19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

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 February 25, 2013: recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 164; recommends be adopted, referred to the floor are Floor Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 to House Bill 1155; recommends be adopted, referred to the floor is Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1209."

Speaker Turner: "House will come to order. All Members in their seats, please. We'll be led in prayer today by Pastor Shaun Lewis... we should 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 Ford. Members and guests are asked to remain from starting their laptops, turn off all cell phones and rise for the invocation and Pledge of Allegiance."

Pastor Lewis: "If you'd bow with me in prayer. Father in Heaven, the Book of Proverbs likens wisdom to a woman crying out in a busy street for someone to listen, but no one stops. And because each is chasing after silver and gold, they're the lesser things in this world. Proverb... Proverbs reminds us, blessed is the one who finds wisdom, the one who gets understanding, for the gain from her is better than the gain from silver and her profit better than gold. The gain of having more money can't compare to the

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

gain of living wisely. And my prayer, today, is that as all of us are tempted to chase after the silver and gold and lesser things, we would be reminded of these words from Scripture and chase after the wisdom that's found only in Your word. May all of us who are here for us... may all who are here pour themselves into managing our state. Thank You for each of them. Give them courage to do their job well. Comfort and protect their families as they're away from home today. In Jesus' name I pray, Amen."

Speaker Turner: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Welch."

Welch - 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: "...Call for Attendance. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record reflect that Representative Jones is excused today."

Speaker Turner: "Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is... really sounds good to say that to you. On the Republican side of the aisle, Representative Schmitz is excused today."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you. The Clerk will take the roll. 116 Members present, a quorum is present. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "State your point."

Lang: "I just want to say how great it is to see you up in the Chair, Sir. My feet thank you."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Lang. Representative Ford."

Ford: "Well, I, too, want to have a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Mr. Representative."

Ford: "Well, you look good up there. You sound great. And I have one question. How long have you been practicing this with your father at home because you're doing such a good job? I mean, I really appreciate you being up there. Congratulations, Leader Turner."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Ford. Representative Bost."

Bost: "Well, I was actually just wanting a... a point of personal privilege. I didn't realize that... that Mr. Mapes had to come back before you could speak. That... that's funny. I... But I... for a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Turner: "Please state your point, Mr. Bost."

Bost: "First off, let me say that it is good to have you there. I also want to say, and we've probably said this out, with anything that I direct toward the Speaker's podium is not towards you personally. Okay? And... and just so you know, there was a time in 1997 that I would have liked to have made your dad Speaker, not just to stand there, but to be the Speaker. So, it's wonderful to see you there."

Speaker Turner: "Thank you, Representative Bost. Mr. Reis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Reis: "Inquiry of the Chair, Sir?"

Speaker Turner: "State your inquiry, Representative."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Reis: "I think we're all cognizant that the Speaker made orders of the week. And I was just wondering if you could get us a definition of what 'orders of the week' mean? Could you check with the home..."
- Speaker Turner: "Call of the parliamentarian. Representative Reis, pursuant to the Rule, Speaker has the ability to establish the 'order of the week'. Representative Reis."
- Reis: "Do you know what the orders are this week? Now, I've talked to a lot of people and no one can remember the last time we had orders of the week. So, I was trying to get some clarity from the home office as to what 'orders of the week' are and how that's going to play out."

Speaker Turner: "We'll keep you informed, Representative Reis."

Reis: "Can I place my order?"

Speaker Turner: "Sure."

Reis: "He said yes."

Speaker Turner: "Absolutely."

Reis: "He said yes."

Speaker Turner: "You can place it. Representative Bost."

- Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There any... we would ask for immediate Republican Caucus and if I'm incorrect, we will be going to Room 115."
- Speaker Turner: "The Republicans will caucus in 115; the Democrats in 114. You should expect to return to the chamber about 1:30. Thank you. House will be at ease."
- Speaker Lang: "The House will be in order. Members will be in their chairs. Under the weekly order of business, on page 2 on the Calendar, there appears House Bill 1155. It's Speaker Madigan's Bill. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Clerk Hollman: "House Bill 1155, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendments 1 through 27 have been approved for consideration. Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps on Amendment 1."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to House Bill 1155 is the… more or less just sets up the title and the framework for the concealed carry Bill. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Lang: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, is this the beginning of the...
filling in the shell Bill?"

Phelps: "Yes, it is."

Reboletti: "And what does this Amendment do exactly?"

Phelps: "It mainly just creates the Family and Personal Protection Act."

Reboletti: "Is there a commitment from the Chair or from the Speaker that your Amendment #27 will be called today after we go through the panoply of 26 other Amendments?"

Phelps: "That is my understanding. Time... time willing I... that is my understanding that we talked about in caucus. Yes."

Reboletti: "So, that will be... That's a 'yes'?"

Phelps: "That's the way I understand, yes, Representative, the best I can and I..."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Representative."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "There being no further debate, 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? Representatives Jakobsson and Yingling. Please record yourselves, Members. Please take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Reboletti, for what reason do you rise?"

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order."

Speaker Lang: "Please state your point, Sir."

Reboletti: "Under House Rule 18(g), I move to discharge HB997 from the House Judiciary Committee. Under House Rule 54 paragraph (a)(2), all Motions are assigned Standard Debate status and I wish to debate my Motion. Upon the conclusion of the debate, I ask for a recorded vote on the Motion to Discharge. Under Rule 49 in Article IV, Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be by a recorded vote whenever 5 Representatives so shall request. There are at least 5 Members on my side of the aisle that wish for a recorded vote on a Motion to Discharge House Bill 997 from the House Judiciary Committee."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, concerning Mr. Reboletti's Motion, I support the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Lang: "So, Members, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 997 be discharged from the Judiciary Committee?' Those in favor will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. We'll give the Clerk time to put this on the board. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. So, the question is, 'Shall the... shall we

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

discharge House Bill 997 from the Judiciary Committee?' Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This Motion requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Marcus Evans. Representative Golar. Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 101 voting 'yes', 15 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion carries. Mr. Clerk, please place House Bill 997 on the Calendar, on the Order of House Bills-Second Reading. Returning to House Bill 1155, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Zalewski, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

Zalewski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. Floor Amendment #2 simply says that under our statute prohibit... the law will prohibit carrying any firearm into a preschool, elementary school or secondary school and the property will include the school property, surrounding buildings, sidewalks and parking lots adjacent to or near the school. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Representative, will this also apply to private schools?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Franks: "It's not listed though, what I'm reading the Amendment verbatim. It does not specifically say private schools and, typically, when we deal with private schools, we… we list them specifically. Is that... was that a drafting oversight?"
- Zalewski: "In the… the language I read is that no person may knowingly carry a firearm in any preschool, elementary school or secondary school or any portion of any school building or school property. Representative, I think that's pretty comprehensive. The… the statute's clear that a school is exempted from this particular sta… from this particular Amendment."
- Franks: "And if a school is in someone's home, how would that work? Let's assume you have a preschool in your basement and you ha... and you're a gun owner and you keep it in the gun safe in the attic. Would... how would that work?"
- Zalewski: "I... I believe it's the intention of the... of the... it's my intention, and the intention of the Amendment, Representative, that, yes, if a school is contained and it's licensed in someone's abode, that, yes, that would... that would be included."
- Franks: "Our analysis seems to say the opposite though, Representative. And I'm looking at the pink sheet that was handed out to the… at least the Democratic Caucus. I don't know if the Republican Caucus received something similar. But it says if the preschool is operated out of a home, the homeowner may possess a firearm if it is properly stored in a locked container. So, is it your contention that that's not the intention of the way the Bill is drafted?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Zalewski: "From my understanding of the existence of... I had misunderstood your earlier question, Representative. My understanding of current law, which we're trying to reinforce with this statute, is that there's a child under the age of 14 in the home, there's a responsibility upon the gun owner to ensure that the weapon is... is locked, unloaded and not immediately accessible."

Franks: "But if that home is also the site of a preschool, would there be an exemption for that homeowner to still have a gun?"

Zalewski: "The answer to that question is yes."

Franks: "Okay. Now, Representative, we're the last state in the country that does not have concealed carry. So, we have 49 other states that we can learn from. I'd like to know how many other states have this prohibition."

Zalewski: "The school prohibition, Representative?"

Franks: "Yes, Sir."

Zalewski: "Representative, I can't speak to all 49 other states and what's... what specific exemption is in that... in their statute. I will tell you that there's a federal prohibition on carrying a loaded weapon on to school property or in... and into a school zone. And we, in our existing Act, the UUW statute, have a prohibition against carrying a loaded and accessible weapon into a school zone."

Franks: "I'm not disagreeing with that. But I... I just... I guess my issue is we're doing this and I'm... and typically what happens when we have Bills that come to the floor is that they're vetted in a committee and these questions are asked. I know there's been subject matter hearings on this

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

issue, but I don't know how many folks from the General Assembly were there. I don't know what questions were asked and these weren't vetted as far as I know because oftentimes we get Amendments or Bills that don't make it to the floor because of the committee action. I look at what we're doing now as being almost a Committee of the Whole. So, that's why I'm trying to ask these specific questions that I would assume that people would be asking in committee, if they had the chance. And I... I'm not trying to hold you to a different standard that I plan on asking the next 27 Amendments on."

Zalewski: "So... so, Representative, my answer to you is I did sit through both of those committees..."

Franks: "Okay."

Zalewski: "...and, you know, we had a... we had what I consider to be a lengthy discussion on the constitutional aspects of Heller, of the Seventh Circuit's opinion on what we're allowed and not allowed to prohibit, and I think a reasonable restriction, as permitted in the Seventh Circuit's opinion and in Heller, likely, is... is not allowing a fire... loaded weapon on school property."

Franks: "I'm not questioning... I agree with you 100 percent, Representative, there is no constitutional prohibition whatsoever from putting this in. I agree with you. All I want to say is we have an opportunity, now, to create and to craft a Bill that could be the model for the country."

Zalewski: "Sure."

Franks: "So, I'd like to learn from the mistakes of what other states have done and take the best practices of those and

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

adopt them. So, I'd like to know is how many other states have this. I... I tend to think this probably makes sense, but I don't know how many others are doing this and why, and have they not used it in other areas and why."

Zalewski: "Representative... Representative, I don't have a specific answer for you on whether our exact language has ever been used in another state..."

Franks: "I'm not asking about the exact language."

Zalewski: "And... and, Representative, that's as good of an answer as I can offer you. If you have a... if you don't believe that this particular Amendment is a reasonable restriction, your option is to vote 'no'."

Franks: "No, that's not what I'm asking about. Let's not turn it into that. Let's not denigrate. Let's keep the discussion at the appropriate level."

Zalewski: "Sure."

Franks: "Because I think this is too much... this is too important of an issue and I tend to agree with you on this. But I'd still like to know about best practices 'cause we're going to have 27 more things we have to ask and I'm just doing this as a precursor for the others who are going to be presenting so we can educate us here. Because we're asked to vote up and down, we're not being asked to have a discussion and then maybe vote next week. You're asking us to vote right now. So, I'm hoping other people are going to be asking other questions and..."

Zalewski: "So..."

Franks: "...then we'll talk."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Zalewski: "To answer your question, your specific question, Representative, I'm told most every other state has a similar, if not exact, prohibition against carrying into a school or school zone. I will say that, again, I believe it's a reasonable restriction we're putting in place with Floor Amendment #2."

Franks: "I'll continue to listen. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Bost: "Representative, in your… and I know that this is just Amendment #2… we're… we're dealing with Amendment #2… and… and I don't know if you're like this or not, sometimes people like to read the end of the book. Have you read Amendment #27?"

Zalewski: "Yes."

Bost: "Okay. Do you not believe that Amendment #27 covers this as well?"

Zalewski: "No."

Bost: "Well, I have... I have a tendency to disagree with you on that because I think Amendment #27 does cover this. I don't think there's anybody in here that wants to endanger children or all of a sudden by voting 'no' against your Amendment, oh, we're... we don't want to protect our school zones. That... that's not the case. I think it needs to be very clear, as... as the former Representative said, that this is very serious. Whatever we're doing here, and we're the last state to work on this type of legislation, and hopefully get something passed. Now..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Zalewski: "Can I... can I..."

Bost: "...I believe that to... yes."

Zalewski: "Just to your specific question, Representative. I agree with you. I think there's an important distinction between Amendment #27 and this Amendment."

Bost: "Okay. All right."

Zalewski: "Amendment #27 is permissive in nature and allows the school to make that determination. Floor Amendment #2 is more compelling. It says, that you shall not bring a weapon into the school. I just wanted to make that clear to you."

Bost: "Okay. I... I believe that in the existence, wi... or the... with 27, wise minds will prevail and allow this to be a sensible piece of legislation if we adopt 27 and not this. But that being said, there are some other questions I have, not only on this Amendment, but other Amendments to come. There's some very, very unique language in this Amendment and Amendment 2 through 17. And in there they quote... and I don't know that I have ever been on this floor and read a piece of legislation that actually quotes Supreme Court decisions. Can you tell me why that might be put in there?"

Zalewski: "So, I... I think out of an abundance of caution,
 Representative, we felt it was wise to address the court's
 ruling."

Bost: "Okay. My... my only thought is, is that, you know, I mean the courts obviously know what they ruled and why they ruled. To... and I just thought it was kind of a waste of space, but we did it for 17 of them so that's kind of... That's just my opinion, for what it's worth. I know a lot of people don't care about my opinion and that's all right

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

too. But let me... let me clarify one more time and then I'll turn it over to the other people that have questions 'cause I know there's a lot of them. All of these Amendments, as they come up, let's stay away from viciously attacking someone, saying, oh, you don't care about school children; oh, you don't care about... you know, you aren't doing that. Okay."

Zalewski: "Okay."

Bost: "But I'm... I'm just saying for the record. Each one of us are very concerned about how this is going to come to pass. Many of us also believe that the language that has been worked on over and over again by Representative Phelps for many years, and myself for many more years, and others who have came and gone from this chamber, to make sure that this is done wisely. And I think a lot of these Amendments, I feel, are being put out there so that we just have Roll Call votes on it and I hope that that's not the path we're going down. And I hope that... that constituents, and I believe they will, will understand that each one of us are concerned about each one of these areas but we've got to make sure that this is a Bill that is workable and does what it's supposed to do, which is allow law-abiding citizens to bear arms. Okay. And... and so, I'm not going to support this because I believe that the same... a very wi... a wiser vote would be to support Amendment 27. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Reis: "Representative, I believe your Bill says adjacent to or near..."

Zalewski: "Correct... correct."

Reis: "...a preschool."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Reis: "What is 'adjacent to or near'? Has 'near' been defined in legislative definition?"

Zalewski: "I... I think..."

Reis: "Yes or no."

Zalewski: "So, Representative, the answer to your specific question about a definition of 'adjacent or... or near' is no. There's no specific definition."

Reis: "You know, we pass a lot of Bills here, some we agree with and some we oppose, but at least the legislative language is spelled out. And that's what's so crazy about the way we're doing this Bill, is we don't even know what the definition of these words are. We can't even argue about the definition to see whether or not we want them incorporated into this particular Bill."

Zalewski: "So, Representative..."

Reis: "Well, you were... you were asked if a school means 'home school'? We don't know because they're not defined."

Zalewski: "Well, Representative, I know what adjacent or near means and..."

Reis: "What's 'adjacent' mean, 10 feet..."

Zalewski: "Next to."

Reis: "...20 feet? 20 feet? What's 'near'?"

Zalewski: "Near means near. You're talking that we're creating a statute here and it's... if it were vi..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Reis: "But is it 50 feet or a hundred?"

Zalewski: "Representative, let me finish my thought. If it were violated in a court, there would be a finding of fact as to whether the person was adjacent or near to the school. So, the question of, you know, yeah, whether or not you understand whether you're adjacent or near a school, to me, if you're near or adjacent a school, you shouldn't be carrying a firearm. It's pretty simple."

Reis: "But your definition of 'near' may be a thousand feet, and someone who's used to carrying a gun in downstate Illinois or another state, that 'near' may be 250 feet. So, my... my point is, is there's many things in here that aren't defined. We don't know what a 'school' is. There are some schools that want to have armed guards or principals carry guns. Will your Bill say that they can't because this says nobody can carry a gun? Are they exempted out?"

Zalewski: "Schools that wish to have an armed guard in front of their doors?"

Reis: "Or in their school."

Zalewski: "Are they exempted from my Amendment?"

Reis: "Yes."

Zalewski: "So, the answer to that specific question is yes.

There's... it's my understanding there's a reference to a subsection that if an armed guard is positioned at a school, that that armed guard will be exempted from the statute."

Reis: "That specifically is said in the Bill?"

Zalewski: "The subsection (b), Representative. It's on line 12 of the Amendment... first page of the Amendment. There's a

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

cross-reference to the Agg UUW statute and it's located there."

