31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on March 18, recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 946, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 1345, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2377, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2404, Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2661, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2879, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2966, and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3052. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on March 18, recommends be adopted, referred to the Floor is floor Amendments #47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, and 53 to House Bill 1155. House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Barbara Flynn Currie, Chairperson from the Committee on Rules reports the following committee action taken on March 19, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 163, Floor Amendment #12 to House Bill 1156, Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1250, and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2363."

Speaker Turner: "All Members are asked to be at their seat. We shall be led in prayer today by Pastor Shaun Lewis, who is the Illinois State Director of Capitol Commission, serving the political Leaders of Illinois. Pastor Lewis is the guest of Representative Brauer. Members and guests are asked to refrain from starting their laptops, turn off all

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

cell phones and rise for the invocation and the Pledge of Allegiance."

- Pastor Lewis: "You'd bow with me in prayer. Father in heaven, 1 Chronicles 29:11 says 'Yours, o Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the victory and the majesty: for all that is in the heavens and in the earth is Yours'. It's an honor to be here, today, in this chamber. Lord, it's a far greater honor simply to stand before You. I'd like to pray for our Representatives and their staff today. Many of them have worked long hours these past few weeks and are anxious about the months of April and May. And as a break approaches, give each one rest. Bless the time they have at home with family. And when they return, may they feel refreshed. Give them courage. Give them tenacity. Give them wisdom. They'll need these in the months ahead. And though you are an unseen God, you hear. And that is why Your people approach You in prayer. In the name of Your Son, Jesus Christ, Amen."
- Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Hurley."
- Hurley et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Turner: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."
- Leader Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect the excused absence of Representative Chapa LaVia."

  Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

31st Legislative Day

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Schmitz is excused today."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, please take the roll. On 116 being present, we have a quorum today. Representative Yingling, for what reason do you rise?"
- Yingling: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. I would like to welcome our Avon Township assessor here from my district, who's up in the gallery. Let's give him a big, warm Springfield welcome."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. Representative D'Amico."
- D'Amico: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Turner: "Please state your point."
- D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to let everyone know, on behalf of former Representative Bob Molaro and the Italian Caucus, we put these carnations on everyone's desk in honor of Saint Joseph's day today. And I also would like to introduce two trustees from the town of Morton Grove, up there in the gallery. Repre... Trustee Dan DiMaria and Trustee Billy Grear. They're up in the gallery right there."
- Speaker Turner: "Welcome to your Capitol. And thank you Representative D'Amico and the Italian Caucus. Representative Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We do request an immediate Republican Caucus. About an hour and..."
- Speaker Turner: "Republicans will caucus in Room 115. The Democrats will caucus in Room 1... No. Republicans will

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

caucus in Room 115. Democrats will caucus in Room 114 immediately. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. On page 2 of the Calendar, under the weekly order of business, appears House Bill 1155. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 1155, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. The Bill is read for a second time on a previous day. No Committee Amendments. The following Floor Amendments have been adopted to the Bill: 1 through 9, Floor Amendment #14, Floor Amendment #27, Floor Amendment #38, Floor Amendment #40, Floor Amendment following Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration: Floor Amendments 47 through 53, Floor Amendment #47 is offered by Representative Christian Mitchell."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #47 is simply an addition to the current requirement of parties keeping a trans... keeping a record of all firearm transfers. And what it would say is that the party in question, after making a sale, must make the affirmative step of sending that record to the Illinois State Police. This will do two things. It will protect lawabiding gun owners who are making a legal and just private sale and will also provide a disincentive to those illegal straw purchasers and people who want to purchase guns illegally. So, I urge an 'aye' vote, but I welcome any questions. I move for its adoption. Forgive me."

31st Legislative Day

- Speaker Lang: "Gentlemen moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."
- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."
- Bost: "Representative, as we move forward and we work on this, is there any provision for like in family transfers, anything that would... would... Is there a... possibly ability that maybe you don't have to do this if... say, my grandfather was handing that off to my grandson?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Sure. There is no specific exemption for that in this Bill. And I think we've seen cases in the past where, you know, guns that have transferred in the family, legally or not, have not always resulted in the best possible results. So, I'm open to the question, but it's not currently in this bill."
- Bost: "Okay. All right. Also, the question that comes to mind here is it's for 10 years you have to keep this record. Is that correct?"
- Mitchell, C.: "That's correct."
- Bost: "What happens if the person that... that is... if it is a transfer like that, that person dies. Does then the family members have to keep that record or how do we do that?"
- Mitchell, C.: "So... so, in this case the record would be in the... in the hands of the Illinois State Police, who are also required to keep it for 10 years."
- Bost: "Okay. So, it is transferred to the Illinois State Police and they can..."
- Mitchell, C.: "That's correct. So, as soon as the... as soon as the firearm sale happens..."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Bost: "Do you..."

Mitchell, C.: "...it gets a..."

Bost: "...do you have an estimate of exactly how many of these transfers occur?"

Mitchell, C.: "I don't have that number on hand. We do not have that number on hand."

Bost: "Okay. I'm going to... I'm going to assume, if every transfer that occurs has to be documented in this way and it includes families, I'm going to assume that the workload on the State Police is going to be a lot heavier than what you're realizing here. Am I wrong?"

Mitchell, C.: "So... so let... so Representative Bost, what I would say is that this record already has to exist. On any..."

Bost: "No, no, no, not... no, no, what you just said doesn't have to exist. If I, all of the sudden, transfer a firearm or purchase a firearm, and give that tran... give that firearm to my grandson..."

Mitchell, C.: "Uh huh."

Bost: "...I don't have to keep a record and give that record to the State Police at this time. An in family transfer is not recorded at this time. So, if we're saying that this is actually going to occur, and they're going to have to keep those records and keep those records for 10 years, the workload will increase on our State Police, correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "That may be true. But... but they're only..."

Bost: "May be?"

Mitchell, C: "Hold on. But they're only required to retain the record. This record must already exist for any sale of a handgun in the State of Illinois. What we are saying is

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

that they then take the affirmative step to send that record within 10 days to the Illinois State Police."

Bost: "And... and..."

Mitchell, C.: "And the State Police can then use that in their investigation."

Bost: "They must... In what investigation?"

Mitchell, C.: "So what it... what it does, Representative..."

Bost: "Now, wait a minute."

Mitchell, C.: "Hold on. Representative Bost..."

Bost: "We haven't... we haven't committed a crime. So, there's no investigation going on here."

Mitchell, C.: "Representative Bost, what it does, is it takes the burden off of the police having to come to your house and ask for the record, because they already have it.

Because they have the record in hand of the last person who legally owned the firearm."

Bost: "So, here's my question. Going on from there. If you don't send that in, what is the charge?"

Mitchell, C.: "It's a Class A misdemeanor."

Bost: "If it occurs twice?"

Mitchell, C.: "If it occurs... can you repeat the question?"

Bost: "If it occurs twice?"

Mitchell, C.: "Second offense? It's still Class A."

Bost: "Okay. So it's a Class A misdemeanor. And you say that there's not going to be an increased workload for the State Police, yet they're going to be handling all of these transfers that are sent in."

Mitchell, C.: "All they're... all they're doing, Representative Bost, is maintaining that record."

31st Legislative Day

- Bost: "No? Okay. I don't think so. Right now, if a... if a dealer sends this in, those are not just sent in, that they're recorded. There's a process at work that must occur in the State Police... in the State Police."
- Mitchell, C.: "So... so to be clear, what I'm saying, Representative Bost, is... so I understand there'd be a record keeping process. But it is my assertion that that process is going to be far less rigorous than the process of sending a sworn officer out to the home of a private citizen, having them then talk to that person, take that record, and then have to go back to wherever it is they're going."
- Bost: "But... So... So, you're saying... you're saying there's no..."
- Mitchell, C.: "That is a significantly higher level of work than filing a record electronically or by hand."
- Bost: "So… so, listen to what you just said. So, because we didn't increase the workload to the level you're talking about, it's a better Bill because they still have to do more work but just not go out to the households."
- Mitchell, C.: "I don't... I don't think that's what I said. I think what I said is the burden of filing a piece of paper or filing an electronic record is significantly less than having to dispatch an officer every time something like this happens, when a gun is recovered at a crime..."
- Bost: "But you're... but you're still increasing a tremendous amount of work on... on our State Police. Just take it that we are. Okay?"

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Mitchell, C.: "This... this is to... this is to assist them in the investigation of weapons that were used in a crime. Of which..."

Bost: "All right. Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, once again, you... you're going down a path that I have a right, a right, as a person, a law-abiding citizen, to own a weapon. I have a right to hand that off to my child, my grandchild, my brother, my spouse, and I'm going to tell you that in my area, and went through many areas throughout this state, you can... these transfers happen all the time. And so now, we're going to throw an undue burden on a... on our policing agency, so they can shuffle paperwork instead of doing what it is that they're supposed to be doing. Once again, we're going down a path to try to cure a problem that this won't cure, it'll only make it worse. Thank you, Representative, for answering a question."

mank you, representative, for answering a ques

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Phelps: "Representative, is there anything in this Amendment that prevents the State Police from charging any kind of fees?"

Mitchell, C.: "No, there's not, Representative. But there's also... there's also nothing that affirmatively allows them to charge fees."

Phelps: "What happens if I want to give a gun to a family member or if I am a grandfather and I wanted to give a firearm to my grandson or granddaughter, will I still have to go through this?"

31st Legislative Day

- Mitchell, C.: "So... so, you are currently required to keep a record of that transfer right now. What this says is you would then have to take the affirmative step of sending that... mailing that to the Illinois State Police to assist them in the case of any future investigation."
- Phelps: "What if I wanted to sell a gun to a friend, like Representative Bost?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Could you repeat the question?"
- Phelps: "What if I wanted to sell Representative Bost one of my Browning Golds? Does that mean I... he has to register that with the State Police as well?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Representative, could you… could you start over and speak into the mic? I'm having trouble hearing you. I apologize."
- Phelps: "I said what if I wanted to sell a gun to Representative Bost, if we wanted to go duck hunting, and he didn't have one and I wanted to lend one to him or sell... would we have to go through this registration again?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Right. That's a private sale, Representative.

  That's exactly what we're talking about here. And remember, what we're trying to do is to protect the law-abiding gun owners, but crack down on straw purchasers."
- Phelps: "Well, I... I disagree. And to the Amendment. Let me just say this, I don't think it's any business to the State Police what I own. And I don't think any of you would want that either. We already have the FOID card, which means the State Police already know that I'm a gun owner. But what is it do... why do I have to tell them what I own. They already

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

know I'm a gun owner. I shouldn't have to tell them what I
own. I urge a 'no' vote to this."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sente."

Sente: "Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sente: "Can you please tell me if this has a grandfather clause in the provision? Is it just moving forward?"

Mitchell, C.: "I'm not sure I understand, Representative. Are you saying if..."

Sente: "For transactions that have already happened. Would those individuals have to retroactively..."

Mitchell, C.: "It only applies moving forward from the date of the... from the date of the Bills being adopted. It's not retroactive."

Sente: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Kay: "Representative, I'm curious about two things. First of all, after the 10 year lapse period on the registration with the State Police, what happens to those records?"

Mitchell, C.: "There's no longer a requirement to maintain them."

Kay: "Will they be destroyed?"

Mitchell, C.: "I believe that's up to the discretion of the Police Department. They could choose to maintain them; they just no longer have a legal obligation to do so."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Kay: "Well... no, I don't think that's right. Either they're
going to keep them or they are going to destroy them.
That's what... the only... one way or the other."

