719 |  |  |  |  |
| $3713 \quad 47$ | 4715 | 4822 |  |  |  |  |
| 48224 | 4916 | 4922 |  |  |  |  |
| 502456 | 561 | 6223 |  |  |  |  |
| 84286 | 868 | 872 |  |  |  |  |
| $9313 \quad 93$ | 9315 | 9514 |  |  |  |  |
| 981 | 9816 | 9918 |  |  |  |  |
| 100111 | 10323 | 10622 |  |  |  |  |
| 111251 | 11322 | 11424 |  |  |  |  |
| 121201 | 13216 | 13823 |  |  |  |  |
| 13991 | 1453 | 15519 |  |  |  |  |
| 185121 | 1907 | 1909 |  |  |  |  |
| 190171 | 19025 | 19320 |  |  |  |  |
| 193231 | 19723 | 19725 |  |  |  |  |
| 200220 | 2005 | 20210 |  |  |  |  |
| 2032520 | 20420 | 20510 |  |  |  |  |
| $21825 \quad 2$ | 21923 | 22516 |  |  |  |  |
| 225252 | 2519 | 25111 |  |  |  |  |
| 25114 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| yesterday | [3] | 10311 |  |  |  |  |
| 19032 | 22224 |  |  |  |  |  |
| yesterday | 's [1] | 14114 |  |  |  |  |
| yet[15] 8 | 818 | 132 |  |  |  |  |
| $1725 \quad 2$ | 2021 | 2218 |  |  |  |  |
| 3125 | 3721 | 935 |  |  |  |  |
| 15092 | 2004 | 20512 |  |  |  |  |
| 206172 | 2133 | 2321 |  |  |  |  |
| 2326 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| York [6] 1 | 191 | 191 |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 194 \\ & 23616 \end{aligned}$ | 195 | 1913 |  |  |  |  |
| young [16] |  | 47 |  |  |  |  |
| 1516 | 173 | 434 |  |  |  |  |
| 58115 | 5819 | 5819 |  |  |  |  |
| $8720 \quad 88$ | 889 | 895 |  |  |  |  |
| 89168 | 8918 | 908 |  |  |  |  |
| 139241 | 14325 | 1441 |  |  |  |  |
| younger |  | 14111 |  |  |  |  |