Reis: "Okay. You got one of them anyway. Representative, but... for what the reasons that have been said before, I'm going to oppose your Amendment. I think we're going around this backwards. We're trying to hodgepodge and fit pieces together that may fit, that may not fit, that may be defined, that aren't defined. I think we need to start out with a... with a Bill and debate it, talk about Amendments inserting into a particular Bill in the right appropriate places. So, with that in mind, I will not be supporting your Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

"To the Amendment. I think there's been a lot of Phelps: discussion about exactly what the language is because, as you know, this is also in 997, which we will be hearing in Amendment 27 later on today. But that 's... what we believe is the definition is way too broad. You're talking to what Representative Reis said, adjacent to and/or near the facility. So, that could be ... and a judge ... that could be defined as a half a mile, a thousand feet, we don't know. So, what I would say today with all these Amendments envision a map of the State of Illinois. Each one of these Amendments, that prohibits these areas, are like red spray paint. So, you take that and you count all those facilities in your community and then you draw a big red circle around that and at the end of the day, if we pass these Amendments, the whole state's going to be red. You're not going to be carrying anywhere. So, we think that this takes

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

away private property rights to our owners and we want to definitely vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Will Davis."

Davis, W.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield for a brief question?"

Speaker Lang: "He will yield."

Davis, W.: "So, based on what was being said about an area, we have something called school zones, like you can't speed in a school zone."

Zalewski: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "Does this Amendment match what will be considered to be a school zone?"

Zalewski: "It's very similar, Representative. And again, there's a symmetry between Federal Law and what we're proposing in Floor Amendment #2."

Davis, W.: "Oh, okay. So, you're basing it on a... a federal standard?"

Zalewski: "It's very close to a federal standard,

Representative."

Davis, W.: "Very close to a federal standard, okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski yields."

Durkin: "Representative, we all kni... we all know why we are here because of what the Seventh Circuit had issued back in December. I would like for you to let me know whether or not the Attorney General of Illinois plans to appeal the decision to the United States Supreme Court. Last week, the

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Seventh Circuit ruled en banc that they would not take up the opinion, so there's really only two things left: to do nothing and let this decision stand as it is, or the case will move forward. I think that would be important for our... for this discussion as we move forward. Are you aware of whether or not there is going to be further action by the Attorney General Office?"

Zalewski: "No, I'm not aware."

Durkin: "All right. I've asked that question yesterday. I hope to have some type of response today. It is ... I think it'll be very guiding for us to see whether or not, again, whether or not there will be a file for certiorari or appeal, whether that there will be some type of request to stay the enforcement. I'll... hopefully, I'll have that answer by the end of the day today. Just some comments. We're going to go through this process and I think we all, before everybody gets too excited, I think you need to understand that this is the beginning of a process. So, when we... if anything does vote out of this chamber today and moves over to the Senate... I've been around here long enough... they are not going to accept everything that we send over there in the same form and... and send it on to the Governor, if were possible. This is the beginning of a process of a negotiation, but I think we also need to realize, is that really a question of whether we should, we must pass a Bill which is consistent with what the Seventh Circuit has ruled. And, I think, it's as very important that people think about some of the language in which they... they've said in the opinion, is that the opinion states

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

that the right to self-defense goes beyond defending one within their home but also outside their home. That's directly out of the opinion. And they, also, state that we obligation to impose reasonable limitations consistent with public safety in the Second Amendment, as interpreted in this opinion. So, I think we need to be aware of that, but I also don't know if people understand what the consequences are if we do not comply with that opinion. There were some statements made a week ago in committee by some gentleman that it really would have no affect upon our gun statutes. I disagree. It's important that we bring resolution to this matter and we do consistent with the opinion, that is if the Attorney General chooses not to take this action further, but I feel very strong and fairly confident that if we do not pass a Bill that is consistent with this opinion that is... we were... we are dealing with that there will be no unlawful use of a weapon statute or an Agg UUW statute in which local police and prosecutors will be able to investigate and prosecute. And I will tell you the consequences of that are far more damaging than anyone could ever imagine. So, this... there's a number of Amendments, here, which are incorporated in the Phelps' Amendment. People... and again, before... I want to just make it clear. People are going to get excited about some of these Amendments, but I believe this is beginning of a process and I hope everybody understands that. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, why did you choose the language adjacent to or near a school or preschool? Is that the verbiage that you drafted?"

Zalewski: "State... state the last part of your question again,

Dennis."

Reboletti: "I... I said that did... why did you put the language 'adjacent to or near' a school or preschool? Why would you use that verbiage? Why..."

Zalewski: "I..."

Reboletti: "...did you choose that verbiage?"

the goal of this particular Amendment, Zalewski: "So, Representative, is to say that it will be unlawful under our statute for a person to carry a loaded and accessible weapon near a school or the approximate area near the school, the adjacent parking lot. I would note the ... the ... and the school grounds. I would note there is a limiting clause in there that talks about the sidewalks and the parking lots and the area adjacent or near a preschool and elementary school. I would note that it's an allencompassing part of the Amendment. I would also note that, in my opinion, it's better to be comprehensive with respect to schools than to be limiting and say it's only going to be in certain re... in certain areas of the school in order to ensure the safety of the school."

Reboletti: "I know, Representative, you're not inferring that somehow I didn't support this Amendment that I would want our... the... the safety of our schools compromised. So, have you ever prosecuted a case, Representative, a drug case

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

where it was within a... a thousand feet of a school or a park? Mr. Speaker, if we could get some order, please? Thank you, Speaker. Representative, have you ever prosecuted a drug case or any other case that required something within a thousand feet a protected area, like a school or a church, truck stop, any of those things? Have you ever prosecuted a case like that?"

Zalewski: "I... It's likely, Representative. I don't specifically remember."

Reboletti: "So, you use the term 'approximate' in your explanation to me about where guns should and shouldn't be, so approximately where they should be. So, when I was a narcotics prosecutor we had to prove one of the elements was that the offense occurred within a thousand feet of a school. A sex offender was within 500 feet of a park. And we accomplished that by having an agent go and measure that. How would I measure approximate and prosecute that under your Amendment, if this were to become the law of the State of Illinois?"

Zalewski: "I think it would be ver... Representative, honestly, I think it'd be very simple. I think you would prove up a map of the school, the adjacent grounds, the sidewalks, the parking lots. It could be done with a Google map. It could be done with a floor plan of the... of the school. It could be done in any which way and you could simply say offender was located here by law enforcement which is adjacent to the school. I... I honestly believe you could prove up that case, I could prove up that case, prosecutors could make that case to a finder of fact."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Reboletti: "Here's the problem, Representative, is the term 'near'. Why don't we ban drugs 'near to' or 'adjacent to' a school? Here's where your problem is. There is a concept in the law that you're fully aware of called void for vagueness. This Amendment is vague. It could not be enforced by the police. It could not be enforced by the prosecutors and you'd have a bunch of not gulities across I know it's not your intention to have the state. prosecutions that would falter, that wouldn't leave the schools anymore protected than they already are now. Why wouldn't you make an Amendment to this Bill that says within a thousand feet of a school you cannot conceal and carry, or with 500 feet, like we do for every other protected area, Representative? All we're looking for... nobody here is against the concept of the idea of your Amendment."
- Zalewski: "So, Representative, if... if there were amendatory language with the exact distance, would you support this particular Amendment?"
- Reboletti: "Representative, I have no problem supporting this Amendment if it has some type of distance that can be proven in a court of law so that every citizen would know exactly where they could carry a firearm, where they could not carry a firearm. So, you would have my..."

Zalewski: "Okay."

- Reboletti: "...commitment to support that. Would you... would you take this out of the record, Representative?"
- Zalewski: "I... I won't take it out of the record,

 Representative, but I can assu... I've been... my sense is

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

we'll be revisiting this and there'll be further discussions down the line. So, I can take your concerns back and... and try to get something drafted that would... would address those concerns."

"And... and that's... And... and to this Amendment. I Reboletti: don't understand why we're playing this political game for the next... I don't know... four, five, six hours, six weeks, six months. We have a Bill, House Bill 997, that could be voted up or down today or tomorrow. But... I know what we'll do is we'll put together 27 different jigsaw puzzles. We'll mix them up under the ruse of House Bill 1155 and then we'll grab a handful of those out and try to put them together. But it doesn't make any sense to do that because all the pieces won't fit. I've never seen a piece of legislation crafted from the end of the story to the beginning of the story. Either people here support conceal carry under House Bill 997 or they don't. If they want exceptions, I have an idea. How about pass House Bill 997, have the other chamber pass it, send it to the Governor and then send reasonable restrictions under new case... under new laws, under new House Bills. But, no, we're going to play the game, like I talked about two weeks ago. Of course, now, of course, we all want violence in schools, which is nonsense. Why can't we do this right? We're the laughing stock of the nation. We don't talk about pensions today. We're not talking about the budget today. It's gun week here in the State Capitol. So, we'll play these games until we can get Roll Calls that can be used against everybody and say, oh, there's Reboletti, he wants guns in schools.

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

More nonsense. We want safe schools for everybody, in the light of all the tragedies that have happened in this state and across the nation. I know, Representative Zalewski, that you're a man of your word, but this is a wrong way to go about this process. I think it's now time, Mr. Speaker, that we look at Representative Sullivan's Motion to recommit."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sacia: "Representative Zalewski, have you read this book <u>From</u> Luby's to the Legislature?"

Zalewski: "No, Representative."

Sacia: "For anybody in this legislative chamber today that has not read this book, you will absolutely vote against these Amendments if you read this book. Please give me your attention, Ladies and Gentlemen. Please. In 1991, this lovely young woman, a chiropractor, went with her parents into a Texas restaurant. She didn't carry her gun because she newly had gotten a license as a chiropractor. And she feared because Texas was a gun-free state or a no conceal carry state that, perhaps, she would be charged. Ladies and Gentlemen, give me your attention. This is too important. This is way too important."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia. Mr. Sacia, let me see what I can do to help you."

Sacia: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, will you give Mr. Sacia your attention and then we can continue this debate."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this lovely young woman watched her parents and 27 other people slaughtered because she didn't have her gun. How many of you are aware the night of that horrific shooting in Aurora, Colorado in 2012 that on that particular midnight there were 10, I repeat, 10 movie theaters showing the Batman movie. Ladies and Gentlemen, please, listen to this. One of those theaters, the furthest one from the crackpot, had a sign on the door 'gun-free zone'. Gun-free zones are killing fields for crackpots. Don't you get that? Here's the problem in Illinois. I love you folks in Chicago. You're the ones that have the problem. You have a runaway gun problem. Don't blame the rest of us. This isn't about Democrats; it's not about Republicans. It's because Chicago wants a warm fuzzy. Let's pass a Bill that will eliminate assault rifles. Last year, there were more people killed with hammers than with assault rifles. Here's an analogy, folks, I ask you to think of this. You folks in Chicago want me to get castrated because your families are having too many kids. It spells out exactly what's happening here. You want us to get rid of guns... It was not out of order. I used it as an analogy, Representative. I used it as a... Representative, it's an analogy. If you're having too many kids you want me to get castrated. That was an analogy to show how silly this is. You bet I use Chicago as an example because you're the folks that want this craziness. I have actually introduced legislation to allow teachers to carry a firearm if there is willingness from the school board.

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Ladies and Gentlemen, gun-free zones are killing zones for crackpots. Please think of that."

Speaker Lang: "The next speaker is Mr. Sullivan, who I assume is rising on his Motion. Mr. Sullivan on your Motion."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have filed a Motion to Sullivan: recommit House Bill 1155 to the Judiciary Committee, where should be vetted, where these Bills should have originated out of, and where we can have further discussion on what is right and what is wrong and how we move forward to the date of June 9 when we do not have any UUW laws. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's where the debate should take place, not on this House Floor. We should be debating pension reform. We should be debating how we pay down \$9 billion worth of overdue bills. We should be debating a budget. Everything else doesn't really matter at this point. So, Mr. Speaker, under Rule 49 and Article IV Section 8(c) of the Illinois Constitution, any vote shall be by rec... by record vote whenever 5 Representatives shall so request. There are at least 5 Members on my side that wish a recorded vote on the Motion to recommit House Bill 1155, along with the filed Amendments #1 through #27, to the House Judiciary Committee. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a vote on concealed carry already. The rest of this can go back to the Judiciary and we can talk about it. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the Gentleman's Motion is in order. And let the Chair state what the Motion is, clearly, 'cause it's a rare Motion on the House Floor. The Gentleman has moved to recommit House Bill 1155 and all of

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

its Amendments back to the Judiciary Committee. If you support the Gentleman's Motion to send this all back to the Judiciary Committee, you will vote 'yes', if not you will vote 'no'. The voting is open. This requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Record yourselves, Members. Please take the record. On this question, there are 47... Mr. Bost. On this question, there are 47 voting 'yes', 57 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion fails. Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans wish... wish for an immediate caucus."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost. I'm prepared to let the House... let their House Republicans go to caucus 'til 3:15. Will that be sufficient?"

Bost: "3:30, please. 3:30, Mr. Speaker. Will that work?"

Speaker Lang: "The House will be in recess 'til the hour of 3:30. The House will be in order. Mr. Clerk, please put House Bill 1155 on the board. When we went to... when the Republicans went to caucus, we had finished debating Mr. Zalewski's Amendment to this Bill. There was nobody wishing recognition, there is nobody now. Mr. Zalewski to close on his Amendment. Mr. Zalewski does not wish to close. Those in favor of the Gentleman's Amendment 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 68 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Kelly Burke, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke."

Burke, K.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of House Bill... of Amendment 3 to House Bill 1155. This Amendment prohibits a person from knowingly carrying a firearm into any portion of a building used as a child care facility or any adjacent property or parking lot area under control of or owned by a child care facility. This Amendment also provides an exception for a person who is the owner or operator of the child care facility in a family home. They... it's an exception when the owner possess a firearm as long as the firearm is stored unloaded in a locked container. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

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

The Chair recognizes Leader Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. Just to... want the Body to know that actually this also, I believe, is covered in Amendment #27 of... if we're just wanting to hang people out on the votes, I guess we can do that. But I... it is my intention, and I think many others, that 27 will cover that. We'll have a sensible Bill without having... because this has the language that is adjacent property, the... the parking lot, all of that same issue that occurs. Bu... I would also... Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? I know I've already went to the..."

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Bost: "What... what do you think the idea of the quoting of the... in this Amendment, there's a quoting of the Supreme Court ruling. What was your intention when you put that in there? Or did you put that in there or did somebody else just put it in there for you?"
- Burke, K.: "I did not personally draft the Bill, Representative, as I'm sure you know. I think... I believe to clarify the intent of the Legislature in conforming with the ruling in the Supreme Court in Heller. To put that language directly in there so everyone's clear that we're conforming with the Supreme Court."
- Bost: "And let me... let me just... do you not believe that without that in there... and I... I mean, it's in there and those who are going to vote for it will vote for it, and those who vote against are going to vote against it. But don't you think that with that legislation in... or with that language in there, I mean, I don't think we've ever done this before, that just seems very, very strange to me."
- Burke, K.: "I... I believe we're following Judge Posner's direction and making it clear the reason why we are having certain exceptions to the concealed carry law."
- Bost: "If... if the language was met up with that particular court ruling, it doesn't have to be in there but you just felt it was... I think it was just..."

Burke, K.: "And in an abundance..."

Bost: "...I think it..."

Burke, K.: "...of caution to make sure that future courts understand our intent in crafting this particular..."

Bost: "Right."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Burke, K.: "...Amendment, we included it."

Bost: "My only thought is and... and this will go on with the debate whenever we have the debate on the whole Bill, but isn't it amazing that we, in the State of Illinois, are so much wiser than every other State in the nation that we haven't passed some form of sensible con... concealed carry over the years? But yet, we are so much wiser, but yet, we're deeper in debt than any other state. So, rather than dealing with our dat... dealing with our state debt and the pensions and the problems like that, we deal with this. I'm just amazed."

Burke, K.: "Representative, I... I believe that this particular Amendment is consistent with current law. And I, also, believe that other states have this very type of ban..."

Bost: "Whose... whose..."

Burke, K.: "...to protect themselves."

Bost: ...whose current law?"

Burke, K.: "Illinois' current law."

Bost: "With... with consistent with cur... According... according, right now, to what the court ruled, we are not consistent with what should be allowed which is some form of... the... people being able to carry and... and have their right to exercise their Second Amendment right. But that's... that's why we're here, to try to pass some kind of Bill that's... kick... puts us in compliance, or at least that I... that's what I thought. So, any rate, we'll... we'll have more debate on this, I'm sure, but... and we're all going to vote the way we wish, so never mind."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

- Reboletti: "Representative, how is the language in this Amendment different than either House Bill 997 or Amendment #27? I think that's included in those Amendments as well as that Bill. Is that... am I mistaken?"
- Burke, K.: "It... in terms of... in the Bill that you're speaking of and the Amendment that you're speaking of, 27, it does not apply to adjacent areas or parking lots."
- Reboletti: "And again, I asked Representative Zalewski this question, I know you're an attorney also, are you concerned that this portion, if passed, would be void for vagueness 'cause when you talk about things being near or adjacent to, that would be difficult to prosecute this of type case because the court and law enforcement would have no idea. It would be very subjective and... and vague for the average Illinois resident who has a carry permit to know where they can and cannot go lawfully."
- Burke, K.: "I don't think adjacent is a vague term. It means next to. It's been used in many other statutes and has... and... Right. I don't..."