Mitchell, C.: "Yeah. So, Representative, they have... because there isn't an affirmative statute dealing with this specifically, they would have discretion as to whether to keep or destroy them."

Kay: "And tell me what statute that is."

Mitchell, C.: "It's 430 ILCS 65/3."

Kay: "Okay."

Mitchell, C.: "It's the FOID Act."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you. One last question. Isn't it, in truth,
the purpose of this Amendment to establish a registry?"

Mitchell, C.: "No. Not at all. So, Representative Kay, these records already exist. The parties... both parties are required to keep them, as is right now. Without this bill passing, those records are required to be kept. What this does is say, let's take the affirmative step of sending those to the Illinois State Police, so that you, lawabiding gun owner in this example, aren't having somebody knock on your door when a crime occurs, because it's very clear who was in last possession of that gun. So it gives a disincentive to people to sell guns illegally and straw purchases. And it also provides incentive for gun owners to protect themselves."

31st Legislative Day

- Mitchell, C.: "Firearm dealers are already required to do this.

  We're just trying to apply it to private sales, where 40 percent of all gun transfers happen each and every year."
- Kay: "Well, private sales are... the private cit..."
- Mitchell, C.: "And that's where illegal transfers take place."
- Kay: "Private sales though to private citizens are equating to a registry, in this particular Amendment. Thank you, Representative."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."
- Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."
- Harris, D.: "Representative, for clarity, I think you just said that, under current law, both the transferor and the transferee must keep a record for 10 years. Is that as you understand it?"
- Mitchell, C.: "That is as I understand it. Yes... yes, Representative."
- Harris, D.: "I thought the requirement was only on the transferor, the individual that transferred it and not the individual who received it."
- Mitchell, C.: "You're correct, Representative, I apologize. I just read the statute. It is on the transferor."
- Harris, D.: "So, but this Amendment takes it further and puts the burden on both the transferor and the transferee. In other words, we are adding a burden now on the individual who receives the weapon, correct?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Yes, Representative. That is correct."
- Harris, D.: "Okay, thank you. And even though this is an Amendment to the current statute, I just want to be clear

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

about one thing. When you talk about transferring a weapon, we're talking about the ownership of the weapon, correct? As an example, if I'm out hunting with a friend and my friend says, gosh, that's a great shotgun you have, may I use your shotgun. You can smile, but this is fairly serious. May I use your shotgun and my friend uses my shotgun, and for some reason, like the Vice President of the United States, shoots somebody by accident, and hold it... and there's a police investigation. My friend is using my shotgun. I have transferred that weapon to him. I want to be clear, you're talking about the ownership of the weapon, correct?"

Mitchell, C.: "That's correct. It's not transferred. This applies only to transfer of title."

Harris, D.: "Okay. But we are adding that additional burden that the transferee must keep a record of that transfer, which now currently does not exist."

Mitchell, C.: "That's correct. And send it to the State Police."

Harris, D.: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, welcome to your role now in this never ending play. Do you think that this Amendment conflicts with any of the other Amendments? I'm not even sure how many Amendments there are. Do you know how many of them have been adopted?"

31st Legislative Day

- Mitchell, C.: "This is a stand-alone Amendment, Representative.

  So I don't know the... the affirmative number of Amendments that have been adopted. It's a stand-alone."
- Reboletti: "Right. But we're putting together the jigsaw one piece at a time here. So, there's, I don't know, 25, 35 other Amendments. What's the... does this Bill include the conceal and carry language from Representative Phelps House Bill 997?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Currently it does. Yes, Sir."
- Reboletti: "It does. So, presuming that your Floor Amendment prevailed, and let's presume that all of these other Amendments today, that all the other presenters will share with us today passes, will you be voting for this Bill as is? Do you support this Bill?"
- Mitchell, C.: "I would have to see the Bill in its final form, Representative."
- Reboletti: "I'm saying... I know you've had a chance to review the other Amendments. I'm saying, overall, though, you would be supportive of this, right? It has all these different Amendments that are supposed to tighten up things and protect law-abiding gun owners, you would be supportive?"
- Mitchell, C.: "I... I would need to see the Bill in its final form."
- Reboletti: "What other Amendments would you like to see that haven't already been filed, to ask for your support?"
- Mitchell, C.: "That's not the purpose of this discussion, Representative. We're considering Amendment #47..."
- Reboletti: "No, I realize that..."

31st Legislative Day

- Mitchell, C.: "...and I think we'll see as we can go along."
- Reboletti: "...and what we're trying to consider is a conceal and carry law that will have, I guess, all these other exceptions as to where you can and cannot go and passing a piece of paper to somebody to say I just borrowed you my handgun. The interesting part is, you've exempted cars out of this. So, if I loan you my car, do I have to file any paperwork with the Secretary of State's office? No, right?"
- Mitchell, C.: "No, but if you transfer the title of the car, you would have to. And that's what this Bill is calling for, is when there is a permanent transfer of ownership, when the title transfers, the transferee and the transferor send that record to the Secre... to, I'm sorry, to the Illinois State Police."
- Reboletti: "And at the end of the day, how do… how does this stop the gun violence in the City of Chicago and all around the state?"
- Mitchell, C.: "So, this gets at the regulation of private gun sales. So, there's a myth that what happens is that if I'm going to use a gun in an illegal crime, I get it stolen, but that's only, actually, 10 to 15 percent of guns. Whereas 40 percent of guns that change hands do so on the secondary market. And what this says is, it does two things, Representative. One, it protects the law-abiding gun owner 'cause if they sold this gun and did so legally, there's now a record of them having sold it and who has it, so when it gets recovered at a crime scene, the police know who to go to, to look at that gun. So it protects the law-

31st Legislative Day

- abiding gun owner and it provides a disincentive for people who want to straw purchase guns to do so."
- Reboletti: "Let's presume this Amendment passed. How many additional staff do you think the Illinois State Police would need, as well as, I don't know, computers or anything else, to implement this?"
- Mitchell, C.: "This... this is a passive change, Representative. It says that records which already exist would merely have to be received and stored. So, I can't give you an exact kind of workforce requirement, but I can say that it's significantly less onerous than having to go out during an investigation, send a sworn officer to the door."
- Reboletti: "So, the Amendments are just going to be collected by the Illinois State Police and that's the end of this Amendment, right? I transfer a firearm to you, I fill all the appropriate paperwork out and it goes and sits in a bankers box at the Illinois State Police? That's it?"
- Mitchell, C.: "That's correct."
- Reboletti: "How is that going to help a criminal investigation, Representative? How will that hap... how will that help?"
- Mitchell, C.: "So... so, effectively what happens here is, you can trace, by serial number, the gun back to the last law-abiding gun owner. And a determination can be made, in this case much more quickly, as to whether or not a straw purchase was used."
- Reboletti: "And that goes back to my point, Representative.

  It's going to require additional staff and computers and research. People have to enter these records into a

31st Legislative Day

- computer, right? So people could search for them if they're in the middle of an investigation, right?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Right. So, it's... but it's merely administrative. It's merely administrative and I would argue that, first of all, I don't agree with the assertion that it's going to be this massive administrative burden that's going to take up millions... tens of millions of dollars. But I would also note that given that this would help crack down on straw purchasers and illegal flow of guns to the streets of the City of Chicago and elsewhere, that a small price, which I believe it would be, is a small price to pay to protect the citizens and taxpayers of the State of Illinois."
- Reboletti: "How is this going to affect the illegal flow of firearms from the State of Indiana or Mississippi?"
- Mitchell, C.: "So... so... so, once again, all... for all guns within Illinois, this is going to insist... this is going to assist with the tracking of all illegal guns in the State of Illinois. Now, if you're looking to... to look at Amendments that would... would do more to deal with, you know, straw purchasing from other states and et cetera, I would be more than open to looking at those Amendments with you, Representative."
- Reboletti: "Isn't what you're doing creating a gun registry? Is that fair to say?"
- Mitchell, C.: "No, absolutely not. Once again, this... these are records that are already required. And what this Amendment says is take the affirmative step to send to them to ISP, so that they can use them in investigations, when necessary."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Reboletti: "And... and to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Here we go again. Random Amendments. This was never discussed in the Judiciary Committee at all. Why not? We sat there for three hours last time, we talked about mental health issues. We sat there before and we've had Superintendent McCarthy come down and testify and talk about what he thought should be in a gun safety package. We've had experts. We've had all types of folks from all walks of life come to testify and not one time was this Amendment brought forward, nor were many of these other Amendments brought forward, so we continue the same sham of a process. Nobody even knows how many Amendments have been adopted. Nobody even seems to care. Because I... nobody won't even know if they would vote for this if this passed. The pro-qun people will vote against it and the anti-gun people will vote against it and we have wasted four and five more hours today to get through this exercise in futility. And for what? countdown to Constitutional Carry continues forward without any thought of how to implement that before the Federal Courts just tell us what we should be doing."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Costello: "Can you tell me how this would affect antiques, relics, nonworking firearms, what may be commonly traded as pieces of art?"

Mitchell, C.: "So... so, Representative, I'd have to look. It's my understanding that those aren't... those nonworking antique weapons you're talking about, are... I... I do not

31st Legislative Day

- believe are currently defined as firearms in the statute. They'd have to be able to project a bullet, as I understand the definition."
- Costello: "Okay. I'm not sure I necessarily agree with you, because when I'm reading this, the term firearm is used, in what I would consider to be very loosely. My major, major issue with this, and with this whole situation, and when you get up and say that you're trying to protect legal gun owners, right now, do you think the criminals are keeping track of the guns that they exchange between each other?"
- Mitchell, C.: "Right. So... so that's actually exactly the point of this Bill. So, what we... what this would allow the ISP to do is find the last legal point of sale. And using that information to assist in their investigation, they could then determine if a straw purchase happened."
- Costello: "And what you talked about earlier, primary and secondary sale. So, 60 percent is a primary sale, right?

  The ISP already has those records."
- Mitchell, C.: "Roughly. So, there's already... because it's being done through a licensed firearm dealer there's already an affirmative duty for that dealer to send those records to the state I believe."
- Costello: "So, at some point in time, you can trace a firearm back to the originating owner and then he would be able to tell you who he sold it to, correct?"
- Mitchell, C.: "So… so, currently, for a licensed dealer, yes.

  You can get the first point of sale because there's that
  affirmative step and because they have to keep that record.

  In this case, this would allow us to do the same thing for

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

private sales, to get those other 2 out of 5 guns that currently we can't."

Costello: "Okay. Well, I... I go back to the fact that, in my opinion, this is infringing on the constitutional rights of legal gun owners, someone who has a Second Amendment right of owning a weapon, okay. The criminals, in my opinion, are not keeping track of the guns that exchange hands. I have a really, really big issue with this Amendment in particular. Nothing against you personally, I respect you as a person, as a Representative. I... I request a 'no' vote from everyone of my colleagues, as I do feel that this is an infringement on Second... Second Amendment rights. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell to close."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment. I want to emphasize this is an attempt to do two things. One, to respond to Mr. Costello's point, the point of this is to protect lawabiding gun owners so that if they ... so they don't get caught up in an investigation for something they did not do and had nothing to do with. And secondly, to make sure that we crack down on the straw purchasers that are currently flooding the streets of my district and many other guns. Thank districts with illegal you your consideration. I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor will vote 'yes', opposed 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? Please record yourselves.

Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

are 50 voting 'yes', 59 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'.

And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #48, offered by Representative Ford, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of House Amendment #48. It requires an applicant to train and qualify for the particular firearm he or she intends to carry with his or her carry license. I move for the adoption of House..."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Representative, what happens if you train on one firearm, but decide to carry another that day? Let's assume the firearm you had trained on is not operable for some ins... for some reason, so you want to use a different firearm. Is there a problem with that?"

Ford: "No."

Franks: "So, there's no... there's no penalty if you use a different firearm than the one you trained with?"

Ford: "We... we just want to make sure that the firearm that you carry... that you decide to carry for the day, that you're trained with."

Franks: "So, there's no penalty."

Ford: "No."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Franks: "Okay. So, this is really more of an encouragement to try to train with the gun that you intend to hopefully carry once you get your license?"

Ford: "Correct."

Franks: "Okay. But if you don't, it's no big deal?"

Ford: "One second. You're correct."

Franks: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Representative, is there anything in this legislation that set... deals with a particular gun called the 'Avenger'?"

Ford: "I don't know that."

Bost: "Okav."

Ford: "I don't know anything about weapons."

Bost: "But... but now wait a minute. You're carrying a Bill to deal with guns. I think you should know about guns before you do that."

Ford: "Well, teach me."

Bost: "So, do you know if there's anything in here that says that if I carry an Avenger, should I train with an Avenger.

Is that correct?"

Ford: "That's right. I mean..."

Bost: "And which barrel should I use for the Avenger? Should I use the 410 or should I use the .38 caliber, or the .44 caliber?"

Ford: "Can I just refer to the Amendment and what it says?"

Bost: "Yeah, please, please."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Ford: "And if we could just stick to that and don't ... "

Bost: "Oh, I am sticking to it."

Ford: "All right. So it says, the Amendment says requires an applicant to train with and qualify for the particular firearm he or she intends to carry with his or her carrying license. And that's the best I can do."

Bost: "That... Okay. That's what... that's a problem I see here.

There is a particular firearm called an 'avenger' that has interchangeable barrels. Which particular caliber do I have to qualify with or can I just interchange those barrels on any given time?"

Ford: "So, does it change the firearm?"

Bost: "Yes. It change..."

Ford: "And so..."

Bost: "...it changes... it changes the... sometimes it can change it from a shotgun to a... to a rim fire, to a center fire. It can... it can change this... I mean, it's a very unique weapon. But if I train with that weapon, and certify with that weapon, then can I use all barrels?"

Ford: "Will it be a concealable weapon?"

Bost: "Yes."

Ford: "Okay. So, you should train with every option of that gun."

Bost: "Ahhh, there we go. There we go."

Ford: "That's what you wanted?"

Bost: "Yeah, yeah."

Ford: "All right."

Bost: "So really, does it say that in the language?"

Ford: "Yes, it does."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

- Bost: "Read the language again to me, 'cause I don't think it does."
- Ford: "I'll read it again. Here we go. Okay. Where we at? Okay. So, the Amendment, during both the classroom and shooting range training component required by this Act, to obtain, maintain, or renew a carry license under this Act, the person shall train and qualify with a particular firearm the person intends to carry under the carry license."
- Bost: "Okay. I am telling you that when you change the barrel, it changes the type of firearm that it is. Correct? So, now you have to qualify with every barrel. However, I believe in court you could argue that it's still the same firearm. It's still this same firearm. It has an interchangeable barrel but it's still the same firearm."
- Ford: "Okay. So, we would leave that up to the judge. But it's important to know that my goal and our goal here, everyone shares the same goal, to make sure that card-carrying individuals are trained and able to..."

Bost: "So..."

- Ford: "...use the gun that they are carrying. And, you know, it's so important that law enforcement must train with the firearm that they intend to carry during their duty."
- Bost: "So, here's my question. If I change weapons, I've already got my conceal carry, and I decided to go and let's say I've been carrying a 9mm... 9mm Glock, okay. And I, all of a sudden decide that I want to carry a .357 Magnum. Do I need to go back to the range and recertify with a .357 Magnum?"

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Ford: "So, you would have to, during the renewal of your license, you would have to train with the new gun."

Bost: "So, you don't believe that it... what your language says is, if I all of the sudden decide to carry a different weapon, that I have to go back and retrain."

Ford: "That's correct. We could work together."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman will yield."

Phelps: "Representative Ford, I think you just admitted that in your Amendment, the language, that if you don't carry the gun that you're trained with, and if your gun breaks and you want to go to another gun, then your permit becomes invalid. Is that correct? Can you say that again for everybody to listen? Because I think that's what we're trying to do here. That you're trying, more or less, get rid of that person's permit. If your gun breaks."

Ford: "Well..."

Phelps: "Is that right?"

Ford: "...that's not what the language is intended to say."

Phelps: "Well, can we pull this out and work on that together on this? I mean, I still don't know if I'm going to vote for it, but I just think that we're really doing something here we don't want to go down the path that we're trying to do."

Ford: "The underlying purpose of the Amendment... if we pull this Amendment now, will you support the underlying measure?"

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Phelps: "And I just said that. In all honesty, I don't know if I still can, but I think there's a lot of people here that would make that..."

Ford: "Okay."

Phelps: "I just don't think that's your intent."

Ford: "Well, we have enough time to move and make this better as the process goes on. So, there's no reason to pull it."

Phelps: "Well... like I said, I'd just like to have the opportunity, if you want to call it back today. But I just..."

Ford: "You know, Representative, I've asked you several times to meet with me and to talk to me and let's work together, so that I don't have to offer an Amendment and my whole purpose of offering this Amendment is because you and I have not sat down and talked."

Phelps: "Well... and we did with the task force..."

Ford: "Yes."

Phelps: "...and I appreciate you doing that and I know what the findings were on that. But also, too, let me ask you another question real quick, if you're not going to pull this. If I lose my gun, will I have to take the training again on a different..."

Ford: "No."

Phelps: "So, this isn't going to drive up... 'cause I... I know you said no, but I don't think that's what the language says. I think the language says that I would have to take the training all over again and spend extra money..."

Ford: "No. The answer is no."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Phelps: "Okay. Well, I... I just think this is going to drive the cost up. I think it's going to affect a lot of poor people.

I don't think that your Amendment does what it says and, therefore, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative Ford, my analysis here says that a person shall train and qualify with the particular firearm the person intends to carry. And we can do this just on a yes or no basis. There is a difference between a .40 caliber, a 9mm, a .357. Is that correct?"

Ford: "Yes."

Kay: "And in fact, there are a number of manufacturers that make .40 caliber, .22 caliber, .357, .45 and 9mm. Is that correct?"

Ford: "If you say so, yes."

Kay: "Well, no, I'm asking."

Ford: "I'll agree with you. You... you ask it, yeah."

Kay: "Okay. All right, that's good. So, if I train on a 9mm
Glock, is that sufficient to shoot a 9mm taurus?"

Ford: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. And so that would be the case for .22, .40 cal, .357, and on down the line?"

Ford: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. And if I took that 9mm Glock and I broke it down and I put a different barrel on it... put a different barrel on that Glock, if it's a Gen 4, would I also be able to shoot that gun?"

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Ford: "That question has been asked already and we've debated that and we're going to talk more about that."

Kay: "Well, I ask it in a little different way though because I am a little more specific in my question, I think, than the previous speaker. Would I be able to shoot that gun, because the only material difference would be the length of the barrel..."

Ford: "So..."

Kay: "...the functioning of the gun would not function any
 differently."

Ford: "...right. To the purpose of the Amendment, requires an applicant to train with and qualify for the particular firearm he or she intends to carry with his or her carrying license. There's your answer."

Kay: "Well, Representative, I would... I would ask that you take Representative Phelps' advice and pull this Bill. I think it needs some work only for legislative intent and clarity. You've got about three-quarters of the way there. You have to clean this up about another 25 percent. So, would you pull that Bill?"

Ford: "Is that... are you going to get any votes on the Bill or something..."

Kay: "I can't get you votes..."

Ford: "...on the Amendment?"

Kay: "...but I'm just telling you what you need to get votes."

Ford: "Well, thank you for..."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Harris."

Harris, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor?"

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Harris, D.: "Representative, we are at Amendment 48. And I have to tell you that I have lost track... I'm up here. I have to tell you I've lost track, 48 Amendments. Now yours is a relatively short, simple, straightforward Amendment. And it says that, required by this Act, to obtain, maintain, or renew a carry license. So, 48 Amendments, I'm not sure where we are. If I want to renew a carry license, do I have to go through another set of training? Are... is that contained in the Bill now, or help me... help me understand. Unlike a FOID card, where I just simply mail in my renewal application and they send me a new one. For purposes of conceal carry permit, do I have to go and take new training each time I want to renew? Is that part of the legislation that is in this Bill so far?"

Ford: "So, this is just the Amendment that we... there's no speci... specification as to what type of training, Representative Harris, in the Bill."

Harris, D.: "Well, I know. But your Bill says to renew a carry license."

Ford: "And I'd say..."

Harris, D.: "So, is there a requirement that I... and it's not necessarily contained in your Amendment..."

Ford: "Right."

Harris, D.: "...I'm just curious as what the status of the Bill is. Is there somewhere in the Bill that says when I go to renew a carry license, I have to go for training again?"

Ford: "I'm told that there's two proposals: one that allows and one that does not."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Harris, D.: "That... that have been adopted to..."

Ford: "In the Bill, in the Bill, in the Bill."

Harris, D.: "In the Bill now. So, there's a conflict in the Bill."

Ford: "That's what we're working on."

Harris, D.: "Okay. And you were... you were direct enough to answer the question that was asked previously by, I think the Gentleman from McHenry County, saying if... if I obtain my permit, the first time, by training with, as an example, a 9mm. And then I say, after I get my permit, well I don't like that 9mm anymore, so I'm going to carry a .45, that it doesn't make any difference whatsoever. Is that correct?"

Ford: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "I have to tell you, that begs the question, why do we need this?"

Ford: "So, if you intend to carry a particular gun, then you should be trained with it. The current Bill in its current status does not require this. This Amendment clearly says that if you intend to carry a particular gun, you should be trained with it."

Harris, D: "I... and I follow. But if... if I'm a person who says, okay, I'm going... I'm going to train with a 9mm and as soon as I walk out of that training, even though I've told the State Police that I'm going to train with... with... I'm going to carry a 9mm and I'm going to train with a 9mm, but I really, really want to carry a bigger .45. So, as soon as I walk out of that training, that 9mm gets put into a carrying case, never again to see the light of day, and I'm pulling out that .45. What difference does it make what

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

this language says? And really, it does beg the question, it... this seems to me to have no teeth whatsoever. No disrespect, but it has no teeth whatsoever. And I say, why should it be in the Bill?"

Ford: "It should be in the Bill because this Amendment can also encourage a better Bill. Whether this Amendment is adopted or not, it can encourage a better Bill and it gets the attention of the Bill's Sponsor, that we would like to improve the Bill as much as we can. And so, this Amendment deserves to be voted on favorably, so that we can offer the best and the most safest carrying law for Illinois."

Harris, D.: "I appreciate your answers. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I want to make sure that your language is clear because I know that people have asked you some questions about what you intend to carry. So, if I intend to carry one type of firearm today and I train with that, but then the next day I go and concealed carry with a different type of firearm, am I now in violation of state statute?"

Ford: "No."

Reboletti: "Then what would... what does this accomplish then?"