Reboletti: "And near it is..."

- Burke, K.: "No, no. Near is not mentioned in this particular piece. It's adjacent to or under the control. And I think those are terms that are used in many other statutes and are very well understood and very capable of a court being able to interpret it."
- Reboletti: "Well, that's fine. Then wouldn't it make sense that

 Amendment #2 would be consistent with the language in

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Amendment #3 then because wouldn't we want this all to have the same exact language so that either it's near, or within 100 feet, or adjacent to under the control? I... I'm not sure why we're setting ourself up for failure if this is what it's... concealed carry is going to look like."

Burke, K.: "We're debating Amendment #3. Amendment #2 has already passed."

Reboletti: "I'm well aware that Amendment #2..."

Burke, K.: "And..."

Reboletti: "...has passed."

Burke, K.: "...and so speaking to... speaking to the Amendment for schools, I believe the rationale was to allow a broader area within schools because there was more concern over... over the... the number of people coming into the schools, whereas this is a more limited population going to child care facilities."

Reboletti: "And how would the child care facilities be marked?

Does there have to be a sign outside? Is there... and does a state licensure that makes the difference? How does a person know it's a child care facility?"

Burke, K.: "That will be debated in a later Amendment."

Reboletti: "Well, what if that later Amendment failed, and then we have this and it... it's unclear?"

Burke, K.: "I don't think that this is unclear. I think it's very specific, adjacent to or under the control of."

Reboletti: "Again, I... I'm concerned, Representative. I... I don't think that people should carry firearms in a... in a child care facility, but I'm very concerned about uniformity in the language about how we proceed in this. And I think that

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

we're setting ourselves up here for failure. And I would ask you if you would consider amending this, as I asked Representative Zalewski to do, to say something along the lines of be within 100 feet or 200 feet of the property, so that everybody knows where they can and cannot be. Do you... do you have an issue of amending Amendment #3 to reflect that?"

Burke, K.: "Yes, I do."

Reboletti: "Do you not think that being within 100 or 200 feet or 500 feet, wouldn't that provide the same level of security at the same time provide an appropriate level of an enforcement mechanism, so that law enforcement agents can know exactly where the person had the handgun and could prosecute the case to the fullest extent, so that we don't have a bunch of not guilties in court?"

Burke, K.: "I think the language, as written, is specific and easily understood and not subject to numerous interpretations and I think it will satisfy a court challenge."

Reboletti: "Well, to the Amendment. We have talked about these challenges and the Seventh Circuit has ruled. So, again, we're going to go on these exercises and it'll be 24 more Amendments. And we'll play games with Amendments on every concealed carry Bill that moves. Just like the fact that you guys were able to file nine Amendments on House Bill 997 when we went to caucus. I'm sure you guys can file the rest of them by the end of today or Amendment #10 or whatever you guys are at on this. You're not serious. Why can't we have a serious conversation about a fundamental

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

right that the Seventh Circuit has ruled on? Why can't we simply have a Bill, like 997, debate its merits, and if it fails, go back to the drawing board. We still have two months. But we have to piecemeal this together. I've never seen a Bill put together like this. Now, I hear we're going to put a pension Bill together like this. Maybe I'll start filing my Bills like this, and you'll have to file 45 Amendments to get to the end of the story to figure out if my death penalty reinstatement Bill, which I'm sure all of you will support, because it talks about the death penalty for people who killed children or individuals in a school. You know where that will be buried? In the Rules Committee because that's not important enough in our concealed carry debate. So, at the end of the day, this stuff is nice to talk about. It's not real. This isn't going to pass in its full format, so House Bill 1155 will become a concealed carry Bill that cannot stand. I'm not sure who will be left to vote on it. I know people decided not to vote on the last Bill which I was surprised by. I thought people who were for concealed carry were going to vote for concealed carry and put this Bill back to where it belonged in the Judiciary Committee to be fully vetted, each one of these Amendments. I don't remember talking about this particular Amendment in the House Judiciary Committee. I've listened to dozens of witnesses, but you know what, I don't know why we couldn't vote on this Amendment in the Judiciary Committee where you have all lawyers. All well-trained in the constitutional law and in case law to make sure that you craft a good product to bring to the House Floor,

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

something we could all be proud of. But that's not how this is. This is a political stunt; it demeans this process. And while this is going to pass, at the end of the day, we're not going to pass concealed carry 'cause it's not the will of this chamber to do so."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative, it's my understanding that this would apply to any and all child care facilities, is that true, whether it's church owned or privately owned?"

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. Now, I know you don't... may or may not have one of these sheets that have all the Amendments listed, but Amendment 13 states that 'no firearm, no carrying a firearm into any church, temple or other place of worship, unless authorized to carry the firearm by the church or temple'. So, what if you support Amendment 13? Does that supersede this Amendment?"

Burke, K.: "What... what is the..."

Reis: "It says they can do it. They can carry in the church or temple or any place if approved by their leadership."

Burke, K.: "The portion of the building that is used for a child care facility is it's prohibited."

Reis: "Unless authorized to carry the firearm by the church or temple?"

Burke, K.: "Representative, Amendment 3... the language of Amendment 3 would control the areas of the church or a facility that are used for child care... used as a child care

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

facility and would supersede this particular Amendment #13."

Reis: "Are you 100 percent positive of that? Let me ask you another example. Amendment #17 says no carrying of a firearm into any private property without expressed permission of the owner. This applies to private property of any kind, any kind. So, what if the private business owner has a building that has a child care... day care service in it..."

Burke, K.: "If they... if they..."

Reis: "...and he says that we can."

Burke, K.: "If they lease it out for..."

Reis: "No, no, no."

Burke, K.: "...a child care facility, then they may not. They may not. No one may have a firearm in that facility unless it is the private home of the owner or operator of the child care facility or private business of the child care facility owner-operator."

Reis: "I... I think you're going to find out, contrary to the gentleman whispering in your ear, that these things are not going to mesh in the final Bill. It says a business... a private property of any kind. This is why it's crazy what we're doing with this. We're going backwards. We're applying Amendments to a Bill that really doesn't exist. We don't know how they're all going to fit together. We have different definitions. You got... he's got near and you don't have near. And this is one of the craziest things I've seen here in my nine years. And Mr. Speaker, we've been working very hard on a fracking Bill that has a lot more

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

controversy and a lot more hard feelings than this does. Let's put this back in committee, let's put a Bill together that we can get a majority around and do it right. This is not the right way to do this Bill."

Burke, K.: "Rep..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Representative, I... I agree with what you're trying to do on this... on this. But I've got a question on the definition aspect. And I'm reading paragraph 2, line 8, where it says no person may knowingly carry a firearm into any portion of a building used for child care facility or any adjacent property or parking lot area, and here's where my question is, under control of or owned by a child care facility. What's the definition of 'under the control of' versus 'owned'? I'm not sure why we have that difference."

Burke, K.: "So th... Representative, that would be property that is adjacent to and under... under the control. By that they mean, let's take a situation where you have a child care facility that then leases their parking lot from an entity that's not, you know, the same as the child care facility. So, they don't own it, but it's under their control. They control who can park there, when they can park there, things like that."

Franks: "I get that, the under control. I think we... I think we should have a definition in these because... where the... where there's an issue here 'cause it also says or owned by a child care facility. Let's assume, for the sake of

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

argument, you have a corporate child care facility that had... that had a place and that it no longer is functioning as a child care facility, but it's still owned by the child care facility though it's rented to somebo... some type of other business. And that business is not a child care facility, but it happens to be owned by that child care facility. Would your Amendment still pertain even though it has nothing to do with child care simply based on the ownership of the property that they would be prohibited to carry?"

Burke, K.: "I... I think the key phrase in here is used as a child care facility, so if the building that we're talking... in question is not being used as a child care facility, then I would not think that the..."

Franks: "And I... and I..."

Burke, K.: "...adjacent or under control of contracts."

Franks: "And I would respectively disagree because there are two 'or' clauses in there because it doesn't say 'and' it says 'or'. If you'd said 'and' I would agree with that analysis. But the way this is drafted, there are two separate 'or' clauses following that initial statement."

Burke, K.: "Representative, without getting into parsing all the words in here, the 'or' in that Section links the building used as a child care facility and the adjacent property and parking lot. I think the implication being that the use is what is important, not the physical aspect of..."

Franks: "And I would typically agree with you except when the last 'or' kicks in, 'or owned by a child care facility'.

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Because if you had control of and it was used as a child care facility, why would you also need the definition including the word 'owned by'? So, I'm thinking that's why we need some specific definitions, here, on this and to make sure that we don't have an unattended consequence where if it's owned by this company that they would have a problem being able to lease something."

Burke, K.: "Well, I think the distinction was the… for the example that I just used, that you could have a parking lot that is owned… that, you know, goes along with the building and is owned by that particular facility or they could rent or lease a property. And that's why, I think, the 'or' comes into play not that it distinguishes the… the function of that parking lot from the use of the building as a child care facility."

Franks: "My only concern is... and I agree, and that's how most people would read it but I would think someone could also argue that if it's owned by the facility, because some of these are for-profit entities. And who knows how large they could be and they could grow and, you know, buy... buy property in highly commercial areas because that's where, you know, mom and dad's working and that's where they drop the child off in the morning, but then they cease to... they cease to function as a child care facility yet still maintain ownership of the property. I don't think that's specific here indicating that would not pertain. I know reasonable people will disagree."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Cross."

Cross: "I'd like to yield my time to Representative Reboletti."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, Sir."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I know that we're moving here at a snail's pace and that's appropriate for a Bill of this magnitude, but who is the Senate Sponsor going to be? Has anybody pre-filed on the other side of the hallway, are you aware?"

Burke, K.: "No. Not that I'm aware of."

Reboletti: "And I want to follow up on the previous speaker's question... questioning. So, if you have a day care center and there is a piece of property that's not adjacent to the facility, but they own a lot, I don't know, maybe two lots away, how is a person going to be aware that, that piece of property is owned by or controlled by the day care facility? Do you understand what I'm asking, Representative, because I'm concerned about the notice provision that we are suppose to give in our statutes that would indicate that a person would know if the piece of property is under control of that entity."

Burke, K.: "Representative, if people are coming to this facility for the purpose of either dropping their child off, picking someone up, going on a... some sort of sales call, what have you, to this particular facility, coming to work at this facility. One would think they are under and they are... know to park in this lot to go to the facility that they're under notice that is in part of the child care facility."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Reboletti: "Well, to that, there is a group of day care centers called Safari Day Care that are throughout my former district and current district and they usually end up in strip malls. So, under that hypothetical, maybe they control the three parking spaces in front of them. Does that mean the adjacent parking spaces which have nothing to do with those parking spaces would be off limits as well?"
- Burke, K.: "So, before we torture this poor little Section any further, I would just like to point out that the standard is knowingly carry a firearm and... and that is the element, so knowingly. If someone innocently parks there because they're going into the coffee shop next door or what not, that takes care... the knowingly portion of the statute requiring the intent takes care of any innocent users."
- Reboletti: "And that's why you talked about the term parsing out the words is because we have to put people on notice so that they know what they're doing is wrong or not wrong. Otherwise, I'm concerned that your Amendment won't have the full effect of the law because how would any person know when they pull off of Grand Avenue in Elmhurst and go into the Safari Day Care that Safari Day Care controls these three parking spaces, they own a part of the strip mall around the corner, but if they go to the restaurant two doors down that they could carry there. That's what I think the problem is. I understand what your intent Representative, and I support the intent. I'm concerned that the way it's worded is not enough to put us on notice. All of us on notice, law enforcement, the courts, prosecutors, this Body, and our residents. Are you... again,

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

I'm going to ask if you'd be willing to amend this at some portion in time... at some point in time to reflect something that could be measured or people would know I'm within 100 feet of the day care... I'm within 100 feet of Safari Day Care, I can't have my firearm on my hip."

Burke, K.: "Representative, I think the knowingly provision takes care of some of your concerns, but we can certainly debate notice provisions at a later time."

Reboletti: "But why aren't we debating them now? That's my question. We're on Second Reading here, the third Amendment, and this might be the final product. We have a court decision that we're suppose to be tailoring legislation to. There shouldn't be a trailer Bill for this. We have enough time. Why can't we do it right? I am going to ask you, Representative, if you would take this Amendment out of the record, amend it, and then I'm sure almost everybody on this side of the aisle would support it. Would you... would you do that, Representative?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Bill's Sponsor, Speaker Madigan, might entertain some questions on the underlying intent of the Bill?"

Speaker Lang: "We're on the Amendment now, Sir."

Sullivan: "Well, we've been on the… the third Amendment for some time and I expect this to go on well into the night.

But at the end of the day, we're going to pass potentially 27 Amendments. With 27 Amendments, how does this actually

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

become a functioning law? So, while we're debating this, we would like some guidance. What is the intent of the Speaker? How does he think you're going to have two Amendments that conflict with each other that potentially can become law? So, if I could get an answer to that, that would be great."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan, we're on Amendment 3, Sir."

Sullivan: "And so, the Speaker does not want to come and talk about his Bill."

Speaker Lang: "We're on Amendment #3, Sir."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Sullivan: "So, obviously, we've been debating this for some time and, potentially, I could live next to a day care center and your Bill would then say, because I'm adjacent to the day care center, that your Bill, or your Amendment, should it become law, will interfere with my constitutional right to conceal carry. Is that a true or a false statement?"

Burke, K.: "That's not a true statement."

Sullivan: "Why would it not be?"

Burke, K.: "The adjacent... it's not saying the adjacent private property... nei... neighboring property. So, if you live next door, is that your question?"

Sullivan: "Yes."

Burke, K.: "So, it's specifying the grounds on the day care and next to the building not necessarily the..."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Burke, K.: "...neighboring property."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sullivan: "So, I inadvertently go to an adjacent property that's under the control… okay. That's the next one that I'm going to be talking about. So, I do apologize. That'll be a different one that I'll have a discussion. But… so, I inadvertently go to this parking lot and I'm going to, in essence, I get a parking ticket or the… let's say that I… I'm speeding and I pull into this parking lot 'cause I don't want to be on the road and the policeman sees that I have a conceal carry permit but I'm in this place because I was pulled over by a cop, doing my due diligence to get off the road so I don't put me or the officer in danger, and I accidentally pull into this place. He could arrest me and charge me with a felony because I have a conceal carry permit in a parking lot adjacent to… that's under the control of the facility."

Burke, K.: "Again, Representative, the determining word here is 'knowingly' and in your scenario that's not knowingly."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay. Excuse me. Mr. Sullivan, I saw you move your microphone. I thought you were completed with your remarks."

Sullivan: "It was here and I got it here so I can actually read the transcript, but I..."

Speaker Lang: "Please continue, Sir."

Sullivan: "...I do appreciate you paying attention to the flow of the traffic here. I have nothing further."

Speaker Lang: "Now, Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"
Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Kay: "Representative, I'm curious about a couple of things here. I have listened all afternoon to what the legal definition of adjacent is. And I truly want to know what your definition is because it's pretty clear and simple in my mind. And I can give you what I think it is and you can tell me that you agree or you can give me the definition for legislative intent that you think it should be."

Burke, K.: "Representative, if you'll just give me a moment to pull it up on Webster's."

Kay: "Sure."

Burke, K.: "But I think it's a term that is used... adjacent is used in many, many statutes and there is a common understanding of what that means. And I will give you the dictionary definition in one second."

Kay: "Very good."

Burke, K.: "Representative?"

Kay: "Yes."

Burke, K.: "The definition can be: lying near, close, or contiguous; adjoining; just before, after or facing."

Kay: "Okay. And I agree with part of that. Let me see if I can
extend that a bit further."

Burke, K.: "We're going to have to argue with <u>Webster's</u> then, Representative."

Kay: "No. Well, I... I looked at <u>Black's</u>, so I'm... I'm cheating too. I... I'm curious, though, when we say lying close or contiguous, we agree on that. Not widely separated, would you agree with that with regard to premises?"

Burke, K.: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear that last..."

Kay: "Not widely separated."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Burke, K.: "Is this the Black's Law Dictionary?"

Kay: "That's correct."

Burke, K.: "Can't argue with them."

Kay: "Okay. And furthermore, not actually touching. Would you
agree with that?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Kay: "Okay. With no third object intervening, would you agree
with that?"

Burke, K.: "So nothing in between the property and the..."

Kay: "That's correct."

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. So, for legislative intent we now have pretty much a four-point definition. You and I disagree, probably our dictionaries, do with the legislative meaning, or for intent purposes, the meaning of what adjacent is. Is that correct?"

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. That's the first time today that we've actually had that and I think that's a real milestone. And thank you for... thank you for bearing with me because, frankly, I'm weary. I'm weary. Let me ask one question since we have this definition in place. If I have a day care center which I own, and I own a piece of property on either side. I own it. I own the day care center. What is my responsibility for those unoccupied properties with respect to your Bill?"

Burke, K.: "In terms of what?"

Kay: "Carry."

Burke, K.: "So what are you asking, specifically, whether someone could carry on the..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Kay: "Well..."

Burke, K.: "...piece of property that's neighboring? I believe we had the same..."

Kay: "No. Here... here, I..."

Burke, K.: "...same as..."

Kay: "I'm sorry, Kelly. What I'm trying... maybe I'm not clear. What I'm trying to say is we have a day care center here. We have an unoccupied piece of property here that's owned by the same owner of the day care center and on the other side, we have the same owner of an unoccupied piece of property. They're adjacent to the day care center. What... what law or what rule would apply? And again, for legislative intent here, I'm trying to... kind of get the metrics together. What legislative intent applies to those two pieces of unoccupied ground?"

Burke, K.: "I think you need to look at the language of the proposed Amendment, 'used as a child care facility'. So, if those pieces of property are somehow used as a child care facility or a part of it, then... then they are under... they fall under this..."

Kay: "Right.

Burke, K.: "...exception."

Kay: "Yeah, I would agree with that, but they're not. But they're 'adjacent to' based on our definition then."

Burke, K.: "They still would have to be used as a child care facility."

Kay: "Those unoccupied... two unoccupied pieces of ground would have to be considered a part of the day care center?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Burke, K.: "It would be the same situation, Representative Kay, if there were a house or other building built on it. I don't think that the fact that it's occupied or unoccupied or vacant or built upon is really germane. I think the issue is, are those properties used in some way, shape, or form as a child care facility."

Kay: "Well, they're not. And I'm just trying to figure if those were my premises, if I could carry a gun on that unoccupied, unused property that I own next to the day care center. Just... just yes or no, that's all I need."

Burke, K.: "If it is not used as a child care facility, then yes you could."

Kay: "Okay. Now, let's make one other assumption, and then I'm going to sit down. Let's make the assumption that there is no unoccupied properties on either side of the day care center. Under your Bill, if I have a home next to that day care center, may I be in possession of a handgun and use conceal carry as a responsible citizen?"

Burke, K.: "Yes."

Kay: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield for just three or four questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Cross: "Representative, I didn't see this in the first Amendment and I don't see it in yours. Is there anything in this Bill that provides for a mechanism for the state to pay its \$9 billion in bills?"

Burke, K.: "No."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Cross: "Is there anything in this Amendment or this Bill at all that provides a way to reduce unemployment in the State of Illinois, other than with lawyers?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Cross: "Is there anything in this Bill that provides any form of Medicaid reform?"

Burke, K.: "No."

Cross: "Finally, we were told yesterday by one of the Chicago committees that if we do nothing with respect to pensions, our unpaid bills will be \$22 billion within the next five years. Is there anything in this Bill or this Amendment that reforms pensions?"

Burke, K.: "No, there's not."

Cross: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Hammond: "Representative Burke, if you have answered this, I apologize. It's a little noisy, so I haven't heard all of your responses. If an individual owns a private day care facility in their home, and they are gun owners, they are or their spouse or other family members, would they be allowed to continue as a day care facility?"

Burke, K.: "Yes. The owner... it is actually in subsection (b),

'Nothing in this Section shall prevent the owner or

operator of a child care facility in a family home from

owning or possessing a firearm or license, so long as the

firearm is stored unloaded in a locked container.' That is

consistent with the current law."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Hammond: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Ives."

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

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke will yield."

Ives: "I just have one simple question. I understand that if you don't knowingly violate the law, if you carry a weapon on to the parking lot, you did not think that would be an offense. So, I'm just curious. What is the posting requirement on property so that you know that you are now under the jurisdiction where you cannot conceal carry? What must a property owner do in order to mark his property, in adjacent properties, along the fence lines? How widespread does it need to be? How big does it need to be? What's the lettering look like? If you could answer that, it'd be great."

Burke, K.: "There... there's no provision currently for that but I think, again, it goes to the knowingly, whether or not something is posted. If nothing's posted, it affects whether or not you knowingly did something. So, I... I think we will have a little more on that debate later, but knowingly in this context, you know, protects someone who is unaware of the type of property they're on."

Ives: "Could we potentially be, then, trapping people into a violation based on intent or somebody's subjective opinion on whether they or not they knowingly did it? Don't you think there should be some sort of posting requirement required if we're going to prosecute these cases?"

Burke, K.: "Representative, 'knowingly' is a term that's commonly used in the criminal law and judges are very

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

capable of interpreting the intent based on the different situ... the different facts of each situation."

Ives: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Burke to close."

Burke, K.: "Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for the adoption of House Bill... the Amendment 3 to House Bill 1155. And I would just point out that the... the way in which we are going about doing this where we break it down into different Sections is... is something that people, especially on the Republican side of the aisle, talked about as a positive thing when we were nego... when we were talking about appropriations Bills several weeks ago, that if we could just break these things down and we could vote on them individually it would have made a lot more sense. Well, we're now doing that and we have an opportunity to vote 'yes' or 'no' on each specific provision of this law. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady's moved for the adoption of the Amendment. 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? Record yourselves, Members. DeLuca, Fortner, Hays. Please take the record. On this question, there are 31 voted... 71 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourned."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, are you rising to speak on the Gentleman's Motion? You're correct. It's not debatable.

Those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion to adjourn the

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

House will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Burke. Please take the record. On this question, there are 46 voting 'yes', 70 voting 'no'. And the Gentleman's Motion fails. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, a point of inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lang: "State your point, Sir."

Reboletti: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure how we're having recorded votes or why we're not having voice votes. Sometimes we move Amendments by voice vote, sometimes we move them by recorded vote. I didn't hear any of the previous movements ask for a recorded vote."

Speaker Lang: "Discretion of the Chair, Sir. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker Lang: "Majority Leader Currie on Amendment 4."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is a simple, straightforward Amendment, and I hope I will have unanimous support to adopt it to House Bill 1155. This says that concealed guns, concealed weapons may not be carried in any government building including this General Assembly, including the court system, including firehouses and police stations, and including municipalities, townships and other units of local government. I know of no state that has concealed carry legislation that permits the carrying of guns in public buildings. And I certainly would appreciate your support for this sensible measure that will protect our workers, protect our courts, our judges, protects our

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

police people and... and in fact, at the end of the day, may well protect ourselves."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Leader yields."

Reboletti: "Leader Currie, not only would the conceal carry be banned in government facilities, where else would it be banned? Would it be banned on parking l... in parking lots and sidewalks and adjacent property, or near..."

Currie: "Yeah. We had... not sidewalks, but adjacent property.

We've had very lengthy discussions on similar language in a
couple of other Amendments that have already been adopted
to this measure. So, I'd hope we're not going to engage in
persnickety nit picking on this Amendment."

Reboletti: "Well, I appreciate the... the fact that I could be persnickety from time to time. My concern, Leader Currie, is for judges and prosecutors that would prefer to conceal carry when they leave the courtroom. And a few months back in... in Texas, a prosecutor, an assistant district attorney, was gunned down after a gang prosecution. They believe that it was the Aryan Brotherhood that killed him. Is there a provision that would allow a judge or a prosecutor to conceal carry from the time they left the courthouse to the time they got to their vehicle?"

Currie: "Well, my understanding is that the entire UUW statute already on the books would apply and that tho… those court personnel people could in some circumstances be exempt."

Reboletti: "What..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Currie: "And I... I do know that there was a recent shooting of a prosecutor either in or just outside an Ohio courthouse. So, it seems to me that this kind of protection is really critical for people who engage in those kinds of law enforcement activities for all of us."
- Reboletti: "And... and I want to be clear too. We had a federal judge that was killed a number of years back also, and you said, under certain circumstances, that a prosecutor or a judge could carry after they leave the building. What would those certain circumstances be?"
- Currie: "I'm sorry, if that was a question, I missed it."
- Reboletti: "I said, what would those certain circumstances be in which a prosecutor or a judge could conceal and carry a firearm from the time they left a government building to the time they got to their vehicle or other locations?"
- Currie: "Well, they are exempt under current law. And nothing in this Amendment changes that, Representative."
- Reboletti: "Well, to the Amendment #4. Now that we have consumed four hours of debate to get through four Amendments and I will, again, address the fact of what Leader Cross mentioned which is this Bill doesn't address pensions but I know we'll put a pension Rubik's cube together on Thursday. It doesn't pay any bills. It doesn't address why the Medicaid reforms aren't performing, why there's... how they're supposed be performing. It doesn't talk about putting the unemployed back to work or providing new opportunities for people graduating from college. But at the end of the day, we're going to go through this process and again, and time and time again, we'll use vague

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

words. We'll have nice bright ideas that sound right, but when it comes time to prosecute one of these cases, it'll fail. And then, I'm not sure what exactly we'll do. We'll talk about knowingly, and if there's a sign, and if it's adjacent to, or if it's near. It's like playing the game of Clue. Nobody will have any idea where they're going to be allowed to conceal and carry a firearm and there's going to be a lot of problems. And the only people that are going to benefit will be attorneys. And that's not the intention of this Bill. I know it's not the intention of the Amendment Sponsor. But at the end of the day, I'm not sure why we don't have an up or down vote on all of Amendments. Why don't we just do it that way? I know the Speaker is out here, or he was out here. It's a pretty simple thing. There's 27 Amendments; we can adopt all those by voice vote like we normally do and then up or down on House Bill 1155 as it stands. And then, we can go from there but we're not in the business of doing that today. We'll figure out what happens next on pension reform or if we get reduced to junk bond status, then we can have another one of these opportunities to play these games. So, I... I'm not sure how many more of these we'll get through, if we're going to be here through #27, but this exercise in futility should probably stop at some point in time where we figure out exactly what the Bill should look like and vote on that Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Will the Leader yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Phelps: "Leader Currie, what if I wanted to carry in my own district office in Harrisburg or in... allow some of my constituents? Would I have discretion on that?"
- Currie: "No. No, there would no conceal carry in any government office controlled by the General Assembly, controlled by a township, a municipality, a court."
- Phelps: "And still, this is the language that's really broad, that no other state really has on 'adjacent to or near' because... what about the Secretary of State's building right here? What about the apartments or the hotels around there? Is there still a radius of what a gun-free zone is? Do we know the feet or miles or blocks?"
- Currie: "No. Under control of... of the state and adjacent property. And we've already had a lengthy discussion of that def... the definition. It means adjoining. It means right next door."
- Phelps: "Well, this is... in my Bill, as you know, Amendment 27, and we don't go as far to create more gun-free zones. So, I just ask the Body to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Leader yields."

Bost: "I want to go down to some of the same questions I th... I think the former speaker did. But in the case of our own district offices, in that case they're leased properties, but they're not necessarily owned by the state. With in... in that case of my office, in Carbondale, would that be then a... would that be covered under this Amendment."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Currie: "That would be covered. And remember the language here is not just owned but under the control of."

Bost: "Okay. So... so, then, that is in an office complex. Does that then stop the person who has the... that has the copier office next door? Will... would they then not... if they had a conceal carry permit, they could not come into their office with their weapon is it... as well. Is that correct?"

Currie: "Well, if... if the person doesn't know this is state property, then this... this provision wouldn't apply. And if they do, then... then the adjacent property would be covered."

Bost: "Well, they obviously would know. My sign is on the door."

Currie: "Your what?"

Bost: "My... the sign is on the door that it's State Representative Mike Bost's office."

Currie: "Well, then if they can read, they should know what they're doing and they should know that they may not."

Bost: "So... so, in other words..."

Currie: "It might be a good idea for you to post a sign reminding them that government offices, should this Amendment be approved..."

Bost: "Well, I know this..."

Currie: "...are not places where you can..."

Bost: "...I know this..."

Currie: "...con..."

Bost: "...might come as a shock to you, but there are actually some State Representatives' offices in the same building as some gun shops in the south. You know that? One... once

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

again, we're… we're trying to draft a piece of legislation that… that is so broad that… that it takes the right away from those people who should have the right to, under the Second Amendment and under a conceal carry permit, to carry. But yet because… well, I know it ruins the neighborhood when a Representative moves in, but this would really ruin the neighborhood for those that might have a… a legal business that is involved with the sale of guns. Do you see a problem with that?"

Currie: "Well, I... I would advise the gun shop to make sure there's another office between you and its premises."

Bost: "Is it... would this... does this law... is it retroactive?"

Currie: "No."

Bost: "Okay. So, if I'm already beside a government office and I have a situation like that, then you're saying that if this Bill passes and it becomes law, that all of a sudden I... that... that since it's not retroactive, I can go ahead and continue to carry in that office."

Currie: "It would not be retroactive in that sense. It would be going forward..."

Bost: "Well, wait... wait..."

Currie: "...that you can't do it."

Bost: "But so... so..."

Currie: "Representative, I'm going to do a survey. I'm going to find out how many of our district offices are in the same building right next door to a gun shop. And I would venture to guess that there... that the answer to that is zero."

Bost: "Well..."

Currie: "But I'll... I'll do some homework."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bost: "I want... Yeah. I wish you'd do the survey because this is how ridiculous these things can get. We're... we... we continue to pile on and pile on and pile on. Do... do the... and... and I think this has been asked before, Leader, do you think that if we pass all of these Amendments, does the Bill actually work? Or is it going to have to be modified quite a bit, or do you know? Because... does Amendment #3 go with Amendment #5, and go well with Amendment #17, and... So, if they're all passed..."

Currie: "No, but there are other Amendments that have been adopted. There are Amendments pending. So, I'm sure that we'll have a... an interesting piece of legislation by the time..."

Bost: "Yeah, it could be interesting."

Currie: "...we finish this exercise."

Bost: "Okay. If... now, what about in a case... you know, when we started out... this... this does have the language like at the parking lots and all that. We did say that, correct?"

Currie: "Yes."

Bost: "What... what occurs in a case out here... like out here where we have a city street going through it, it covers a parking lot and... and there's one parking lot on one side of the street and another parking lot on the other side of the street, how does... how does that read? What's your interpretation of that?"

Currie: "A city street is public property. So you can carry on a city street."

Bost: "Okay."

Currie: "And across the street isn't even adjacent."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bost: "Okay. But in... in the... except... so, really the only place that you can carry, let's say in this area, would be down one of the streets because if you look, we have a public building, which is a parking lot of that public building and it goes on and on and on all over the... the downtown area."

Currie: "Right. The... the Capitol Complex, absolutely."

Bost: "The... the only way you could carry..."

Currie: "Yeah."

Bost: "...is along the street itself."

Currie: "Yeah. Yeah. Down the middle of... of Monroe you can carry your gun, sure."

Bost: "Could you..."

Currie: "Second Street... yes, but not..."

Bost: "What... what..."

Currie: "...on the Capitol Complex."

Bost: "...what's the ruling on sidewalks?"

Currie: "That's public property, you can carry."

Bost: "Okay, okay. Thank you, Representative."

Currie: "I hope you won't, not near me, but..."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sullivan: "Touché, by the way. So, Leader Currie, in the City of Chicago you have aldermen that have the ability to carry a weapon. Is that true?"

Currie: "You know, I'm not sure that it still is. I thought there were new requirements for training before any elected official like aldermen can carry..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sullivan: "Sure."

Currie: "...a weapon."

Sullivan: "That... but they have the ability to carry a weapon if they..."

Currie: "Well, yeah."

Sullivan: "...meet certain criteria."

Currie: "And... and I'm... not sure what the status of that law is."

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, it's state Law, so I..."

Currie: "But under... under this they wouldn't be able..."

Sullivan: "...I know the answer to it. I'm getting to... the question is, how does your Bill affect those people that are presently have the ability to carry a weapon?"

Currie: "They can't carry the weapon in the... in Chicago City

Hall or in the County Building under this measure, should

it become law."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, all the people from the City of Chicago, and I'm talking to the Legislators on that side of the aisle, you're going to go back to your aldermen when you vote for this and say, sorry, I'm taking away your ability to carry a weapon..."

Currie: "Not..."

Sullivan: "...by my vote today. Well..."

Currie: "...not to carry..."

Sullivan: "...I'm leading up to the vote, potentially."

Currie: "...to carry your weapon at work, yes. You know, to carry your weapon when you're out at a firing range, that's okay.