Ford: "All right. So, it says requires an applicant to train with and qualify for the particular firearm he or she intends to carry with his or her carry license."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Reboletti: "Right. And so, that's my intention today is to carry a .38. The next day, it's a .45. Are you telling me if I train under a .38 I cannot conceal and carry a .45..."

Ford: "No..."

Reboletti: "...under your stat... under this Amendment?"

Ford: "...no."

Reboletti: "So... then what... that's not... you say intent, so really, let's assume that... there's really no criminal penalty to this then, right?"

Ford: "No criminal penalties. But what we're doing is doing the best thing that we can do to answer the Seventh Circuit.

And that is to shape the best Bill for Illinois. And if the police are required to train with the firearm that they're going to work with, then I think that it is most appropriate to consider the same measure for civilians."

Reboletti: "But you're making a presumption that a person's only going to carry... conceal and carry one type of firearm..."

Ford: "No."

Reboletti: "...own one type of firearm and therefore, they're..."

Ford: "No, so..."

Reboletti: "...going to train with that particular firearm."

Ford: "...no. I'm making an assumption that if they want to carry an automatic, then they should be trained with an automatic... caliber gun."

Reboletti: "Well, automatics are illegal, but... I'm still trying to figure out what this does. So, I go and train and I... with what I intend to carry. Within two hours of leaving

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

the training facility, I no longer intend to conceal and carry that. So, what does this accomplish then?"

Ford: "It accomplished that, if a person intends to carry a particular gun, they will be trained with that particular gun."

Reboletti: "How... and how will this be enforced then?"

Ford: "Well, how would it be enforced? Because their license is... it depends on who's providing the training and of course, the law in its full capacity will figure out ways to enforce these Amendments."

Reboletti: "Does this also make a presumption that a person would only be able to conceal and carry one firearm?"

Ford: "No."

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm still trying to figure out exactly what this does. I understand you want training and that you want to make sure that people are going to train with the firearm they're most likely going to carry. But there are going to be some folks who own a number of handguns and they may train and... and qualify with one firearm but have 15 different firearms that they can choose from to carry. So, I don't know what... what problem this solves. That's why I can't support it. I don't... if it had some teeth to it and said, oh, you have to... you have to qualify with certain weapons and if you're not carrying that one, then there's a problem. You violate the UUW statute. That could be different, but I don't know what this really solves."

Ford: "Well, one of the things that I asked the Sponsor of the Bill is to possibly have a list of firearms that's

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

concealable in Illinois that permit carriers could choose from. So, that would be restrictive. This is just trying to make sure that we are being as safe as possible when we enact a law in Illinois. So, simply train with the firearm that you intend to carry. And this Amendment is not going to become the Bill. This Amendment allows..."

Reboletti: "How do we what's going to become the Bill? I have no idea what's going to become the Bill."

Ford: "But do you agree that people should train and know how to handle the gun that they are carrying?"

Reboletti: "I believe that... that somebody is going to conceal and carry should qualify, both in a classroom and at a range. We can agree or disagree on how many hours and how many classroom hours that should be. And I'm going to assume that they are going use a firearm that they are comfortable with... they may carry."

Ford: "Comfortable, comfortable..."

Reboletti: "...that's fine."

Ford: "Now see, that's the difference. When you're training and shooting at paper, you're comfortable. But when the situation arises that you are in a heated battle, you need some training to fall back on and that's what this does. There's no training to fall back on if you are not trained with the gun that you're going to be carrying during conceal and carry."

Reboletti: "Well, I appreciate, Representative, that you're trying to make the streets safer. I'm not really sure how many people were murdered over the weekend in the City of Chicago, but this isn't solving that issue. On June 9 of

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

this year, we'll have constitutional carry, while we dicker around with this particular game and people will carry whatever they want, wherever they want, and however they want. So, we'll probably see Amendment #143 and nobody will know what the Bill really does and nobody will vote for it and we'll be no further ahead in complying with the Federal Court case."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Costello: "And Representative, kind of to Mr. Reboletti's point and I'm trying to understand it myself. Are we talking about calibers? Are we talking about types of guns, i.e., the automatic versus a revolver?"

Ford: "Both."

Costello: "So, if you train with a 9mm automatic, you could only carry a 9mm automatic, not a .45 automatic? You don't..."

Ford: "You can if you train with it."

Costello: "Excuse me?"

Ford: "You could carry whatever you train with. There's nothing that's going to prohibit you from training to carry the .45."

Costello: "But does it have to be the exact weapon. Say the..."

Ford: "No."

Costello: "...a serial numbered weapon?"

Ford: "Absolutely not. And you know, everyone knows that this Amendment, when the Bill... full process takes place, this could be implemented. And if there's a problem that we need

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

to technically make changes, it can happen. So if you are one that believes that a person should carry a gun if they are trained with, then you believe in this Amendment."

Costello: "I could tell you personally from going through military and police training, I... I personally believe, because you asked, you're either proficient with a handgun or you're not. And you're either proficient with a rifle, or you're not. One thing that I would add there is there's different types of ammunition. Different types of ammunition flies differently... you know. So, I personally believe, again, that if you're proficient with a handgun in training, you're proficient with any automatic. You're proficient with a revolver; you're proficient with any revolver. That's just my personal choice. But thank you for the clarification."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford to close."

Ford: "Thank you. I believe that if it's good enough for the police, I think it's good enough for civilians. And I move for the passage... or the adoption of House Amendment #48, please."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 50 voting 'yes', 62 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #49, offered by Representative Arroyo."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

- Arroyo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment... I would like to adopt, Amendment 49. It's a pretty simple Amendment. We would like to... if you're going to have a conceal and carry license, just to only be able to conceal one gun."
- Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. There being no debate, those in favor of the Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 52 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #50, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, after the unfortunate demise of my last attempt to regulate the carrying of concealed weapons in bars and restaurants, I took heed with the advice that was offered from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and we significantly tightened up the legislation. Working with Representative Durkin and the Illinois Restaurant Association, this Amendment would provide that no person may knowingly carry a firearm into any establishment that, as you noted in the discussion, is licensed as a retail liquor license establishment, Section (d) of the Liquor Control Act, extremely limited. This does not preclude the carrying of a firearm into a grocery store, liquor store, does not preclude it carrying into a festival, a fair, or anywhere with a temporary liquor license, a church picnic, special

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

event, wedding, a meat shoot, or any other special or temporary permits for the serving of alcohol. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment.

Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, two questions. And you and I had a debate on your previous Amendment. And we talked about licensed versus unlicensed. So, you've changed that. How does this Amendment differ from the Bill that we were talking about previously, Representative Phelps' Bill, in regard to we're going to lice... exempt the ability to carry in these licenses?"

Williams: "Representative, the... the Bill you referenced provides for a limitation on the carrying of a concealed weapon in establishments which get over 50 percent of their revenue from alcohol sales. So, it is limited to basically bars that have no food. But I would submit to you that, in addition to the fact that there's enforcement issues, knowing exactly how much percentage of... of a bar's revenue or a restaurant's revenue might come from food versus alcohol obviously, that could change from week to week. I would also submit that people can abuse alcohol and it... whether they're in a restaurant or a bar. So, the idea here was to, again, working with the Restaurant Association, preclude carrying of a loaded gun in places where alcohol flows freely."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

- Sullivan: "Okay. So, you believe that the only difference at this point is the 50 percent threshold level. Okay. So, a secondary question. Under what we're talking about, under the Appellate Court ruling, UUW laws have been stayed, thrown out in essence or potentially will be thrown out June 9. Under those laws, you had a right to carry a firearm in your place of establishment, but since we do not have UUW laws and you're making new UUW laws, what happens if the owner of one of these establishments decides that they want to carry a gun for self-protection."
- Williams: "Well, we got into this discussion before when we talked about street fairs and festivals because, under the current UUW statute, you are not able... permit holders were unable to carry. At that time, we kind of used the opposite argument. So, I guess I would say that would be a separate issue. Under this Amendment, it would require another Amendment to restore that, if your premise is correct, which I'm not sure because it seems that we've addressed it a couple... looked at it in a couple of different ways. But in terms of a broad Amendment that would provide for noncarrying... or for carrying of firearms in establishments, I think that's a separate issue and something that we can look at separately, and that sounds reasonable."
- Sullivan: "Okay. So, it's your belief that under your Amendment, you would be precluded from carrying a firearm, but you would... potentially we would have to revisit this on a second Amendment."
- Williams: "Well, I think that is the subject of a current court case that is pending right now after a recent stop that was

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

made to decide just that issue. So, I don't think it's clear at this point whether the UUW laws are in effect or not. I think there's some disagreement on that issue."

Sullivan: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, that brings up the craziness of what we're trying to do here. Right now, this Amendment, if passed and put into law, would preclude an owner of an establishment from carrying a firearm. And... and I realize what the game we're playing right now and that's fine, but let's look at the legislation before us. You're going to tell some person, out in the country that has a liquor establishment, you can't have a firearm in your establishment. That's what you're telling them today. So, it sounds great. And I'm for, believe it or not, I'm for putting in an exemption so you can't carry a firearm within a liquor establishment, if done correctly. And that's the key phrase there, if done correctly. This is not done correctly because of the process that we're unfortunately forced to go through by the Speaker. If we had a fair process, maybe we could have fair discussions, like we're having now. But it's not a fair process; it's a convorted process. We have no idea what's going on. And so you have a conflict here. It's unfortunate, because I think you're on to something, that something that should be in the overall conceal carry Bill, but not like this. For that reason, I'll be voting 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Bost: "Representative, when you were first given your opening speech on this, you said that you and I had a conversation on... and I know that everybody laughs over it but it is real, the meat shoot, the turkey shoots that were discussed and you say that now this is exempted?"

Williams: "This is limited. If you glance at the Liquor Control Act, there are dozens and dozens of different licenses that are issued. So, this applies in subsection (d), which is extremely limited, which is the retailer's license. So, that is for on premise sale and consumption of liquor under that particular license. There are many other places where liquor can be consumed on premises, but they would be subject to a separate license. I doubt the event that your referencing is in, you know, publicly open at all times, just like a restaurant or bar would be. And if you look at..."

Bost: "Actua..."

Williams: "...regulatory structure..."

Bost: "Actually, Ma'am... Okay."

Williams: "I mean, I would pre... I would..."

Bost: "Let me tell you... let me tell you exactly what happens. Crazy Joe's Fish Farm... fish... Crazy Joe's Fish. It is a known establishment in... just outside of Ava, Illinois. Every other weekend, right in the bar, okay, nobody's drunk, falling down, fighting, or anything like that, but everyone comes up and they have specialized... specialized shotguns that they shoot at... well, years ago it was known as a turkey shoot but now a meat shoot because it's not only turkeys they... they go ahead and you shoot at targets

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

and they award you prizes which are meat. Okay. It can be turkey, it can be full hams, it can be all that stuff. They actually sit in the bar, and you go to the back of the bar, and everybody cannot go past a certain spot in the bar with alcohol, but you're within 15 or 20 feet and they go to this window and they shoot out the back window of this establishment. This isn't a new practice; it's been going on for years. Under this legislation, what we're telling them is... 'cause they're knowingly... they're knowingly going in to where they can serve alcohol and it is a restaurant with a firearm. Under this, you would stop that. It is a place out by itself, no one's around, it's very safe. Matter of fact, they have a judge that... that changes the targets over and it's a roped off area. Families go and watch this happen."

Williams: "And that is legal under current law? Under what permit? What license for... do you know?"