And you want to have it at home, you may have it at home, but you may not have it in my work place."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sullivan: "I just wanted to point that out. Thank you very much."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sacia: "Leader Currie, I have two very simple questions. Number one, do you have any idea how many mass shootings have occurred in this country in the last two years?"

Currie: "Well, I've... I've certainly heard of several. Newtown,

Aurora."

Sacia: "Sure. We... we would probably agree that far too many. Would... would that..."

Currie: "One is far too many."

Sacia: "Absolutely. Do you know how many of those shootings occurred in gun-free zones?"

Currie: "I do not."

Sacia: "Every one except the shooting of Congresswoman Gabby Giffords. Every one. And I know how you love being enlightened by our side of..."

Currie: "Well, and I..."

Sacia: "...the aisle."

Currie: "...expect Mrs. Lanza was not in a gun-free zone either."

Sacia: "I'm sorry."

Currie: "I believe Mrs. Lanza was not in a gun-free zone when her son killed her."

Sacia: "I... but I'm referring to the guns-free zone in the killings, certainly the school house was. Thank you, Leader Currie."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Brauer: "Representative Bost was talking about an example down in his office in southern Illinois, and I had a question. If he had an alarm go off one night and he has conceal and carry and he would go there to protect his property and he could see people carrying it off, the police might be a little late in responding, what would be his obligations to walk in without his gun?"

Currie: "He would be required to walk in without his gun. But I'll tell you, Representative, in places where people have not been allowed to carry guns when there is that sort of situation often enforcement does not follow."

Brauer: "I'm sorry. Could you say that again?"

Currie: "What I'm saying is people are often not prosecuted in circumstances like that. There is prosecutorial discretion and the example that you're giving is one in which my experience tells me often would not be likely to result in prosecution."

Brauer: "Well, what would happen if the state's attorney happened to be from the opposing property, and I know it's hard to imagine, but if they didn't get along with Representative Bost?"

Currie: "Well, and then... then there would be a prosecution."

Brauer: "There would be... well... Oh. They'd see... Yeah. Throw...
throw something else in the air will you, please. Also,
down here, just east of the Howlett Building, there's a
Vinegar Hill Mall and in that mall is a... a pawn shop that

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

sells quite... quite a few firearms. Now, would... would they be affected going back and forth?"

Currie: "No, they would not because that's not a conceal carry issue. You're talking about buying an item at retail. The person would have to have a Firearm Owners Identification card, but that person would not, therefore, be allowed to carry a concealed weapon."

Brauer: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor will yield."

Kay: "Leader Currie, a couple of real quick questions. I'm looking here at what staff has handled... handed me today with respect to the Amendment you have filed and I'm curious, would the State Police be allowed to carry a firearm in this building?"

Currie: "Yeah. Yes, they would."

Kay: "Okay. And where would I... where would I deduce that from your Bill?"

Currie: "I think that that's already in the Unlawful Use of Weapons statute, but I believe also Section... Section g... subsection (g) refers to the... to those exemptions that are already part of the Unlawful Use of Weapons statute which does include law enforcement which would, of course, include the State Police."

Kay: "Is it your understanding, like it was mine, that the State Police were not allowed to carry their weapons into a committee hearing a week ago?"

Currie: "I do not know."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Kay: "Okay. Thank you. I have no more questions."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative Kay asked my first question, but I guess I'm going to ask a broader question. Why do we need this? Why do we need to carve out these?"

"We don't. We don't need to. There's no requirement that we do so. But let me read you from the Supreme Court decision in the Heller case. 'Nothing, in our opinion, should be taken to cast doubt on', and then I'm leaving some language out and some elision... 'laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings'. The Supreme Court in a later case, McDonald, reiterated that point. And in the Seventh Circuit case, decided in December, the opinion written by Judge Posner says, 'the prohibitions on the possession of firearms for various people, laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings. We repeat those assurances here.' So, in that opinion, Justice Posner writes that a Legislature forbid the carrying of firearms in schools government buildings means that any right to possess a gun for self-defense outside the home is not absolute. And it is not absolute by the Supreme Court's own terms. We don't have to do this. We do not have to do this, but we may. And in my view, in order to ensure the safety of the public, we should."

Reis: "So, you agree with Heller decision?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Currie: "I agree with the part of the Heller decision..."

Reis: "You're just..."

Currie: "...that says that if there are guns... if there are guns, it doesn't mean that the right to a gun is absolute."

Reis: "That's a long answer for saying I think you agree with the Heller decision, so we'll take that. But back to my question, Representative. You feel it's important, but why do you feel it's important that we carve out these places with... that all these Amendments are doing?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, what was the question?"

Reis: "Why do you think it's important to ban guns in government buildings? Why do you think it's important to ban guns at day care centers?"

Currie: "I... I think that the Supreme Court had that part of it right."

Reis: "No. Why do you..."

Currie: "Sensitive..."

Reis: "...personally?"

Currie: "...places like schools and government buildings. Places where we do not want shoot 'em ups. Places where we want to make sure that people are adequately protected from angry citizens, from taxpayers who didn't like the last tax bill, from what have you."

Reis: "Rep..."

Currie: "I think it is sensible. I think it is sane. I think it is responsible. And I hope you will support Amendment 4 to House Bill 1155."

Reis: "To the Bill. Representative, you had a handgun ban for 30 years in the City of Chicago. Are you telling me there's

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

no guns? These places are going to become havens because no… every… the criminals who have guns, who don't have FOID cards, who don't have training, who don't have mental health evaluations are going to be the ones with guns. How much more evidence can we show to you that a 30-year handgun ban that led to one of the highest murder rates in the country. So, I… it doesn't make sense to me why we're doing these at all. I think it's proven that the exact opposite happens. And I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Amendment, as well."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Mautino."

Mautino: "I know we've gone... Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "She will yield."

Mautino: "Okay. The... the issue of adjacent properties. In this... so, that would be any... any neighboring property, maybe across the street from a city hall?"

Currie: "No. I don't think it would be across the street from the city hall. I think you have to be adjacent, adjoining."

Mautino: "Adjoining."

Currie: "I... I certainly will..."

Mautino: "Okay."

Currie: "...ally myself with Representative Burke's definition on a similar language in the previous Amendment."

Mautino: "Okay. I wanted... I was unsure about that because when Representative Bost mentioned a representative district which is next to a gun shop, that would be mine. Just thought I'd... I'd mention that. And..."

Currie: "Yeah, but that doesn't mean you can conceal and carry in that gun shop. That's only a retail establishment."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Mautino: "Well, I appreciate what you're doing here. And actually, I appreciate the fact that we get to vote on Amendments, which we haven't done since 1995, and so, any Member can file an Amendment on any of these Bills. But as I look at what's been adopted so far, pres... the schools, the child care facility, and the state and units of local government to this point and adjoining property, it begins to look to me like the City of Chicago red camera lights. When they first introduced their Bill, it had adjoining properties and it had ranges. And when we drew a Venn diagram, just a little compass point around those facilities, once adopted into that Bill, we found that everything was excluded. So, I... I appreciate your position on the issue. And I respect Representative Brandon Phelps, Representative Mike Bost, John Bradley, their decade-long work on something the Supreme Court said we have to do. My concern in building... the way that we're building right now is we end up with unpassable legislation which excludes so much by the little pieces. I've been opposing all the Amendments. I intend to continue to oppose those until I reach Amendments 24 and 27 that, I think, reasonably address each of the issues that all of you want to protect against in the Bill. I would even love to see the opportunity for Representative Phelps to, if we were truly going to do this the way the old... the old days worked, we would be able to make Amendments on Second Reading on his Bill which he could determine whether they were hostile or not. To your Amendment. I respect what you want to do. I think it is covered very well in 24 and 27. And I think

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

that as we adopt more of these Amendments, we end up with the Chicago red light camera problem where we have now excluded more than is included and that will not meet the goal of what we're trying to do. So, I would urge a 'no' vote on this and all Amendments other than 24 and 27."

Speaker Lang: "The Majority Leader to close."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Speaker, and Members of the House. I think this has been well and thoroughly debated. This is about sensible, sound gun control policy, both under the Supreme Court rulings in Heller and McDonald and in the Seventh Circuit decision that has brought us to this discussion today. It is clear, specifically, that government buildings can certainly be places where people may not carry concealed weapons. I urge you to vote 'yes' to support the safety and the health of the public. I urge you to follow the sensible language of the Supreme Court and the Seventh Circuit in both of these opinions."

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? Record yourselves, Members. Mr. Fortner, Mr. Hays. Please take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no' and 7 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #5 is offered by Representative

Lang."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Floor Amendment #5 would prohibit the use of conceal carry in any casino or gaming establishment and the property thereto. I would ask your support."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Bost: "What exactly is different in this particular Amendment in comparison to what would be in Amendment #27?"

Lang: "Well, one difference is this one's mine."

Bost: "True. True. I... I can see that. Besides that, though?"

Lang: "Well, this is... this is Amendment 5. That's Amendment 27.

I filed this one first. And so, when we get to Amendment 27, we'll address that when we get there."

Bost: "Well, actually... Okay. Then... then what is the difference between this and Bill #9... is it 977? What's that one? 997.

I'm sorry."

Lang: "So, I believe that this, also, applies to video gaming establishments which of those other Amendments do not. It also applies to the parking lot owned and controlled by the gaming facility which Amendment 27 does not."

Bost: "Does this... does this include like our VFWs and things like that all over the south that might have gaming equipment in them?"

Lang: "The answer is yes."

Bost: "So, what... and their parking lots, correct?"

Lang: "The answer is yes."

Bost: "And any adjacent buildings?"

Lang: "Controlled or owned by them."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bost: "How about the sidewalks around them?"

Lang: "A public sidewalk is a public sidewalk, Sir."

Bost: "Is... do you think that... that there's a... a big danger in the Murphysboro Legion Hall for allowing conceal carry to occur? I mean, you know, or... or the VFW in Murphysboro? Do you think there's a big danger there?"

Lang: "Sir, I think where people go to gamble, which is a policy in this state, that is an adopted policy, they have substantial amounts of cash with them on occasion."

Bost: "So... so, we've got the people that have..."

Lang: "Sometimes they don't... wait, did you ask me a question?"

Bost: "Yes, I did. Go ahead."

Lang: "And... and those people need to make sure that they're protected. I would, also, suggest to you that if you want a exemption from Amendment 5 for the Murphysboro VFW, you can file Amendment #28."

Bost: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Look, as we start to spread this out, now we're going to start saying to people who are veterans that might have the opportunity to have conceal carry that all of a sudden when they go to be with their friends and to hang out in these VFWs and Legions that... not only with this Amendment but with one more... that all of a sudden they shouldn't be able to carry. Now, we can put them in harm's way when they were younger, to defend our rights of this nation, to stand up for the United States Constitution, to protect our liberties, but now we're going to say with this language, oh, no, never mind. You're not... you were good enough to go over and put your lives on the line, but... You were good enough to carry

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

a weapon whenever the U.S. Government told you you needed to carry a weapon but to protect your own livelihood and protect yourself and... now.. now, we don't think you're well enough trained for that and you shouldn't be able to do that in... in the areas in which you socialize and, you know, I tell you what, that whole Constitution thing that you were fighting for, let's just forget it, okay? Let's just forget it. So, you veterans, don't carry. Don't carry. We're going... we're going to create enough zones around every place that you go that we can... we can say here, in the State of Illinois, that we have a conceal carry Bill but we really don't because you can't even... oh, wait, no. If you walk down the middle of the street with your gun, with... with the gun concealed, then maybe we'll let you carry, but we'll see how many more Amendments we put on here before we actually make it to where it really isn't a concealed carry Bill at all. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is just going on and on because why? Because you believe that government getting bigger and staying large and controlling our lives every day, in every way... never mind that the ones that I'm bringing up are the ones that fought, that watched friends die so that they could have certain freedoms. Don't make me say something like let my people go. That would be embarrassing or something, right? But instead, why don't we stop this ridiculous charade, here, today and look at the Bill and truly work on crafting a Bill like other states have. Folks, we are the laughing stock of the nation. The laughing stock of the nation when it comes to our budget, when it comes to our pensions, when it comes to the amount

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

of politicians that we put in jail and the issues that we have here, in the state, but we're right on conceal carry. We're right. Whatever we do let's... let's not pass any type of real opportunity for law-abiding citizens to carry. Let's keep doing this because we, the State of Illinois, are so wise and the people of this chamber are so wise that we can out think the other 49 states. Well, if we can out think them, how about we start thinking about how we can get some jobs back here? How about if we out think them, we can start working on maybe paying our pension debt down. Well, let's just continue this fun party."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative Lang, I know that you're very learned in the gaming community with what other states probably do, like Indiana, or Wisconsin, or Iowa, our sister states. What do they do with respect to conceal and carry at their gaming facilities?"

Lang: "I... I don't know, Sir, but I'll bet you're going to tell me."

Reboletti: "Well, Representative, I was asking you because I thought... I know that you've worked on these issues for about 25 years and I know you've had some failures along the way with passing those... that legislation, but I'm not sure. I wish I knew. That's why I was hoping you would know the answer because I thought if Indiana did it a certain way, they have facilities 35 miles from my house or 50 miles away in... in... in Kenosha, that maybe we can maybe

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

mirror some of the things that oth... our sister states do, so that we would have some type of uniformity. We know that obviously those things are working there. Why wouldn't you try to find out what our other sister states are doing?"

- Lang: "Mr. Reboletti, I can tell you, for certain, that most states prohibit the carrying of concealed weapons in most facilities that sell a substantial amount of alcohol. And I would say at this point, to the Gentleman who spoke before you, that under... under Amendments 24 and 27, those VFW halls would be... concealed carry would be prohibited in those VFW halls under those Amendments as well. And so, it's about the sale of alcohol and most states prohibit that whether it's a casino or some other facility."
- Reboletti: "But that makes the presumption that we're going to pass those Amendments. We may not pass those Amendments. Is that fair to say, Representative?"
- Lang: "Well, that's certain. I'm just... this is my opportunity to respond to the previous Gentleman who suggested that I was somehow assaulting the Constitution, and we should proceed to pass or adopt Amendments 24 and 27 because they were so fantastic. But they exempt those facilities as well."
- Reboletti: "Representative, does this Amendment #5 reform the pension system?"
- Lang: "Sir, it will not reform any other system other than deal with this Bill. So, you can go through your list but the answer will be no."
- Reboletti: "And... and I will go through my list. I was duly elected by 108,000 people in the 45th District and I'll ask

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

the questions. Does it help pay the bills that our... that we owe, the \$9 billion in... in our backlogs?"

Lang: "No."

Reboletti: "Does it help the unemployment rate or create new jobs across the State of Illinois?"

Lang: "Certainly not."

Reboletti: "Does it help reform Medicaid or implement the reforms that we passed two years ago that have not been put into place?"

Lang: "No, it simply protects the health, life, and welfare of the people going into these facilities. If that's not good enough for you, Sir, I'm sorry."

"Well, to the Amendment. I... I'm amazed of what we Reboletti: have done here, as a state, to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people when the City of Chicago had 500plus people murdered last year. We didn't have orders of the day and say well, we've got to solve that problem immediately. We even had a Committee of the Whole. It took the President of the United States, who lives in that war zone, after his fifth year, to say we have to do something. This can't stand. So, here we are because of a federal court decision, not because this has been some mutually vetted Bill where people from my side of the aisle sit with folks on your side of the aisle and say here's what would make perfectly good sense for our state. No, we'll continue to put the pieces of the puzzle together. And media, hang on, because I'm sure that in the next three to four days we'll know what that piece of legislation looks like. This doesn't stop the murder rate in the City of Chicago. This

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

doesn't help solve any crimes. It's a... it's a piecemeal way of putting legislation together. And while, Representative, I know that you want to make sure that the people who go to the casinos are safe, this could be done after passing House Bill 997 and then... then, work our way backwards as to what should be excluded. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. And I'll be brief. Representative Bost, to answer your question, Amendment 27 has... mine has casinos in it, but we do not establish video poker because of the truck stops and fraternal organizations. And mine doesn't go as far to be more gun-free zone with the parking lots and the adjacent properties. All we're doing here, again, way too broad, creating more gun-free zones. And we urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hays."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Hays: "Representative, we are going to spend this entire day and well into the night debating Amendments attached to no underlying Bill, that are going nowhere. In an attempt to squeeze something of value out of this day, does anything in this Amendment get us an inch closer to a gaming license in Danville?"

Lang: "I wish that it did, Sir."

Hays: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Kay: "Thank you. Leader Lang, just a... a very quick question, maybe a follow up. We had a... I think Representative Burke and I had a good conversation with respect to the definition of what adjacent means. Did you... you heard that, I... I know, you were in the Chair. Do you agree with that definition... or those definitions?"

Lang: "I do, except in this Amendment, it talks about property owned by or controlled by the gaming enterprise. So, it's not other property."