Bost: "Because it's not illegal to go ahead and shoot from there and the licensed establishment doesn't have a..."

Williams: "We're talking about the concealed carry of loaded weapons. If there is a target shooting something..."

Bost: "That's not what your language says, Ma'am."

Williams: "...that falls under another area of law. But we're modifying..."

Bost: "Your language says if you knowingly bring a firearm in...
they knowingly bring their firearms in."

Williams: "Well, under current law, you're unable to bring a firearm into those places. So, it appears that..."

Bost: "No, no, no, no Ma'am..."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Williams: " ...your fish market may be in violation."

Bost: "No, they are very legal with what they are. The local police have checked it all out and they've been legal for years doing what they do."

Williams: "Well, they might be in violation. I'll get you the citation, if you'd like, after the debate, or I can get it to you now. But there is an explicit prohibition unless it's an unloaded weapon under current law. So, you may want to look into that a little bit more."

Bost: "Well, it's unloaded when they bring it in, but they load it at the back window."

Williams: "Then it appears to be in violation of current law."

Bost: "Maybe I'll need to change that. Would you join with me in changing that?"

Williams: "I think we're talking about a different issue now. I don't think it makes sense to mix alcohol and loaded guns. Although, I am willing to greatly scale back to... to accommodate some of your concerns, which I will note, also includes no prohibition of having the gun in the parking lot. So, if you're running around, doing your errands, with your gun, put it in the parking lot and go into the bar or restaurant and consume alcohol."

Bost: "Do you... I'll talk to you later about other issues."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Kay: "Representative, I'm curious about your Amendment. I'm
more curious, I guess, about the street fairs and the
street markets, which we have pretty common in southern

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Illinois. Would somebody be able to carry in that particular situation?"

Williams: "This Amendment does not apply to any special or temporary liquor license. And those are not permanent liquor establishment as licensed under Section (d). The type of event you're discussing is licensed under the special use permit license for the sale of alcohol. That's subsection (g). My Amendment only addresses only subsection (d), so the answer is no."

Kay: "Ann, I'm sorry I can't hear you. I'm sorry."

Williams: "The answer is no."

Kay: "So... so just to be clear, if there's a street fair, there's a vendor who's selling alcohol, duly licensed, he has a firearm, that's okay?"

Williams: "Under this Amendment, it does not address those sort of situations."

Kay: "It does not address it?"

Williams: "It does not. This is limited to bars and restaurants licensed under Section (d) of the Liquor Control Act, for the sale or consumption of alcohol on premise."

Kay: "Since it does not, and since street fairs are a pretty big event in southern Illinois... probably central Illinois likewise... I think it would be advisable for you to pull this Bill and work on that particular piece."

Williams: "Well, I would be very interested in pushing a restriction on street fairs and festivals. My district, we have several each weekend in the summer. So, I'd be happy to work with you on a separate Amendment in that regard."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Costello: "And Ann, I'm not going to ask you about meat shoots."

Williams: "Bring it ... bring it on."

Costello: "I just want... want to bring one point for clarification. I think this is something that is somewhat addressed in 997. And I think in 997, it says if over 50 percent of the business is from serving alcohol, but I will also tell you, I think it's extremely, extremely important that the owner of an establishment has his Second Amendment right to protect himself. So, I would just tell you, I think we're really, really close on being able to work on this and I would love it if you would work with Representative Phelps on this Amendment. Because, I think we're close to being able to getting to something here that is supportive of."

Williams: "Well, I might suggest a premises carry for an owner might want... you might want to apply a broader than this Amendment, this is very narrow. It only applies to bars and restaurants. So, that is if we get to the point where UUW is not enforced. But again, there's, despite the representations earlier, I believe currently they are still able to carry within their own establishments under current UUW statutes that are still in effect. But I hear what you're saying and I would support a separate discussion about that."

Costello: "Okay. Thank you."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

"To the Bill. Last week, we had this conversation, I think it was two weeks ago, over the language in your original Amendment. Extremely vaque and it was a bad moment on the floor and I think a lot of people understood that. But I think that the way it's drafted right now is common sense and I personally believe that alcohol and guns are not a good combination. But I also had a discussion with many restaurateurs in the State of Illinois a few weeks ago. They're concerned, also, if they're going to be required to have guns on their premises, this is going to affect their dram shop insurance and that it's not going to be a negative... it's going to be an impact which is going to force them to pay higher premiums. So, think about that when you're voting on this. But I just don't believe that guns and firearms should be part of any type of carry and conceal permit. I would encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #51, offered by Representative Dunkin."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #51 simply requires an individual to... who owns a... requires a handgun carrier licensed to maintain a minimum of \$1 million of insurance. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, could we hold the noise down in the chamber? Ladies and Gentlemen, could we hold the noise down in the chamber? Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would request that somebody bring the trophy to the floor."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Representative, is this insurance cape... are we capable of purchasing this insurance from anyone at this time?"

Dunkin: "Yes, we are."

Bost: "That's not what the insurance people have told us."

Dunkin: "Well, I don't know what insurance people you're talking about, Representative. You can buy gun... handgun insurance today, on an umbrella policy. You know that, Representative."

Bost: "A million dollars?"

Dunkin: "The question, as I..."

Bost: "Okay. All right. Now... now, let me ask... your Bill says \$1 million. Am I correct?"

Dunkin: "Yes, Sir."

Bost: "Okay. Can you purchase a million dollar policy for carrying a handgun today, umbrella policy? It's a jobs Bill, correct?"

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Dunkin: "Yes. Yes."

Bost: "It's a jobs Bill. Nobody has this job now, but we're going to go out and see if we can't find somebody who wouldn't actually take this job, because as of right now, there's not an insurance company that will cover this."

Dunkin: "You can buy it today, Representative."

Bost: "No, not according... not according to the insurance people. Representative..."

Dunkin: "What insurance people are you speaking with, Sir? This is a large industry. I'm saying, yes, you're saying according to a number of folk you've talked... you've spoke to."

Bost: "Okay. I will make this statement and feel secure in saying that statement that as of right now, we've not found anyone who will insure this particular hazard. Okay, because that's what you do, you insure based on hazard. And it's based on... on... you know, they've got to calculate that all out. And... and so, because of that, there is no one that actually carries this. Okay, here's my question. Even if someone did have it, do you have any idea what the cost would be?"

Dunkin: "Yes."

Bost: "Really?"

Dunkin: "In New York, it's... it's roughly 1600 to about 2 thousand dollars. That's in New York... the State of New York."

Bost: "Sixteen hundred... \$1600 to \$2,000 for what? For what?"

Dunkin: "For an annual policy of \$1 million for a gun owner."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Bost: "Okay. In this floor, we try not to discriminate against..."

Dunkin: "And of course, it would vary depending on how responsible the gun owner is."

Bost: "We... we... and let's say that it is that much. On this floor, we try not to discriminate against someone based on the fact of their income. Is that correct?"

Dunkin: "That's a subjective question. I have no idea if we discriminate..."

Bost: "We try... we try..."

Dunkin: "...or not on someone's income."

Bost: "...not to.

Dunkin: "Well..."

Bost: "Well, okay."

Dunkin: "...you can argue one way or the other."

Bost: "Mr... Mr. Speaker..."

Dunkin: "I try not to."

Bost: "...to the... to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I would argue that it's very clear that if you are a person who would like to have a conceal carry permit and if you have to meet these obligations for insurance, under no circumstance would you be able to afford it if you had a low income. So, basically, this is saying that the only people we want to be able to conceal carry are people with a higher income. This is... this is one of the most ridiculous ones we've seen come forward."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Reboletti: "Representative, I'm assuming that you want... if we pass a conceal and carry Bill, that you want people to be able to defend themselves all throughout the state. Is that a fair assessment?"

Dunkin: "That's correct."

Reboletti: "However, if you're saying that it costs \$2 thousand or whatever the policy amount would be, wouldn't that preclude most folks from being able to protect themselves, because they can't..."

Dunkin: "Well..."

Reboletti: "...afford \$2 thousand a week?"

Dunkin: "Representative, that's speculative. Let me clarify on the... the range. First off, those responsible gun owners... because they'll pay a much... a much lower rate. I'm giving you a range and you hit the top of the range. You know, so it could go anywhere from 500 to about 2 thousand dollars, depending on your, you know... sort of... sort of your record of responsibility, et cetera. For example, I mean... you... you and I drive cars, right?"

Reboletti: "That's correct."

Dunkin: "And if you don't have a lot of speeding tickets, a lot of accidents, your premiums tend to be much lower."

Reboletti: "And there's comprehensive..."

Dunkin: "Am I correct?"

Reboletti: "...and there's liability, right?"

Dunkin: "Sure.

Reboletti: "Okay."

Dunkin: "Absolutely. And so..."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Reboletti: "Does this have a demarcation for that? Is there a liability insurance and a comprehensive insurance?"

Dunkin: "And we would... we would make that a part of this legislation. So, here's what... here's what... here are the questions that need to be asked: why a million dollars? Do you want to ask that question, Representative? 'Cause I can tell you why. It's not at random. You have the State of New York, the State of Connecticut, the State of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, California, they're all in this direction of a million dollar policy. And the reason for that, Representative, and I say this respectfully, is because it costs almost a million dollars to deal with someone who is shot up with no insurance in the public facilities... excuse me, a public hospital facility. And so, that discussion is not talked about. Who pays the cost... for example, in the City of Chicago, where I'm from, out of all city residents where there's been murders in my respective district, very actively on the southern end of the district, and a gunshot wound victim, you know when the bullet pierced one lung, it can go to the heart, it can go to the spleen, to the gall bladder. That's about a million dollars. And you know who picks up that cost, Representative Reboletti? We do, as taxpayers. And so all this is... this simply sets a framework for those individuals who have been irresponsible and someone to pick up the cost. Now, if you report your gun stolen or lost, that's another... another situation. But right now, it's anybody, at least where I'm from, who has a gun, and someone is injured, I'm not talking about the murder... a murder or

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

death, but someone is injured, this particular insurance would kick in. Just like we have when we own a pool, when we own a fur coat, car insurance, apartment insurance. This is a deadly instrument that should be and is, in a lot of cases, insured. Up to a million dollars would really, really help the more responsible citizen."

Reboletti: "Representative, I... let me interrupt your filibuster for a moment. Does the insurance policy that you claim is available in New York State cover willful acts?"

Dunkin: "I'm sorry, can you repeat that, Sir?"

Reboletti: "Does the insurance policy that you claim is available in New York cover willful acts?"

Dunkin: "Representative, the legislation that's pending in New York, by... sponsored by Representative Oti... Ortiz, is looking... is seeking to do the exact same thing that I'm doing. As a matter of fact, three years ago..."

Reboletti: "It's not a law yet. It's a piece of legislation."

Dunkin: "Correct. It's a proposal."

Reboletti: "Oh, so there is no law in New York that says you have to buy insurance for your firearm."

Dunkin: "It's a... most of those insurances are umbrella insurance. But right now, because of this legisl... this proposed legislation about three years ago... it's inspired California, Maryland, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, New York, to do the same thing, so that's..."

Reboletti: "Well, I guess a good start, Repre..."

Dunkin: "...the path that we're headed on with this aggressive violence with guns."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

- Reboletti: "Maybe you could agree with me to repeal the income tax so that people would have more money so that they could maybe buy a gun policy, because they're not going to be able to do so because of the 2 percent income tax increase. Representative, do you really believe it's constitutional to be able to require that you would insure a constitutional right?"
- Dunkin: "You know, Representative, I wish I could sit here...
  stand here and tell you that I'm a constitutional authority
  or a lawyer that focuses in that particular area, but I'm
  not. What I am clear on, is the district that I represent
  and the city where I represent and the county where I
  represent, there are real consequences when individuals who
  have no insurance and they go to the emergency room at any
  one of the hospitals and the cost, and you talk to any ER
  professional... professional, will tell you there's up to a
  million dollars in costs of emergency room treatment."
- Reboletti: "Representative, I have no doubt that that's the case. And when Superintendent McCarthy testified, he wasn't concerned about the law-abiding gun owners, he said that, those who have FOID cards. He was concerned about gang members and I have no doubt that the gang members aren't going to conceal and carry with a licensed permit and an insurance policy. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "To the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Dunkin, I know, has brought this before. Remember, this makes it mandatory to get an insurance plan if you're able to conceal and carry. There... there is no insurance policy

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

today that does anything with intentional acts, covers any type of intentional act. The Department of Insurance that I've talked to and many people in the in... insurance field have said to create this type of plan it would cost the individual \$1.5 million to implement and create this type of plan, a million dollars for the rider and \$500 thousand to implement it. I urge a huge 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Kay: "Representative, have you ever sold insurance?"

Dunkin: "No, Sir."

Kay: "So, you probably are not familiar with the fact, as we stand here today, that there are no companies that provide this coverage, is that correct?"

Dunkin: "That's not true. Representative, that is not true."

Kay: "Does State Farm provide it?"

Dunkin: "That is not true. The Illinois Association..."

Kay: "Does State Farm provide it?"

Dunkin: "...the Illinois Insurance Association, they say that they sell this today. Now I can't speak specifically of a particular provider, but gun insurance is sold today."

Kay: "Well, is it sold on a retention basis, a deductible
basis? How does that work?"

Dunkin: "Representative, the... just like accident insurance. You know... the... look, can I cite this for you? I mean, I know... at face value, this looks as if it's something trivial. It's not trivial. The United States Conceal and Carry Association recently began selling, what it calls, Self-

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Defense SHIELD. If you are forced to justify the use of your gun in self-defense, according to its website, again the United States Conceal and Carry Association, who are very supportive of guns, as we well know, Self-Defense SHIELD would help you pay for your expert pro-Second Amendment lawyer, by reimbursing your legal defense expenses, following your acquittal. You know, it's a system that simply... if you have to use your gun in self-defense, and someone's injured or someone's killed, you have at least a million dollars insurance to defend your Second Amendment rights of using your gun to protect yourself. Now this is according to their website. New defense shield policy..."

Kay: "Are you saying then, an unintentional act would fall into that category?"

Dunkin: "Yes. A negligent act would."

Kay: "Well, unintentional is not necessarily negligent, but I'm
 not going to debate that necessarily with you."

Dunkin: "Unintentional is negligence, right?"

Way: "But here... let me... let me just say this to you. I think you're... you're not quite right about the companies that sell insurance here, respective of what you told me. It's not a standard policy. In fact, it's not a policy that even is conceived in writing in contract form by the companies that I spoke to. And I want to be fair with you, I haven't talked to all of them, but I will. The truth of the matter is that what you're trying to do here is diminish Second Amendment rights through an insurance policy and I will tell you this, you may be right, there may be a few million

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

dollar cases from a gunshot wound, but I will say to you that they would be far and few between, because a million dollars covers far, far more severe medical conditions than what you're speaking of. But I would advise you, just in passing, that you make sure, when you bring these Bills, that you check and see that these insurance companies provide the policies that you say they do, because the ones I've checked with, so far, don't. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Dunkin to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill here is an issue... again, on the face of it, may seem as if it's egregious or over the top, but the fact of the matter is, we are headed in the direction of law-abiding citizens having insurance to protect themselves negligence. If you drop your gun, and it goes off and someone's injured or someone's killed, a million dollars of insurance would help defend you or have a source of re... or dollars to help offset the cost of that negligence. Just as if you were... you were driving a car, if you lost your fur coat, or your diamond ring or God forbid, someone gets hurt or drowns in your swimming pool. So, we're looking at, I just looked at some other... some other articles on here, and it can go anywhere from \$200 on up. Currently, this insurance on guns is offered as an umbrella policy. What I'm saying is to bring it up to a million dollars, it's a trend that six other states are headed in and we need to look at it very seriously. We have not... not New York, not Maryland, not Connecticut, not California, the

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

murder rate. Now, if our murder rate in Chicago alone was over 513 individuals, you can imagine that over four times as many individuals were shot in the City of Chicago, over four times those... the individuals. And the majority of those, two-thirds or three-fourths of those individuals, had no insurance. They walked into an emergency room and quess who paid the up to a million dollars in emergency care? We did. All of us here in this room, citizens across the state, had to reimburse that particular level 1 trauma center to administer care for that particular individual. This is a first step. This is a reality. We're headed in this direct... in this direction anyway. And if you can insure your house, your car, your boat, your swimming pool, gun insurance is just around the corner and we should be responsible and take the lead, right now. I would ask and encourage all of my responsible colleagues for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 34 voting 'yes', 74 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #52, offered by Representative Martwick."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is Amendment... as presented, would amend the provision in prior Amendment 27.

In Amendment 27 there is a provision whereby local police

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

can... local police authorities or the county sheriff can object to the issuance of an application. In that instance, the... the licensed applicant would then go before administrative hearing where the burden would be on the local police department to pro... approve by clear convincing evidence that the applicant was not worthy of getting a license. This Amendment would create, in the instances where an applicant has five or more arrests in the last seven years or three or more arrests for gangrelated offenses, would create an automatic objection to the issuance of the license and this would not be a denial of the license, it would just ... it would just trigger that administrative hearing. And... and just further... in... in the event that this automatic objection, if the local enforcement still has an opportunity to withdraw that objection and... and then remove ... right. And even if the applicant was denied the license in the administrative hearing, there would still be a further appeal process. And that's all I have for now."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, generally with your Bill, I agree with and I'll be voting for it, or your Amendment, but I do want to point out one piece that potentially is going to be problematic for many people in this General Assembly and potentially you might want to remove that from the Bill, should it move forward on whatever Bill that we have that

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

moves forward. On your Bill, on page 1 line 6 and 7: 'if an applicant has been arrested five times or more for any reason within the past seven years'. Can you explain that?"

Martwick: "Yes. It's... it's for any crime... any... if... if the applicant has five or more arrests for any crime in the last seven years, what this would do is just simply trigger an automatic objection. The police already have the right to actively... proactively file an objection, but in these instances, it would... five or more arrests..."

Sullivan: "So..."

Martwick: "...it would create an automatic objection."

Sullivan: "Yeah, so it's pretty straightforward. So, if someone has the right of conscience to object to anything and they get arrested for it, five times in the last seven years, they're going to be... this provision is going to kick in."

Martwick: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "So, if a union organizer was at a site and they walked into the road and they were told not to and they're arrested five times in the last seven years, this provision would apply."

Martwick: "That's correct."

Sullivan: "And we could go on and on and on about that. Do you know where I'm going with this? And maybe we want to tighten this up or remove that provision because, the gang provisions are good. We like that. And you might actually see that in some comprehensive Bill, should the Speaker ever want us to run a comprehensive Bill. Someday you might see that because I think that's a good idea and I'm going

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

to support your Amendment but the underlying premise still is the same on those one provisions. Do you agree?"

Martwick: "Yeah. I... I understand your point, Representative.

But what I'm saying is, is that, you know, in the first
year there's an expected 400 thousand applications. And
what this..."

Sullivan: "I think that's about double what it will be, but that's fine."

Martwick: "Double. Yeah... well, I honestly I don't know, but that's a number I had heard."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Martwick: "But what this does, is that simply takes... it draws a line. And it says that what we're going to do, in order to catch people... catch the egregious instances where... so that this doesn't slip through the cracks... that they're going to be automatically going to a hearing. They are not going to automatically be denied a license..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Martwick: "...they're going to be having a hearing. And the police have to prove by... local law authority has to prove by clear and convincing evidence that this person is not entitled to a license. So, the presumption is that they are still entitled to the license and if you're talking about the case that you're talking about, where this is for union organizing and they've been arrested by peaceful protest on a picket line, the police can withdraw that objection."

Sullivan: "It... it could be for anything, obviously."

Martwick: "That's correct."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

- Sullivan: "That's... that's the basis of this but you're asking for one more hoop. I just think there's unintended consequences who you're trying to capture in this provision, more than the provision itself. That's the point I'm trying to make here. Yes or no?"
- Martwick: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question?"
- Sullivan: "Do you believe that there's unintended consequences in that provision of people that you probably would not want to capture or have to go through the rigmarole, or one more step to get a conceal carry permit?"
- Martwick: "No, I... I don't think that there are unintended consequences. This is... this is five or more arrests. So what this is doing is it's drawing a line that says if you are in that category, five or more arrests in the last seven years, then you will go through this process, whereby you'll receive a hearing. The presumption, even if you have, let's say, 27 arrests, the presumption is that if you have no convictions, that you're entitled to this license. But we're going to put you to a hearing and the police are going to have an opportunity either to present their reason why you shouldn't have the license or they can withdraw it if they find that you are..."
- Sullivan: "So, Representative, you don't... you don't find it odd that you're going to add one more hoop, one more harassment of gun owners, union organizers, or people rights of conscience, you don't think that's harassment?"
- Martwick: "Yeah. I... I disagree with you there because this is not one more hoop. This hoop already exists, Representative. This... this is in the provision that was...

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

that was put forth by Representative Phelps. It was supported by the NRA. This is a provision that allows the police officers to object to any applicant. All I'm doing is I'm creating a condition where there's an automatic objection."

Sullivan: "Representative, I disagree with you on this one provision. That your second part of your Amendment is something that I hope will be in any potential conceal carry bill. So, I will be supporting it, but I think you really should revisit that aspect of it, should this actually get on a Bill somewhere down the line. Thank you."

Martwick: "I appreciate your thoughts. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Costello: "In... in general, I'm in agreement with this, as well.

What I would ask, is there any type of appeals process?"

Martwick: "Yes, there is an appeals process. If you... any applicant who is... were an objection, where the local law authority makes an objection to the issuance of the license, there then would be an administrative hearing. If the applicant is denied the license at the administrative hearing, he would then be entitled to appeal that... that ruling. So, there is... you can appeal the denial."

Costello: "Okay. And that was my question. Thank you."

Martwick: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

Franks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Franks: "I'm reading the language here, and I want to be very clear on this. This does not require any convictions, does it?"

Martwick: "It does not."

Franks: "And you mention that there was an appeal process, but I'm reading the Bill and I don't see any review mechanism. It seems that it's only the sheriff or the municipal law enforcement agency who would make that determination. What if you disagreed with that determination?"

Martwick: "Representative, I believe that... remember, I am creating an Amendment. I believe that that language exists in Amendment 27 which was..."

Franks: "Was that adopted?"

Martwick: "...which was... yes. That was Representative Phelps'

Amendment to the conceal and carry Bill that we adopted two
weeks ago."

Franks: "Well, I'm concerned how this is drafted. I could think of all sorts of mischief. Because if the sheriff is the one who's reviewing it... what would happen if the sheriff, for instance, harassed an ex-girlfriend and picked her up every Friday night for two months and arrested her. And she was... you know, all these things were thrown out, but she got arrested anyway and then he's the one who has to review whether she can conceal carry in order to protect herself from this guy."