Kay: "Okay, thank you. And in your Bill or in your Amendment,
would revenue agents be able to carry guns into a casino?"

Lang: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. And State Police, likewise?"

Lang: "Law enforcement has a right to carry, Sir."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you very much, Leader."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. You know, what I think today proves for you people is that you might have the Majority but you can't lead. The people of Illinois are watching this; they're watching this. They know that the City of Chicago is the murder capital of this country. You have tons of government regulation, and yet, you've had over 500 homicides last year. The issues, as my colleagues have been talking about, high unemployment, high debt, high deficit. You raise the taxes in this state and yet our debt is \$2 billion higher. And you're going through this. Again, you might have the Majority, but you sure as hell can't lead."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Reis. Mr. Reis."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Reis: "Representative, you've been the Chair quite a bit today and no one's talked about penalties. What if someone's found guilty of violating this law should it become law?"

Lang: "As... as... That's a very good question, Representative. My understanding is that there's some conversation going on regarding what penalties might be for violating any portion of this Act with these Amendments, and that's an Amendment yet to come."

Reis: "So, we'll have even more. Who will be in charge of enforcing this?"

Lang: "That's an Amendment yet to come."

Reis: "You baffle me, Representative. You didn't have an answer to either one of them. So... Folks, we've ... we've said it a hundred times, this is about as incomplete of anything that I've seen. Agree or disagree with what goes on, we're... we're just hodgepodgeing things together. We don't know what definitions are. We don't know what the penalties are going to be. We don't know who's going to enforce this. My goodness, you're taking this all the way down from Chicago to a little town of St. Marie, where I live with 250 people. I mean, how on earth are all of municipalities and all these places of government going to enforce all this? What happens when a truck stop pulls into a... a truck pulls into a truck stop where there's video gaming? Does he have to have... he or she have to have that gun put away before they go into the parking lot? I mean, there's just a thousand unanswered questions here and this

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

is, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a terrible way to do a very important Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Nice seeing you in the Chair this afternoon. You're a lot more agreeable than the previous Speaker, I might add. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, will this do anything to bring gambling out to the State Fairgrounds?"

Lang: "I certainly wish it would, but it does not, Sir."

Brauer: "Well, I wish it would too. You know, you talked about the VFWs that we have in so many communities downstate, the American Legions. Very few that I've ever had the privilege to be in, didn't have guns on the wall; guns from World War II, guns from World War I, from Korea, from almost every conflict they've participated in. What will your Bill do to these VFWs and American Legions?"

Lang: "My understanding is this Bill is about concealed carry,
 isn't it, Sir?"

Brauer: "Well, it's conceal and carry, but these..."

Lang: "Unless the wall's concealed, I don't know what the problem is."

Brauer: "Well... so, if you have it out in the open, it'll be fine?"

Lang: "My understanding is that this Bill won't affect that process."

Brauer: "So, it's your intent that they will not be affected because these guns typically are in working order. They are

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

up on the wall and with ammunition. They would be easy to take down and fire."

Lang: "Again, Sir, this Bill only deals with conceal carry, some so, them the owner of the facility, of course, can have his or her own weapon, if it's legal. And so, I presume those weapons on the walls would be owned by the owner of the facility."

Brauer: "That's not true. A lot of times they're owned by people that have served their country, and they're there on loan."

Lang: "There's no intent in this Bill to affect those weapons, Sir."

Brauer: "So, what... what you're basically saying then any... anybody can walk into an American Legion with their own gun..."

Lang: "No."

Brauer: "...as long as it's not concealed."

Lang: "No, that... currently, the language is silent on the issue that you just raised, Sir. That'll come in a later Amendment."

Brauer: "Okay. Well, if I could give a recommendation, I would certainly like to see to maybe take this out of the record and maybe start working on some State Fair legislation..."

Lang: "Sir... Sir, this..."

Brauer: "...that we can get something constructive."

Lang: "...Bill's not going to Third Reading today. So, you can file Amendment 28 to clarify this issue if that's something you wish to do."

Brauer: "He's got 28. I might be able to get 29."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Lang: "You could do 29, 30, 50, whatever number you wish."

Brauer: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Leader Lang, just a question. You alluded earlier that there would not be any opportunity for anyone to carry a concealed weapon into a casino. Are you aware that there are several states, and I'm getting this information from a lobbyist and he is going to call back with the states, that already provide lockers at their facilities where individuals that arrive there can secure their... can secure their weapon? Would we consider doing something like that in Illinois?"

Lang: "Sir, we can consider that. File the Amendment. I'm certain the Speaker would be happy to let it out of Rules, and we'd be happy to debate it on the floor."

Sacia: "Sound like you're getting a little irritated,

Representative."

Lang: "No, not... not at all, Sir."

Sacia: "I hope not but..."

Lang: "Not at all."

Sacia: "You know, there's an interesting saying that's making the Internet. With all this gun control, I haven't heard one politician say how they plan to take guns from criminals, just law-abiding citizens, and I think that's exactly what we're doing here. I promise you, Representative Lang, that I will get the names of those states that already do have security facilities in their

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

casinos, and I will share that with you because I know you would want to know."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment will vote 'aye'; those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 56 people voting 'yes', 47 people voting 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Jakobsson, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Jakobsson."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have Floor Amendment #6 which prohibits carrying any firearm into any hospital or mental health facility. And it does include adjacent property or parking lots owned or controlled by the facility. I think that's a pretty simple Amendment. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

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

Reboletti: "Representative, again, we go back down this path of adjacent and knowing. For a mental health facility, are all those facilities going to have some type of notice that this piece of property is under their control? Because, as I've asked previous Sponsors of Amendments, that if we

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

don't have notice, then we don't really have an effective statute. So, how would these mental health facilities or hospitals indicate that they owned a piece of property or controlled the piece of property?"

Jakobsson: "So… well, if this became law, of course, any hospital or mental health facility would have a sign saying that that's what they are. That would be part of the law, but also, they would be able to post that arms would not be allowed."

Reboletti: "Besides hospitals and mental health facilities, if you go to an urgent care facility, like the one we have in Addison, which is associated with the hospital, does that fall under your Amendment? Is that considered part of this?"

Jakobsson: "Well, you know, that's a very good idea, and I'll make sure that we can include that, if it's not already part of this."

Reboletti: "Well, I... I was as... so, you're saying that it's not included as... as part of this? That's fair to say."

Jakobsson: "Right now, it's what you see in front of you."

Reboletti: "Thank you very much."

Jakobsson: "House... Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, when... when we start talking about mental health facilities and hospitals, do... would a CILA or Bogart facility fall under this? I mean, I know they're... they're MD and there are both physically and mentally disabled in

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

those facilities. Does... does this... would it fall under that type legislation?"

Jakobsson: "I'm not sure I understood really."

Bost: "Okay. Let... let me... let me explain this to you and maybe your staff can. We have, in this state, certain facilities through... spread throughout our communities, quite often residential neighborhoods, that are known as CILAs. Okay? And... and those facilities, do they fall under either mental health facilities, or if they're hospital-type facilities?"

Jakobsson: "CILAs are not defined as mental health facilities."

Bost: "They are not. Okay. That... I needed to know that for sure because the danger I see there is... is that if I have a conceal carry permit and I have a CILA next door, all of a sudden I would have a problem because I... I would be adjacent to."

Jakobsson: "Remember, you can do whatever you want on your property."

Bost: "I... you can unless you're adjacent to, correct?"

Jakobsson: "This... this Bill would... this Amendment would not interfere with your personal property."

Bost: "If you live next door... Does it say 'adjacent to'? Does this language say 'adjacent to' like the other language?"

Jakobsson: "Adjacent to, sure, that includes area nearby."

Bost: "It... it does..."

Jakobsson: "But your personal property is your personal property."

Bost: "But if it's adj... if my personal property is..."

Jakobsson: "There's a Second Amendment that allows you to have that in the… in your home."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bost: "Well, we're going to differ, I think, because I believe that if, the way this reads, that if your personal property is adjacent to, then you no longer have the ability to carry in your per... in your own abode. Because it's banned from adjacent properties and sometimes, you know, there might be a place where that might come into effect. Do you not agree? Wait. The answer is yes or no. You don't need... I mean..."

Jakobsson: "I disagree."

Bost: "Okay. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, you'd better look close 'cause I got a feeling that... and I don't think this is going anywhere, I really don't. But, we're... we're playing games again. But you'd better be clear what the language says. This... this is covered in Amendment 27. Again, covered in Amendment 27. All of these things have been worked on for, around here, it's really a while that they say... and... and I have all the respect for the ... Representative Phelps and others who have worked on it for 10 years. I first worked on this Bill with the late Terry Deering 20 years ago. This is not new on how we've tried to put this together over the years, but yet, we're playing these same games. Let's pass a Bill that's clean, that works correctly and doesn't have all these questions that... and works on what we've already been working on, something that other states have proven out. Well, let's go on."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Sullivan: "Representative, we... we've gone into some of the aspects of your Bill. What would happen if someone was in a car accident and had the conceal carry, and they're brought to the hospital, and once in the hospital, it was... it was noticed that they have a gun on them? What happens there?"
- Jakobsson: "If you read this, it says no person may knowingly carry a firearm into the hospital."
- Sullivan: "I knowingly carry into the hospital. I know I have it, I have a conceal carry permit. But I have to go to the hospital, and so I knowingly bring... am I supposed to say I'm sorry, wait, I'm dying, but I got to stop at my house and drop off my conceal carry? So, I ask the question, what happens?"

Jakobsson: "You are..."

Sullivan: "Representative, straightforward."

- Jakobsson: "If you don't intentionally... if you don't intentionally carry it into the hospital, that's not what this says."
- Sullivan: "I'm intentionally carrying. I know I have a gun. What... what if I walk into there and said, hey, I got a gun. I know I got a gun. I know I'm bringing it into there, but I got to go get rescued. I need... I had a heart attack, I'm bleeding, I'm whatever. What happens?"
- Jakobsson: "If you have that much time to leave... to think about it and you're in your car or with someone, you can put it away in the car the way... the way it should be."
- Sullivan: "Would an ambulance be considered government property?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Jakobsson: "And... you know, I'm not an attorney, I'm not a state's attorney..."

Sullivan: "Have you been paying..."

Jakobsson: "...but I..."

Sullivan: "...attention to the previous..."

Jakobsson: "...can't see ... I can't see that a state's attorney..."

Sullivan: "...Amendments that we talked about that said no government building or property?"

Jakobsson: "I can't see that a state's attorney would... okay."

Sullivan: "So, if I get in a car accident and I'm put in a government property, which is an ambulance, and then transported to a hospital, what happens?"

Jakobsson: "Well, I tried to address your question, you kept cutting me off."

Sullivan: "I'm sorry. I apologize. So, I'll ask it very distinctly. If I get in an accident, I'm put in a government vehicle, which is an ambulance, and transferred to a hospital, what happens? Am I in violation of your Amendment?"

Jakobsson: "You know, I... I cannot really... as I said, I'm not an attorney or a state's attorney, but I can't see that they would..."

Sullivan: "But Representative..."

Jakobsson: "...prosecute that kind of a violation."

Sullivan: "...this is your... this is your Amendment. You should be prepared to answer these questions. And that's a very simple, real-life scenario that could happen. So, any of us, we could... could become criminals by simply getting into

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

an accident because we have a conceal carry permit. Oh, the big dog's coming up."

Jakobsson: "If you let me finish, I don't see a state's attorney prosecuting that kind of offense."

Sullivan: "So, you think Anita Alvarez wouldn't prosecute somebody in the City of Chicago if this happened? You're going to guarantee me that here, today, before all your colleagues?"

Jakobsson: "I can't speak for her. I told you that."

Sullivan: "Once again, so you can't tell me that I wouldn't get prosecuted if that happened."

Jakobsson: "I... I think you have a Bill that you're sponsoring, and this prohibition is in that Bill."

Sullivan: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you."

Jakobsson: "So, I think you have a Bill that you're sponsoring, and I believe this same prohibition is in that Bill."

Sullivan: "I'm sponsoring what Bill?"

Jakobsson: "One that you're sponsoring."

Sullivan: "Is that... yeah, okay. Well then, we'll... we'll have to figure out what those are, but yours don't specifically delineated those, ours does. It's not that we don't have the similar things, 'cause there's a whole bunch of Amendments that are also in the Bill that is in 997, but it all flows together. And that was my previous question to the Speaker, how is this all going to work? How does one flow to the next without penalties, without knowing what's going on. All right. Well, let's go to the next issue on definition of hospitals. My father's a veterinarian; that's a hospital. Would that be considered part of this Bill?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Jakobsson: "Well, if an animal hospital falls under the definition of a hospital, then it would fall under this."

Sullivan: "Okay. My wife is a nurse practitioner and she works at a take care clinic. Is that considered this? It is a medical facility. Would that be considered a hospital because they're a treat and care, or is it more like the previous question of a urgent care unit?"

Jakobsson: "This is hospitals and mental health facilities."

Sullivan: "Well, thank you for que... your answers, but I think you should really look into the fact that you can criminalize folks for just getting into an accident and think... I think our Body should think about that before we vote on this issue."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Franks: "Representative, I know that Mr. Phelps's Bill 997 has some of the similar prohibitions for hospital or mental health facility as yours. My question is, or one of the questions is, why did you include the adjacent property or parking lots in here? Because my thought would be, let's assume someone is, you know, carrying, and they know they can't take it into the hospital. But when they get to the car, they take it out of their pocket, take it out of their jacket, take it out of their purse, and put it into a locked container and leave it in their vehicle. Unfortunately, if they would do that, I think under the way this Bill is written, they'd be violating the law. Why

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

would we want to make them criminals for doing something that seems so responsible?"

Jakobsson: "I know this includes parking lots, but it's... I think carry... let me get back to you on that in just a second. It's... it's like others that we've talked about. We want to protect the property and surrounding areas including parking lots."

Franks: "But I... but the parking lot is not the actual premise. Let's assume, for instance, that I'm a jewelry salesman, and I tend to keep samples with me in the car and I've got precious gems, and I travel in not the most savory areas, so I've... I conceal and carry. No... no, my neighborhood. Well, don't worry. And then, I'm on my... I find out that my son's broken his leg playing football and I have to go to the local hospital. I've left my work, I've left the jewelry store, I'm carrying, I get to the hospital parking lot to see my son, and I put the... my... my firearm in a locked container. I even take the bullets out and I put it in the trunk. The way this Bill is written I'd be violating the law, correct?"

Jakobsson: "As it stands now, yes, but as we know we can always amend..."

Franks: "Can we amend it? 'Cause I know that's..."

Jakobsson: "I'd consider that."

Franks: "...not your intent. I know that's not your intent. And it just seems that we had more reasonable approach in the Bill that Mr. Phelps had put forward that would cover what you want but not make criminals out of law-abiding citizens. Would that be something you'd be willing to do,

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

so we all can vote for this Amendment, to take it back and make that change?"

Jakobsson: "And... and there are Amendments forthcoming, so certainly that would be considered."

Franks: "If we would... if we could have that Amendment, I just think that would make it safer. And let me ask you this, how many other states have it drafted like... like this Amendment #6, as opposed to how Mr. Phelps has it in 997? Do we know what our... 'cause we have a huge laboratory, we have the entire United States. Every state in the union has a conceal carry law. What are the other ones doing on this, and what works and what doesn't work?"

Jakobsson: "There are many states that carve out special areas, and I... I don't know, in particular, about hospitals and mental health institutions."

Franks: "Can we find out? Because this is what... this was my fear when we were talking in caucus that people wouldn't have the answers to these very specific questions, and they're asking us to vote up and down. And I... I just think we need a little bit more information because we want to make the best Bill possible here, but we, also, want to make sure we're not making a mistake. Would you... would you consider taking it out of the record and maybe getting some answers. We have 27 more to do and maybe we could have the answers by the end of the day."

Jakobsson: "No, thank you."

Franks: "Okay."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kay."

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

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative, I have... I'm kind of like a broken record and I apologize for that. But today, I've asked the question several times about the definition of adjacent properties or premises. Do you recall the conversation I had with Representative Burke?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Kay: "Do you agree with the definition that she gave me, or we agreed upon, with respect to adjacent?"

Jakobsson: "Yes. I believe that the definition that Representative Burke gave is the same that would apply here."

Kay: "Okay. One last question. Does your Amendment apply to nursing homes or other such facilities?"

Jakobsson: "This says hospitals and mental health facilities.

If they provide mental health care, then, yes, it would..."

Kay: "And it..."

Jakobsson: "...apply there."

Kay: "I'm sorry. And if... and if they don't, then it doesn't
apply?"

Jakobsson: "No."

Kay: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McSweeney."

McSweeney: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. This Motion requires more 'ayes' than 'nays'.

Those in favor will vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'.

Take a vote. The question is, 'Shall the debate end?' Those in favor vote 'yes'; those will vote... opposed vote 'no'.