Martwick: "And I agree with your concerns. I think that would be a real problem, except the hearing is not before the local enforcement. Local law enforcement is the one that makes the objection..."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Franks: "Right."

Martwick: "...and it's their burden of proof to prove that the applicant should not be granted a license but they are not sitting in judgment of it. It is an administrative review that's, again, set up in Amendment 27."

Franks: "But where is the review? Let's assume that the sheriff says that this person should not get a license. Then, the license is denied unless the person goes forward and appeals the decision, correct?"

Martwick: "Well, that is the ..."

Franks: "So, you've switched the burden of proof."

Martwick: "No. No. The burden of proof... the burden of proof is on the local law authority to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the applicant is not worthy of a license. There's an administrative review and I believe, if I remember my reading of Amendment 27, it would be set up by the State Police and administered by them. But this is an administrative hearing and then there would be a right to appeal that decision of that hearing."

Franks: "Well, why did you choose arrest instead of conviction?

'Cause I can think of lots of instances where people can get arrested. I could get arrested here on the House Floor if I start screaming and throw a box of Kleenex. And you could... I could be arrested. I could be arrested after Mr. Lang's medical marijuana Bill passes and I leave my medical marijuana card in my van and I forget as I'm walking around and somebody arrests me for carrying marijuana. I could get arrested for conscien... being an objector. I mean, think of Muhammad Ali. He's a... I could think of all... lots of reasons

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

people get arrested, but not convicted. So, why are we using an arrest standard instead of a conviction standard?"

Martwick: "Well, that's a very good question, Representative Franks and if you'll allow me, I'll give you an answer."

Franks: "Thank you."

"This Amendment began after I had a meeting... an Martwick: advisory meeting with residents of my community and it was attended by representatives of the Chicago Department. And one of the instances that they brought up, when they talked about this, was that a person is only precluded from having a license if they have a conviction. And what they said to me was, they said that we have a known person in our community that has 27 arrests. Those 27 arrests have almost exclusively been in the company of known gang members and have been in the... and convicted felons, but yet, this person has never been convicted of a crime. And they looked at me across the table and said, is this the kind of person that we want to be granted a license to carry a gun? And what I would say to you, Representative Franks, is that I respect what we are trying to do here with, you know, conceal and carry. And I think that it is incumbent, in order to protect the rights of the law-abiding citizen. And it's incumbent upon us to make sure that those sorts of people aren't erroneously granted a license so that they could do harm with it. That protects not only the general public, but the law-abiding citizen, who would abide by the law and carry peacefully."

Franks: "And I agree with you. I agree with you a hundred percent. I just think this is sort of a clumsy way to get

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

there. Wouldn't it make more sense for those folks to do an affidavit and provide it to law enforcement and then give the sheriff or the municipal law enforcement folks the ability, then, to object and that way we don't use this sort of amorphous standard. But that way there could be some determination, there can be some discovery, there can be some observance and that way, we can let law enforcement do their job. Why don't we empower the citizen to object to the local law enforcement then let them make a determination?"

Martwick: "Well, that's exactly how the law is... would be written in Amendment 27. There is that provision for local law enforcement to object. What I'm doing is I'm creating an automatic objection in the instance of five or more arrests in the last seven years or three or more gang crime-related arrests in the last seven years. What this does is that it takes that person who's got 27 arrests and doesn't allow them to slip through the cracks. It says you're going to go for a hearing and... and it's going to take those people, put them before a hearing. There is a presumption that they are entitled to the license until it is proven by clear and convincing evidence that they're not entitled to it."

Franks: "But wouldn't... wouldn't you agree that three gangrelated arrests are a lot different than five arrests for
not showing up to court for a bill that you didn't pay to
the local water company and then they haul you in on a body
attachment, because that's arrest. Don't you think there's
a heck of a difference between someone who doesn't pay his

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

bill five times than someone who is with a gang for three times?"

Martwick: "Well, I would say that that administrative hearing should allow that person to get through and get their license. Although, I would also say that a person who is arrested five times in the last seven years we... I think it's incumbent upon us to say that before this person carries a deadly weapon, that we should, at least, take a look and see if they have the ability to make good decisions."

Franks: "But you have that ability now. If we... under the Amendment #27, when that becomes law, we will have that ability. But I think this is sort of mean-spirited towards poor people who may not be able to go to court and afford something and get arrested for a civil matter and then not be able to get a... purchase a firearm based on civilly not paying a bill. So, I just think this is drafted too broadly. I think if you look at possibly gang-related, there'd be a much stronger one. But the way this is drafted, I think it's too broad."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick to close."

Martwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I request an 'aye' vote on this. I... I think that if we take a look at this, this is taking a provision that's... that is already in Amendment 27, sponsored by Representative Phelps and all we are doing is we creating an automatic objection. That person that receives this objection will still get a hearing where they are already presumed to... to be entitled to this license and

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

only by a showing of clear and convincing evidence would they be denied. There's already a provision that would allow the police, or the local law authority, to withdraw their objections to this. This will catch the people that shouldn't have been given the license in the first place. This allows us to catch those that would slip through the cracks and would not only harm our fellow citizens, but would also affect the rights of law-abiding citizens to exercise their rights under the Second Amendment. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "Floor Amendment #53, offered by Representative Drury."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury."

Drury: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 53 is not about guns. We've been hearing lots of Bills here about guns. Amendment 53, everybody, is an Amendment that's offered to establish common ground and build foundations upon which everything else that we've been discussing will be built upon. For weeks this House has been divided over which Amendment's going to pass and which Amendment isn't going to pass about guns. And we've been trying to define the scope of the conceal carry Amendment. But one thing that we have overlooked the entire time is the fact that Illinois is in

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

absolutely no position to implement a concealed carry Bill as it stands. The NRA asked for an auditor report in 2012, which was completed in April of 2012 and that report found that Illinois is in absolutely no position to administer its FOID system. What Amendment 53 does is give the State of Illinois the time it needs to implement a concealed carry Bill and build all of these Amendments we've been talking about upon that. If we don't do that, we're building a house upon a faulty foundation that's going to sink on its own weight. I ask for the adoption of Amendment 53."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "To them to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I've got to know Representative Drury pretty decent here in the last few weeks and talked to him a few times, and we got more discussions to go but this has everything to do with guns. And out of respect to the Sponsor, I just want everybody to realize, we are under the gun, so to speak, with the clock because the Seventh Circuit of Appeals has issued a mandate that Illinois has to pass a reasonable concealed carry Bill within 180 days. We have got to get something done. If they're not ready, they better get ready because June 9 is the deadline. So, this is nothing more than a stall tactic and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

- Reboletti: "Representative, I know that you were at the hearing... actually this is one of the few Amendments that might have actually been discussed in a substantive committee. Wasn't there an issue with how the circuit clerks were treating the dispositions of mental health cases, each one treating it differently. There was different issues laid out by the circuit clerk of DuPage County."
- Drury: "There was an issue. I'll agree with that, yes."
- Reboletti: "Right. And so, you're saying that only... in your Amendment, that only three circuit clerk offices were complying and that... that's not a fair assessment. Is that... is that correct?"
- Drury: "No. What the Amendment says is that the Auditor General's report found that only three were complying. I think compliance has come up since the Auditor General's report, which shows us that if we actually make a concerted effort, we can get that number closer to a hundred percent."
- Reboletti: "I have no doubt we could do that in a substantive piece of legislation and I've talked to my circuit clerk about that, as I did during the hearing. Why... does the circuit clerks association want to be involved in this debate? Have you had any conversation with them?"
- Drury: "You know, I don't think it's a matter of whether they want to be involved in the debate. They're involved in the debate. Right now, there are people getting guns who everybody agrees should not be getting guns. Even Mr. Vandermyde of the NRA agreed to that. This was his report.

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

The fact is, is that when, I think it was Mr. Kachiroubas testified in front of the committee, what we learned was that all he needed to do was give his judges a form that they can fill out and they could be in compliance with this and that they weren't doing that. And so, whether the clerks want to be in compliance, that's not the issue. They need to be in compliance because there are people out there who everybody agrees should not have guns and they're ruining it for everybody who actually is fighting for this right to have guns because Mr. Vandermyde agreed to that too. Nobody wants these people, who we're talking about, that this Amendment is aimed at, people who are... have known mental incapacities, no one wants them to have guns. But right now, the way the system is set up, they have them."

Reboletti: "Rep... Representative..."

Drury: "And all this does is give the time... give the time to allow the Illinois State Police, the circuit clerks, and the Department of Human Services, time to catch up and allow everybody to implement a Bill that we all can live with."

Reboletti: "Okay. First... first of all, Representative, the idea that the circuit clerks aren't complying is false. And I talked about that during the hearing, that there was now, I think there's 20-some odd circuit clerk's office that are sending the dispositions, but that some of the circuit clerks, like DuPage County, say that the language does not allow them to forward a mental health disposition to the State Police. I think you and I could agree that we could remedy that pretty quickly and take the Illinois

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Association of Circuit Clerks out of this Amendment, almost immediately. The second question I have for you is, how can the Illinois State Police tell us what they're able to do when the Governor keeps taking money away from them to implement the FOID card system, let alone a conceal and carry permit? How would they ever send us... assuming that other Amendments would pass, they're going to be filing bankers' boxes full of transfer papers and then they'd have to look at all of those and then look at your Amendment. And they... what would they tell us, that they're unable to issue a conceal and carry permit?"

Drury: "The Illinois State Police, my understanding, is behind this proposal. And what this does is give us time to find the necessary remedies to the issue that you're addressing, which is, why is the FOID system so broken? Why will the conceal carry system be so broken? And give them time to implement a better system. But simply to say we all agree that the system isn't working, but we don't care and let's just add on to it, I think that that would be irresponsible of this General Assembly."

Reboletti: "I... and to the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, there are different things that we can... and approaches we can take to make sure that the FOID card system works, that it simply takes all the information that's available from all of the law enforcement databases and takes in all of the mental health records, but we can't pretend that it has every piece of information ever. We want to have as much information as possible. Why we would involve the circuit clerks, the State Police, and the Department of Human

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Services into the mix is a little disconcerting to me because we can fix all of this stuff, right here, right now, but not this week because I have no idea how many more weeks we're going to be continuing at this process. This, again, is another Amendment that did not make it to a substantive committee for debate. As the Amendments did not make it to the debate... to a substantive committee. So, again, we're going to continue on this same path of... now we're on 53, then we'll move to a different House Bill and at the end of the day, this Bill will fail because it will never receive 60 votes. It may not receive 6 votes because nobody will even know what's in this legislation any longer, each Amendment changing the previous Amendment. And so, this has absolutely done nothing for the public safety of the people of the State of Illinois. It's not reducing the murder rate in the City of Chicago. It's not making anybody safer. And the game should stop now."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, I'm just a simple country boy from the suburbs. Maybe you could explain to me how your Amendment will interact with the... the court opinion that gives us to June 9 to pass a conceal carry bill?"