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

This is a Motion to close the debate on the Amendment. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 88 voting 'yes' and 27 voting 'no'. And the previous question is put. The Chair recognizes Representative Jakobsson to close."

- Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I would just say that this Amendment prohibits carrying any firearm into any hospital or mental health facility. I urge an 'aye' vote, please. Thank you."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all take the record. On this question, there are 64 people voting 'yes', 45 people voting 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Hollman: "Floor... Floor Amendment #7 is offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment would prohibit conceal carry in libraries and adjacent parking lots. I ask your support."
- Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Reboletti: "Representative, again, I'm going to as... ask if you are aware of how other states address the issue of... of libraries."
- Lang: "If it's a government building, it's probably true that they prohibit conceal carry, Sir."
- Reboletti: "So, would it be fair to say that Leader Currie's

 Amendment would already cover this particular Amendment or

 is that only for state buildings?"
- Lang: "It... it may, but there may be libraries that are not public buildings and therefore, we need this Amendment."
- Reboletti: "So, in the City of Elmhurst, there are homes right across the street from the library and businesses, would those homes and businesses be part of this adjacent property?"

Lang: "No."

Reboletti: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "There being no further debate, Mr. Lang to close."

Lang: "Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting 'yes'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record yourselves. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #8 is offered by Representative Feigenholtz."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang in the Chair."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #8 prohibits carrying a firearm into a stadium, arena, or collegiate, or professional sporting event. It includes adjacent property or parking lots owned or controlled by the facility."

Speaker Lang: "Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Chair recognizes Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, how is your Amendment different from the provisions that are in House Bill 997 or, I would assume, Amendment #27?"

Feigenholtz: "It includes parking lotted... lots and adjacent properties."

Reboletti: "Why... why is it so important not to have it in the parking lot? So, I know that you represent Wrigley Field; you have parking lots all over the place up in the area. Some of those parking lots are blocks away from the stadium. Why couldn't somebody park three blocks away at a facility there and leave their firearm there?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I have two very interesting… over the weekend was reading an article about two shootings that were actually occur… that actually occurred in parking lots adjacent to stadiums. But on that question, I also have a letter from five of the sports teams in the City of Chicago addressing the issue of gun safety: the Chicago Bears, Chicago Blackhawks, Chicago Bulls, Chicago Cubs, and the Chicago White Sox, all asking us to please allow them to

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- make their own decisions and prohibit this from becoming law."
- Reboletti: "Representative, you mentioned some shootings in a parking lot..."
- Feigenholtz: "It... they've asked us to include parking lots, Mr. Reboletti."
- Reboletti: "Thank you. Do you see... you mentioned some shootings in a parking lot. Was that in... in your district or is that in the City of Chicago?"
- Feigenholtz: "I believe that the two occurrences were in other states."
- Reboletti: "They were in other states which is interesting because I was going to ask you if the people possessed a FOID card in the State of Illinois and maybe the people here might have been gang members because, as I have said in our committees numerous times, that gang members are going to carry wherever they feel like carrying. They don't have FOID cards; they usually have felony convictions. So, I'm still trying to figure out why if... if I leave my firearm secured in my trunk before I go into Wrigley Field, how is that making anything less safe with respect to gun safety? Why is that so less safe if I leave my gun in the car than if I leave it at home, I guess, 'cause that's all I can do?"
- Feigenholtz: "Representative Reboletti, this... the point that you are bringing up about storage is going to come up in a future Amendment. This Amendment strictly deals with stadiums and adjacent parking lots."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Reboletti: "Are those adjacent parking lots... some of those parking lots in Wrigleyville are under private control. Would those parking lots be subjected to this Amendment if it became the law of the land?"

Feigenholtz: "Only if they're owned or controlled by the stadium themselves."

Reboletti: "So, if I own a parking lot across from Wrigley Field and it's my lot, I could allow people to conceal and carry and put their firearm in their car and that would be okay. But if the Cubs own the parking lot next to me, then I couldn't, right, because that would be property adjacent to, so I would lose that privilege to do so. Is that right?"

Feigenholtz: "It depends on subsequent Amendments that are adopted onto this measure, but as this Amendment stands..."

Reboletti: "Which... which..."

Feigenholtz: "...you are correct."

Reboletti: "...which subsequent Amendments would those be?"

Feigenholtz: "I have a feeling there will be many."

Reboletti: "Well, I... I'm sure and you know what, I... I guess I could drink a lot of Mt. Dew and... and take NoDoz and be here for the rest of the night, that's fine, but at the end of the day, it doesn't make any sense. So, if I own a parking lot in Wrigleyville, I'm not near the... the actual stadium, I'm not next to something else, you're going to tell me that some additional Amendment will deal with that. We already had an Amendment like that. It was called the City of Chicago's ordinance banning handguns, Representative, and that didn't work out so well; 500

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

murders last year. So, I'm just trying to figure out exactly why one lot would be okay and another lot would be different. Is that your intention in this Amendment?"

Feigenholtz: "The intent of the Amendment is to… if the… if the adjacent parking lots are owned by the sports team, as I said earlier, that it would be prohibited."

Reboletti: "Right, but if... if across the street... I know before Ricketts bought the McDonald's, they used to allow people to park there or the gas station. That would be okay, right?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct. It's not adjacent."

Reboletti: "So, how does that make it less safe than to park in one lot versus the other lot? If people can still bring their firearms and park it... park, I don't know, 50 feet away or 100 feet away. How's that different?"

Feigenholtz: "You raise a good point."

Reboletti: "And so..."

Feigenholtz: "And that may be addressed in a future Amendment."

Reboletti: "I have no doubt it'll be ad... addressed in a... in a future Amendment. Representative, I know that you're... what you're... you're well-intentioned here, but again, we... we get back to this adjacent, and close to, and nearby. At the end of the day, what we're going to concoct here is a cocktail that will not pass muster. We're going to be right back on Jan... on June 8, and I have no doubt that the Federal Court will not be pleased with the... what is perceived so far as reasonable restrictions and I guess constitutional carry will happen because the Christmas tree is far, far overweight right now with ornaments. But I'm sure at about

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

3, 4:00 this morning, I can only imagine what Amendment #55 will look like."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Absolutely."

Kay: "Sorry to go through this so many times, Representative, but you likely heard the definition that we have of what adjacent means. And for legislative intent, I would like to know if you agree with the definition that Representative Burke and I agreed to."

Feigenholtz: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield just for a few questions?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Cross: "Hi, Representative. Representative, does your Amendment do anything to reform the pension system at all?"

Feigenholtz: "The pitching system? The pension system or the pitching?"

Cross: "According to the Governor, it's costing us \$17 million a day when we ignore it. Does your Amendment do anything to do… take care of the pension problem?"

Feigenholtz: "No."

Cross: "Does your Amendment do anything to pay down the \$9 billion in unpaid bills?"

Feigenholtz: "Not this Amendment."

Cross: "All right. Does your Bill or Amendment do anything to create more jobs in Illinois?"

Feigenholtz: "No, Sir."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Cross: "Representative, we all know on this floor that this Amendment, whether we vote for or against it, doesn't fit within this Bill and that this Bill is going nowhere because of the way it's been drafted. Why are... why are you going through this exercise knowing that this... this Bill 1155 will do nothing at the end of the..."

Feigenholtz: "In an effort to save lives, Representative."

Cross: "Well, this Bill can't pass out of the House like it is nor can it go over... nor can it go to the Senate. So, how does that save a life, Representative?"

Feigenholtz: "We can try."

Cross: "But you're asking people to vote on a Bill that doesn't come together at all, that it's... it's just impossible for this... the way it's crafted. And maybe you didn't do that and I'm sure your intentions are good, as a general rule I know that, and I'm not suggesting they're not for you, but why are we going through this exercise when this is not a Bill that can pass because of the way it's drafted. How does that do anything good?"

Feigenholtz: "Representative, I am concerned about the welfare of small business in my community."

Cross: "Mmm mmm."

Feigenholtz: "I have a large stadium where 40 thousand people gather frequently, and I believe that it is my responsibility to try and protect them."

Cross: "This Bill doesn't do it, unfortunately. That's them that's the sad part about it, Representative. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bost: "Representative, on... on a very light note to start off, new hairdo, right? Is it? It's wonderful. Your new hairdo. It's... you got a new hairdo? Looks... hey, I... I think it looks lovely, you know. I... I don't know if you know or not, my wife and I, we own beauty salon, you know, so I... I notice things like that. The agree... that you know, she... she owns... she does hair and I do books and the agreement is I don't touch anybody's hair, so I couldn't do that."

Feigenholtz: "I said I can't hear you. I wasn't talking about my hair."

Bost: "You can't hear me? I was just ask... I was asking about your hairdo. I think it looks lovely."

Feigenholtz: "Thank you."

Bost: "I was giving you a compliment."

Feigenholtz: "Mike, thank you."

Bost: "So... you're welcome, Sara. The question I have ... "

Feigenholtz: "And your hair looks great too, Mike."

Bost: "Well, thank you. It... it's becoming a lot whiter and grayer. When you first opened up with this, you said there were some recent shootings that have occurred in parking lots. Can you expand on that, when those were?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe that they were acts of violence at two different stadiums in the country."

Bost: "So, they were in the... in the... you don't remember where they were at?"

Feigenholtz: "I believe one was in Kansas and another in San Francisco."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bost: "Okay. Were they legal people that had conceal carry permits that actually committed these crimes and these acts of violence or... or yes or no. Do you maybe..."

Feigenholtz: "I don't know the details..."

Bost: "Okay."

Feigenholtz: "...but there were fatalities and that caught my attention."

Bost: "Okay. And... and I understand why you're trying to... in leading the debate, but without us knowing whether or not they were... they had conceal carry permits or whether it might be that they were in violation of the law anyway, that they were criminals. And... and I'm... I'm sure that at the times and I'm... I'm going to assume that at some time in sports facilities in Chicago and around this state in the far out regions of the parking lots, there has probably been shootings. And... and I... I mean, I can't quote an incident, but we can assume that that would be the case, correct?"

Feigenholtz: "I guess."

Bost: "And... and I would assume that that occurred that they...
especially in the City of Chicago, that wasn't with a legal
gun because they're illegal there now. My thought on this
is, is that maybe if we want to save lives, we allow those
law-abiding citizens who meet all the requirements of the
Bill that we put together to be able to keep themselves and
their families safe when they have to park a long distance
away in these parking lots, which quite often you are not
going until after dark to return to your vehicle where many
vehicles are lined up and criminals could hide, and it

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

would give them an opportunity to defend themselves. So, Representative, to... to the Bill. Folks, think about that. What we're really trying to do is allow the opportunity for people to carry weapons to defend themselves and protect themselves and their families. Where else than in a sporting facility whenever they might... because of whatever reason, have to park way out, not necessarily under the lights, maybe near a wood line or something like that, and they put themselves in danger and we're going to tell them that oh no, no, no, you can protect yourself in the middle of the street, or by the time this all gets said and done, maybe in a field somewhere in Washington County. I'm not sure exactly at what point we finally quit throwing these Amendments on and what this actually does, but we give... we are taking away the initial intent of why we would have conceal carry, which is that you could protect yourself and your family. So, let's put them into a dark parking lot, because I know the parking lots come all the way up to the stadiums, but they go way out in a larger stadium. Folks, this doesn't make sense. We've got to stop this, and we've got to get this Bill created in a way where those people, who are law-abiding citizens, that go through the process to get a conceal carry permit, would be able to protect themselves in as many places as possible. So, let's be honest, you really don't want people protecting themselves because government can do that. Oh no, wait, government's not doing that. Government's incapable of doing that. So, let's really work on the true Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Franks: "Representative, I agree with the premise here. I'm...

but I'm looking at the way this is drafted and... and it says

no person may knowingly carry a firearm into any stadium,

arena or collegiate or professional sporting event. What do

you mean by carry? You can't bring any firearm in?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Franks: "So, even if it's in a box?"

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Franks: "You can't. Okay. Now, let me ask this. What happens if Chicago gets the Olympics, and we have an Olympic shooting event. Would this prohibit the… these athletes from bringing in their firearms to compete in the Olympics?"

Feigenholtz: "If you look at subsection (b), it's covered what...
the issue you're addressing is covered in exemptions."

Franks: "I'm sorry. Could... I'm looking at... I'm looking at the...
the exemptions and provisions in subsection... which one
would apply?"

Feigenholtz: "Section b, Representative, cross references the unlawful use of a weapon."

Franks: "Can you tell me, specifically, in subsection (b) where this would be exempted?"

Feigenholtz: "Sure, hold on one second."

Franks: "Thank you. Thank you for pointing that out. We saw it. It's in the event that we may get the 2016 Olympics. I think that is... you had thought of that, so I want to let folks know that. So, thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bradley."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bradley: "Purpose of an announcement."

Speaker Lang: "Please proceed, Sir."

Bradley: "The Revenue Committee scheduled for this evening is canceled."

Speaker Lang: "A... a disappointment to us all, Sir. Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sacia: "Representative Feigenholtz, would you agree with me that if I were a person bent on committing mass shootings, a stadium would be a good place to go? Would that be... would we agree?"

Feigenholtz: "Possibly."

Sacia: "This is not a trick question."

Feigenholtz: "Possibly."

Sacia: "Well, I... I'm trying to put my mind and think like a person that would want to kill folks. So, we pass this legislation and all of us good, honorable people will check our gun or leave it home. But I'm a crackpot, I decide I want to go and kill a bunch of people. Is there any security at the stadium such as we have here in the Capitol or at the Stratton Building that would prevent someone entering with a firearm?"

Feigenholtz: "I think it depends on the stadium but security is exempt. They carry firearms."

Sacia: "No, no, no. I... I understand that, Representative, but you alluded to the fact that in your district you have a stadium where you could have many thousands of people. So..."

Feigenholtz: "Correct."

Sacia: "Is that true?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Feigenholtz: "And the alcohol."

Sacia: "Okay. But that being said, here again we go after the good, honest guy. None of us in here are going to carry a firearm in there, but the crackpot that's going to kill people, he knows nobody's going to have a gun, so he's going to carry a gun in there. Why do we exempt this? Wouldn't it be so much better if the crackpot didn't know if the guy next to him had a gun?"

Feigenholtz: "I think the less guns permitted in the stadium or arena the better."

Sacia: "Thank you, Representative. Once again, we prove that if we take guns from good, honest citizens, we'll cut down on crime. And thanks to Chicago, we've proven that's true. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Feigenholtz to close."

Feigenholtz: "Apprec... I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Those in favor of the Lady's Amendment will vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, please, Members. Davis, DeLuca, Fortner, Hays. Please record yourselves, Members. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 58 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Floor Amendment #9 is offered by Representative Cassidy."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

Amendment 9 would prohibit carrying any firearm into an

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

amusement park which also includes adjacent property or parking lots owned or controlled by the facility."

Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the adoption of the Amendment.

Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Than... thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative, what's the policy on this issue in other states?"

Cassidy: "There are two states that speak to it specifically.

Missouri and Texas both have language concerning amusement parks and in most other states, the amusement parks themselves have a policy against weapons in the facilities.

Disney, for example, has a blanket ban in their facilities."

Reis: "Wasn't aware of that. Does that mean I would not knowingly know I shouldn't carry in there?"

Cassidy: "I'm sorry. What?"

Reis: "I didn't know Disney had a... in..."

Cassidy: "They do have a policy that prohibits weapons in their amusement..."

Reis: "But it's their..."

Cassidy: "...parks."

Reis: "...policy and they put that in place."

Cassidy: "Yes."

Reis: "Okay. Is that advertised?"

Cassidy: "I believe we found it on their website."

Reis: "I guess if you carried one in there you would not knowingly know that you shouldn't carry one in there, huh?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Cassidy: "You probably have to take that up with the Disney Company."
- Reis: "Okay. My... my question is... is, you have children, have you been to the amusement park where they did allow conceal carry and were you scared? I mean were you concerned?"
- Cassidy: "Actually, when I took my children to Disney I was aware of the signage at the entrance to the facility that said that no weapons were allowed."
- Reis: "No, I meant the other way. Have you gone to the amusement park where maybe they did allow them to carry in?"
- Cassidy: "I have never been to an amusement park that doesn't have signage saying no weapons are allowed. I have not been to Great America here with my children 'cause they're kind of young for it."

Reis: "But we can't conceal carry here in Illinois."

Cassidy: "Right, exactly. So..."

Reis: "So, I know conceal carry..."

Cassidy: "I... the only places I have been are places that have that signage at the entrance."

Reis: "Now, what constitutes an amusement park?"

Cassidy: "I think that's a commonly understood term; tilt-a-whirls, roller coasters and the like. How is it defined in your Bill? I believe the Bill you're sponsoring also bans carrying in amusement parks. Do you have a specific definition in your Bill?"