Drury: "The Seventh Circuit rule, and we keep hearing about this, I'm glad you asked the question, Representative, because this is very important, because there... there's been a misunderstanding about what exactly is required by the

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Seventh Circuit. The Seventh Circuit has simply said that Illinois is given 180 days to craft a new gun law that will impose reasonable limitations, consistent, consistent with public safety and the Second Amendment, as interpreted in this opinion, on the carrying of guns in public. The Seventh Circuit also stated in its opinion that Illinois has a lot of options for protecting its people from being shot without having to eliminate all possibility of armed self-defense in public. This Bill is consistent with the two dictates of the Seventh Circuit. It allows a new gun law to be crafted with... within 180 days. This law does not prevent a Bill from being enacted within that 180-day period. It allow... it does not eliminate all possibility of armed self-defense in public. In fact, all of these issues about 'shall' carry, 'may' carry, clips, those issues will still go on. This doesn't stop that. And it allows Illinois to protect the public by requiring known deficiencies in our FOID system to be fixed before any concealed carry permits are issued. All this does is impose a reasonable limitation, just as the Seventh Circuit said we can do. It allows us to keep the public safe. And it allows us to sleep at night without blood on our hands."

Sullivan: "So... so, Representative, getting to the fundamental of how you construct a Bill and, like I said, I'm just a simple country boy from the suburbs, this is just adding to what is the underlying Bill. And do you have any belief that the underlying Bill's going to pass?"

Drury: "Sir, I'm asking for Amendment 53 to be adopted. And I believe that everything that we've been talking about here

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

shows that this is worthy of this General Assembly's consideration. And that if we are going to move any Bill out of this General Assembly, that we need a provision as similar or exactly as in Amend... as we have here in Amendment 53; otherwise, as the Auditor General found, we are not only endangering the people of the State of Illinois, we are endangering every person in the United States of America because of our broken FOID system. And I can't imagine that anybody sitting in this chamber wants to have that on their back, endangering every person in the United States of America because our system is broken and we're in such a rush to implement a Bill based on a faulty foundation."

Sullivan: "So, Representative, in your world of, I believe you're a former assistant U.S. Attorney, could you explain to the Body what constitutional carry would mean and what the effects on the State of Illinois would be?"

Drury: "As a prosecutor, we didn't really deal with constitutional carry. What I do know is that this Bill doesn't get us to constitutional carry. What this Bill does is it allows us to implement a law before June 8; it doesn't stop that from happening and it allows the Illinois State Police, the Department of Human Services, and the Clerks Association to certify that they're complying with the issues that we all agree are problems. That... it's the one thing, I think in the last month or two months that I've been here, that everyone agrees on. The FOID system is absolutely broken. This is something that we agree on. And this... all this does is give us the time to fix it and it is

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

consistent with every single word that was issued by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals. This is a no-brainer for us. It's a no-brainer."

Sullivan: "So, Representative, not being a lawyer, my version, or what I believe constitutional carry and maybe 'cause you are a prosecutor with worldly views and the Constitution behind you, evidently you could explain to me a little further, should we go beyond January... June 9 what would happen. So, what happens to UUW laws? What happens to our ability to carry under the constitutional carry theory?"

Drury: "I'm... I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question."

Sullivan: "So, repeating, me not being a lawyer and you being a prosecutor and understanding the Constitution much better than I do, of course, if you could explain to the Body coming June 9 when constitutional carry is the law, what that means for everybody. What... what... what does that mean that I could do in regard to carrying a concealed weapon or not a concealed weapon?"

Drury: "See, I... I think that we're ships passing in the night,
Representative. Because constitutional carry, however
you're going to define it, we're not there. We're working
on a Bill that gets us there and this Bill actually gives a
solution..."

Sullivan: "Representative..."

Drury: "...to prevent us from..."

Sullivan: "...we're... we're two ships passing in the night 'cause this Bill that we're debating has zero chance of becoming law. No chance. Would you agree with that?"

Drury: "I think that's an opinion that you have, Sir."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, that's probably a well-versed opinion, I would say. But the idea of the cir... of the courts and what they said was, they're going to stay our UUW laws until June 9, give us 180 days to come up with something that is constitutional, which this will never become law. We all know that. So, come June 9, what happens? You... you must have an opinion in all your years of experience as a prosecutor. What happens?"

Drury: "What happens if we don't... we don't implement any law before June 9?"

Sullivan: "Sure."

Drury: "If we don't implement any law before June 9, we're going to have to take a close look at what the Seventh Circuit says. But I... we're just not there. I mean, that's a defeatist attitude. The way I look at it as, Sir, is that this proposal, the proposal that is in front of us right now, Amendment 53, which is the only thing that is being debated right now. Amendment 53 gets us to the point where we could implement; we can discuss whatever Bill it is that you want to discuss or anybody else wants to discuss. But the fact is, to discuss all of these Amendments without having a foundation to build it upon is... it's silly. We all agree, this isn't something that... that... we're on the same side of this. I... I want a Bill in place before June 8 or June 9. I think you want a Bill in place before June 9. All this says is, let's fix the system and put in place the protections that the Seventh Circuit said are necessary. Let's protect the public. They didn't say that any Bill... that we have to put everything into place. It says that we

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

can have a Bill consistent with public safety. And that's all that this Bill is doing and it's absolutely consistent with what the Seventh Circuit ordered in its opinion."

"Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, as I apologize for the banter but I'm trying to get to the point here of constitutional carry is upon us. We're wasting our time debating Bills that will not become law. The Representative's Amendment, should it become law, will force a constitutional crisis on June 9. That's the point that I was hoping that the Gentleman, that is a prosecutor, would understand. Clearly, he does not. Nobody wants constitutional carry that wants safety in Illinois. We should have restrictions on constitutional car... on carry laws. Even those of us that are avowed Second Amendment right supporters believe there should be some restrictions. We had a chance. House Bill 148, Representative Phelps's Bill. He said back then, it's not going to be the same Bill. But Representative, to now push Amendment 53 that says we're going to push this off two more years will create a constitutional crisis in Illinois. That's the point I'm trying to bring up. You obviously didn't see it, and that's fine. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill is not very well-advised. It's going to go against the court opinion that we must do something by June. I am, as many of you know, a staunch Second Amendment supporter. I would like to see a comprehensive concealed carry Bill passed that has reasonable restrictions. Nothing that we have done is reasonable or could pass constitutional muster. So, at some point, Mr. Speaker, it'd be nice to sit down, as

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Representative Reboletti has said, sit down and try and put something together 'cause the clock is ticking. June 9 is upon us and at that point, we do not want to go to constitutional carry. I know there probably are some people that do, but those of us that want safety and responsible gun ownership would like to get a comprehensive Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, C.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Mitchell, C.: "So, to be clear, Representative Drury, what you're saying here is not that you want to push off conceal carry, but that you want to make sure that when the Bill gets implemented, we are in compliance with the report that questions the safety of our current system. Is that a fair characterization?"

Drury: "That's absolutely a fair characterization. My Bill does not move us anywhere near a constitutional crisis like the Representative just stated."

Mitchell, C.: "So, to the Bill. I rise in strong support of this Amendment. What we have right now is an Auditor General report that says, at present, only 3 percent of circuit clerks are reporting people who have been adjudicated to have mental health issues to the ISP. That 85 percent of calls into this system are presently unreturned and that only one in three cards that has been revoked are being returned to ISP. So, not by the definition of some liberal blog or some left-wing group from Chicago, but by the definition of the very statute

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

with current volume, not counting volume that would be increased once we pass a conceal carry law, people who are not supposed to have firearms would get them. So, I... I urge a 'yea' vote on this Amendment. And I think it's very important for our public safety, in the streets of my district and elsewhere. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

Costello: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury yields."

Costello: "Thank you. I just... I keep hearing FOID brought up in this debate and I think it's very important for people in this chamber to understand, we have the most restrictive policy in the State of Illinois. That I'm aware of, there are only two other states that have anything similar to a FOID system, that's New Jersey and Massachusetts, by memory. I would tell you, the other 47 states that don't have any type of system similar to ours have concealed carry and seem to do a pretty good job with it. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Drury to close."

Drury: "Members, this Bill protects the public safety. There's a report from our Auditor General, an independent report, that has found that because of the… because of the poor way in which we are implementing the FOID system, we are jeopardizing the public as a whole, and not just the Illinois public, the entire United States. This Bill does not create a constitutional crisis. What it does is it gives us the time to implement a law before June 8, as the Seventh Circuit has required and then it says that we will not issue a permit until the known deficiencies in the

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

system are taken care of. This is something that we all agree on. These are people with known mental disabilities, mental impairments, that should not have guns. And this basically just gives us the time to fix the system that's allowing them to have guns. This Bill should pass 118-0. I know it's not going to, but the fact is, this is not a controversial Bill. It doesn't come close to constitutional fear mongering that we've been talking about. I absolutely understand what this Bill does, despite what the Representative from Mundelein just said. This Bill saves lives and we want to be able to kiss our kids goodnight. We want to be able to sleep at night. We want to be able to go to bed at night knowing that Illinois doesn't have blood on its hands because we refuse to act. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 48 voting 'yes', 62 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Bolin: "No further Amendments. No Motions are filed."

Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. The Chair recognizes Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Sacia: "Ladies and Gentlemen, joining us in the gallery today above my side of the aisle, is my good friend, a retired State Police officer, a long-time member of the Illinois

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

State Police and currently a member of the Carroll County Board, Mr. Joe Payette. Would you acknowledge him, please?"

Speaker Lang: "Welcome to Springfield. Chair recognizes Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Davis, W.: "Ladies and Gentlemen, obviously we've been having a lot of fantastic conversation about guns and other very sensitive issues here in the State of Illinois. But I hope that, despite all of our tough conversations, hopefully Members of the chamber and anybody listening will take the opportunity this evening to join me for what I encourage you... or ... will tell you is a fantastic night of entertainment. I'd like to invite you to something that we call stone jam. Many of you have been there before. It is tonight, in case you didn't know. If you're looking for some great music, great conversation, then please join us tonight at 406 E. Adams, any time after 8:00 and hear the music stylings of a gentleman named Mike Fountain or affectionately known as DJ MF. So, I hope that you'll all join me tonight so we can put some of this conversation behind us, for a few hours and enjoy ourselves. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

- Moffitt: "I just have a final reminder. Tomorrow morning, 7:30, in the Stratton cafeteria, the Fire Caucus will go over some Bills, do some other business. So everyone got a letter on it and is invited. Fire Caucus breakfast, tomorrow morning, 7:30, Stratton. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading, there appears House Bill 2494. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2494, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Second Reading of this House Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. And on the same Order, Mr. Clerk, appears House Bill 2586. Please read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2586, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. And proceed please to House Bill 2830... 2836, Mr. Clerk. Please read the Bill. 2830, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Bolin: "House Bill 2830, a Bill for an Act concerning State Government. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions are filed."
- Speaker Lang: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "The 3:00 committees will now be meeting at 4:15. The following committees are meeting at 4:15:

  Agriculture & Conservation in Room D-1, AppropriationsElementary and Secondary Education in C-1, Insurance in

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

Room 114. And Transportation: Regulation, Roads and Bridges in Room 413. Meeting at 5:15 is the Public Utilities Committee in Room 413. Once again, that's meeting at 5:15 p.m. tonight."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk Bolin: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 164, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer. House Resolution 166, offered by Representative Golar. House Resolution 167, offered by Representative Brady. And House Resolution 170, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Leader Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, March 20 at the hour of 12:30 p.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til Wednesday, February 20 at the hour of 12:30 p.m."
- Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 3623, offered by Representative Arroyo, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. This is referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 165, offered by Representative Berrios. House Resolution 169, offered by Representative Hatcher. And House Joint Resolution #30, offered by Representative Kay. These are referred to the Rules Committee. There being no further

31st Legislative Day

3/19/2013

business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."