Reis: "Well, we might, but... but my point is all afternoon is... is that there are no definitions in all these Amendments."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Cassidy: "I'm sorry, Representative, what were... what was the question?"

Reis: "Representative Franks will get his time later I'm sure.

Our point is all afternoon is there are no definitions. I

bet there is a definition in our Bill, but this is just

another hodgepodge that's all... nope, can't carry here,

nope, can't carry there. But what is an amusement park?"

Cassidy: "I... I do not believe that anyone would be confused by...
by what is and is not an amusement park. And there is no
definition in your Bill."

Reis: "You've read our Bill?"

Cassidy: "Right here. Yes, Sir."

Reis: "No. Did you read our Bill?"

Cassidy: "Staff, here, has assured me that your... and your Bill is right in front of me, and it just says amusement park."

Reis: "I'll check that out. So... thank you, Representative."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Bost: "You know, I... I understand the language and the... in... in this for, like, parks in the inner cities and... and playgrounds and I agree with you on that, but what about larger state parks that are throughout the southern end of the state that might have roads going through them that are state park roads? It... would this then say that I can't use the cut-through road to go from Makanda to Giant City Lodge?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Cassidy: "This is actually only specific to amusement parks.

This is not specific..."

Bost: "Oh, okay."

Cassidy: "...to a city or municipal or state parks."

Bost: "That's... Okay. That's another Bill I'm thinking of."

Cassidy: "This is very..."

Bost: "I will... I apologize for that then."

Cassidy: "No problem."

Bost: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady will yield."

Sacia: "Representative, I had the privilege of meeting your children last week. You have a beautiful family. Thank you..."

Cassidy: "Thank you."

Sacia: "...for introducing us. You... you mentioned earlier, that's what prompted me to push my speak light, that when you go to a amusement park, I... I think I sensed that you stated that there... there's a sense of comfort if you see that sign, no weapons allowed. Did... did I perceive that correctly?"

Cassidy: "Actually, what you heard me said... say is that I have only ever been to amusement parks that have that signage not because I only choose to go to..."

Sacia: "Okay."

Cassidy: "...amusement parks that have that signage. I was indicating I had never been to one that did not."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sacia: "I guess the point I've been trying to make all day is if amusement parks, obviously, would be, again, a great killing field for those that want to kill people. And do we really believe that making it a felony, probably making it a felony to keep people out of there that are carrying a gun, do we think those people really care? They're planning on going there to create mayhem and kill people. So, if we prohibit them from going there, are they going to heed that warning, if you will?"

Cassidy: "My sense of comfort would not come from wondering who may or may not have a weapon in an amusement park. My sense of comfort would come from knowing it is well staffed with security who is trained and understands the proper usage... and how to protect my family. And thank you for the compliment to my boys. They enjoyed being here."

Sacia: "They... they seem... you have a wonderful family. I... I share with you, Representative, Representative Reboletti corrected me. It's not a crackpot; it's a whack job. But if I were a whack job that went to an amusement park, I really wouldn't care about that sign out front. I really wouldn't because I want to create mayhem. I want to kill folks. And a whack job doesn't care about the sign, so with all do respect to your Amendment, I encourage the Body to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady will yield."

Cavaletto: "I just have one question concerning the amusement park. Would a golf course be involved in that?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Cassidy: "I've never been to a golf course with a roller coaster on it."
- Cavaletto: "If I... if I went to a golf course to play golf could I take a gun in my bag?"
- Cassidy: "To be honest with you, I... I believe the... the common understanding, and we could... we could check with... with the language in... in the Bill from your side of the aisle as well, I don't believe that the commonly understood definition of amusement park would include a golf course, Although that could, perhaps, fall under the... the other parks Amendment that... that is addressed later. An amusement park, in my understanding, would be a place with rides and entertainment."
- Cavaletto: "So, a golf course may be included in... carry... I could carry..."
- Cassidy: "I... I... as I said, I've never seen a golf course that has a roller coaster or a tilt-a-whirl or any of those things on it. What... a golf course tends to be a golf course."

Cavaletto: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Of course."

Reboletti: "Representative, again, I hearken back to the adjacent property or parking lot. So, let's assume I own adjacent property next to Great America in Gurnee and maybe people camp there or they park there. They couldn't leave their firearms in that car, could they?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Cassidy: "Once again, as with the others, this would be property controlled by the amusement park. So, if you were to lease your property to the amusement park, then perhaps it would apply. But if you simply owned it, it would not be under the control of the facility."
- Reboletti: "But that... doesn't that then defeat the underlying purpose of your Amendment because within a couple hundred feet maybe I have this piece of property where people could go there versus a couple hundred feet away Great America owns the property, and so therefore I can't park there."
- Cassidy: "The intent is to... to cover the property under the control of the facility."
- Reboletti: "Wouldn't we want to have people be able to conceal and carry in the parking lot because, obviously, where there's large crowds leaving, maybe there's a gang fight breaks out? There could be some type of, as Representative Sacia likes to use the term, mayhem. Don't we want people to be able to protect themselves in... in those situations?"
- Cassidy: "As... as to the previous questions, that would be the job of security and law enforcement."
- Reboletti: "But what if security can't get there in time? I... I guess that's where we always end up here is that 49 other states have this. Do we know what Great America does in Texas or California? Do we know what... what their restraints are..."

Cassidy: "Texas..."

Reboletti: "...or constraints?"

Cassidy: "...explicitly bans the presence of weapons in amusement parks, similar to this."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Reboletti: "What does Indiana or Wisconsin do?"

Cassidy: "In those instances, it's usually the policy of the owner... ownership of the facility. There are two states that explicitly blan... ban and that would be Texas and Missouri."

Reboletti: "Oh. What about parking lots in those states that you mentioned. Are... are they banned from concealing and carrying a firearm on the parking lots in those states?"

Cassidy: "I'm unaware."

Reboletti: "If... if those states allowed that would you be willing to change your Amendment then to allow for parking lots, then?"

Cassidy: "No."

Reboletti: "I didn't think so. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Yes."

Durkin: "This may be redundant in my line of questioning but the hour's getting late, the oxygen is getting low, but is there any definition in the Criminal Code for amusement park? Want to ask that young, bright attorney? He's a fine chap. He might be able to provide good counsel for you. I'll give you a moment."

Cassidy: "He's going to look."

Durkin: "All right."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin, do you know the answer to the question? We could save a lot of time if you know the answer."

Cassidy: "I have the answer."

Durkin: "I... I'm not sure if that's my responsibility now."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Durkin: "Now... yes."

Cassidy: "In the two mentions of amusement park, in the entire Code, it is not defined. It is included as a list... in a list of other facilities that are commonly understood."

Durkin: "Wow. Okay. Now, there are different organizations, fraternal organizations in the suburbs, the Jaycees, the Elks who will have summer festivals and within there they'll have different rides, tilt-a-whirls and whatnot, and it'll be a gated area in which you have to pay money to get access to those rides. Is that an amusement park?"

Cassidy: "I believe that festivals and the like will be addressed in a later Amendment."

Durkin: "Well, we'll worry about that at a later point. But I'm... the question is posed to you. Please respond."

Cassidy: "I did. I believe it would be addressed as a festival."

Durkin: "Is it an amusement park? Is that..."

Cassidy: "I believe it's a festival."

Durkin: "...certain ...is that section within... All right. So, the ques... your answer is no. So, when the... the Village of LaGrange has a outdoor festival that is run by the Jaycees which has all the rides and whatnot and you have to pay, it's... it's fenced off and you have to pay admission to get access to it, it's your opinion that that is not an amusement park."

Cassidy: "I believe an amusement park would be a fixed location. I believe a summer festival or an outdoor

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

festival would be a festival. It would be a licensed event."

Durkin: "Are we guessing or do we know that?"

Cassidy: "That is my belief."

Durkin: "It's your what?"

Cassidy: "That is my belief."

Durkin: "All right. Well you've done a super job with this and I thank... and I'll wait to hear some more of this really ste... startling debate, some of these really inquisitive questions that will be coming from my colleagues."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor will yield."

Brauer: "Representative, I've... have on my iPhone a definition of a amusement park, and it says it contains recreational devices as merry-go-rounds, Ferris wheels, roller coasters, et cetera, usually have a booth for games and refreshments. Would you say that's a pretty good definition of amusement park?"

Cassidy: "Sure."

Brauer: "Well, Representative, when I go out to Scheels, which I go out quite frequently, and I'm here from Springfield, it... it's a rather large store south of town here. And they have Ferris wheels, they have all kinds of games, you can get in a... cars, there's three of them lined up and it's for NASCAR racing. There's all kinds of... of hunting games that are make believe, so that would fit this definition of amusement park."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Cassidy: "I... I believe what you are describing is a retail store."
- Brauer: "Yes, it is, but with that definition it's exactly what Scheels would be described as."
- Cassidy: "If their primary purpose is a re… is retail, then they're a retail store. If their primary purpose is… is the rides and roller coasters, then that's what… then they… then they would be. Yeah."
- Brauer: "Well, you... you can go to an amusement park and buy things all day long. There would be this..."
- Cassidy: "It really comes down to what the primary purpose is."
- Brauer: "Well, that'd be described 'cause they have all sorts of vending machines. They have all sorts of... of people that's selling what have you, t-shirts, ball caps. I mean, you can go to a amusement park and you can spend thousands of dollars, if you so desire."
- Cassidy: "Having been to Disney, I can attest to that."
- Brauer: "Well, especially if you take a couple kids with you.

 Well, Representative, what I'm saying is your definition of amusement park, I mean, does... does it fit coun... county fairs? Because they certainly have their share of rides."
- Cassidy: "Again, that's a licensed permit event that would be like the festivals."
- Brauer: "Okay."
- Cassidy: "And fairgrounds are usually park facilities, I believe, as well, so that would be addressed in a later Amendment."
- Brauer: "Okay. Well, I think we still have a lot of issues here that really haven't been described as clear as they need to

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

describe if we're going to put it in statute. I mean, right now, you haven't told me that Scheels really doesn't fit that issue."

Cassidy: "I think that I did tell you Scheels is a retail establishment, not an amusement park."

Brauer: "Well, you tell some kid that. I mean, they're not going there to go buy something; they're going there for the rides and for the games, and I'm kind of the same way."

Cassidy: "Kids aren't getting conceal carry permits either."

Brauer: "No, but I am."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy to close."

Cassidy: "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? Record yourselves, Members. The hour is late. Have all voted who wish? Arroyo, DeLuca, Fortner, Hays, Rita. Please record yourselves. Please take the record. On this question, there are 56 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', 11 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #10 is offered by Representative Jakobsson."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan, for what reason do you rise?

Representative Jakobsson on the Amendment."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have Amendment #10 which allows public, private, and community colleges and universities to establish their own restrictions and regulations perturning... pertaining to the carry of firearms on campus property."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Mr. Speaker, in the late hour, do you have any mushroom food back there because the mushrooms are getting a little hungry."

Speaker Lang: "I suppose you could forge around, Sir. I don't know what's back there."

Sullivan: "Okay. Well, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, there was an agreement on the previous legislation, House Bill 148, that described, which is also embodied in Representative Phelps's Bill in 997, an agreement about college campuses. How does your Bill alter or go against the previously agreed language with the colleges that we had in the previous Bills?"

Jakobsson: "If you give me a minute, I will try to answer your question, please."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Oh, I'm sorry. We didn't have the staffer there."

Jakobsson: "This is the language, not that in the Bill that you referred to, that the community colleges, the universities, publics and privates, all have agreed to."

Sullivan: "This definitely is not the agreement that came together between Representative Phelps and the colleges. This is different from what was agreed to, and they're going against that in your Amendment, I assume, if you can explain the differences between the two."

Jakobsson: "This is the language that the universities want."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Sullivan: "I don't disagree that this might be what you want, but this is not want the universities agreed to in 148 or 997."
- Jakobsson: "I am told this is the language that the universities want. I didn't say that it's mine."
- Sullivan: "Leader..."
- Jakobsson: "It gives them the opportunities for each one to do its own rules and regulations, to do their self-governing that they feel is necessary."
- Sullivan: "Mr. Speaker, could we potentially go to Representative Phelps for clarification and then back to me for further questions?"
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan yields to Mr. Phelps. Please proceed, Sir."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of clarification. And I would like the Sponsor to take this out because the colleges went back on their word. On the many years that we negotiated this, we did not agree with this. We had a gentlemen's agreement. And I'm at upset the colleges and I want that to go on the record."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you for your indulgence. So, obviously, we know the answer to that and we can move forward. So, with the Bill that you have that is your language and potentially a... going back on the word of the colleges, if they're with your language. My understanding that... well, let's talk about the University of Illinois. I'm an alumnus of your hometown university. Like many people here, we know what Green Street is. Green Street is the four-lane

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- thoroughfare through the middle of campus. What would happen if I had a concealed carry permit, and I was pulled over right in front of the alma mater, under your language? Would I be in violation of this Amendment?"
- Jakobsson: "The university has the opportunity to send up... set up its own rules for its property. It does not own Green Street that you were just referring to."
- Sullivan: "Are we reading the same Amendment because that's not what I'm reading."
- Jakobsson: "Well, if you're not reading the one that I'm talking about, maybe we should get to the one that I'm presenting."
- Sullivan: "They may restrict or otherwise regulate firearms on or in close proximity to their campuses. So, we don't know what close proximity is. Grounds or other property including but not limited sidewalks, commons, and highways. So, it's..."
- Jakobsson: "Owned by the school district. Please remember to read the full sentence."
- Sullivan: "Owned by the school district is... or the schools is not in your Amendment."
- Jakobsson: "Look at page 1, line 12, I just read it from there."
- Sullivan: "Representative, on line 16 of your Bill, after a... it says or... or on, or in property owned and controlled. So, that is a separate issue that we're talking about. My question still remains. What happens if I'm on the highway, Green Street, in front of the alma mater, in your jurisdiction with a concealed carry permit, and I get

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

pulled over by the police and they recognize that I have a gun on me? Am I in violation of your Amendment?"

Jakobsson: "If that property is owned or controlled by the university or the higher institution."

Sullivan: "Representative, that is not what your... not your Bill says. It says after the fact, if they're... a separate issue, if they have owned property, but that is not what it's talking about in Section 8, starting in line 6, going all the way down to what you're talking about in line 16. It specifically points out different areas that can be considered an area that you cannot carry. Highway is specifically addressed in your Amendment."

Jakobsson: "If it's owned by the university or the college.

Let's... let's look at a campus that is pretty well, you know, confined and..."

Sullivan: "How do you..."

Jakobsson: "...all the roads..."

Sullivan: "How do you own a highway? Then it makes no sense.

How do you own a highway? Representative, I'm... I'm just trying to get an answer here. Your Bill does not say that.

I know that you keep repeating it, but you can repeat it a hundred times, it's not in your Bill."

Jakobsson: "Well, it seems like I can keep reading to you what the Bill says and you don't hear it."

Sullivan: "Fine. Fine."

Jakobsson: "So, let's move."

Sullivan: "Let's... let's start at the point where you think it says that. Nothing in this Act shall preempt, abridge, limit or diminish the authority of the community colleges

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

and public, private colleges and universities for prohibiting, restricting, otherwise regulating firearms on or in close proximity to the campuses, grounds and other property, including but not limit to, sidewalks, commons and highways owned by the school district, community college, or public or private colleges. How do you own a highway? Back to that. How do you own a highway?"

- Jakobsson: "We want to make sure that if there is any portion that is owned by a..."
- Sullivan: "I get that they can own... they can... Oh, I'm sorry. I won't... I won't talk over you."
- Jakobsson: "...a university or college that they can have the control of it. Thank you."
- Sullivan: "All right. We're... we're clearly not going to get by that, so I'll go on to the next point before I shoot myself. Representative, so, do you consider fraternities part of the campus?"

Jakobsson: "Yes, they are."

- Sullivan: "Okay. So, a fraternity is part of a campus. I think we both agree with that even your staffer there agrees with that; That's perfect. What happens if we're on the… let's call it… let's… on the side… on the Champaign side, and I own a private home right next to a fraternity, and so, I'm in proximity of that property. Am I limited from having a concealed carry permit in my home?"
- Jakobsson: "That's your personal property and you are allowed to have your personal property."
- Sullivan: "So, how, then, do you distinguish proximity, say one area, and not... I mean, I'm right next door. Isn't that in

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

proximity? Is... okay. Well then, let me... let me put this another way, or we're going to mash words here."

Jakobsson: "It's the surrounding property that is owned or controlled by the university. Your property is your property, and your personal property is not affected by this."

Sullivan: "Mr. Speaker, I give up. I... I give up, but I... in my... in my last little explanation... I would like to verify the vote on this Bill... or on this Amendment. I ask for a verification."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is..."

Sullivan: "I'm so flustered I don't even know what I want."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Bost."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. 'Cause I'm not Bost: going to try to debate that with... when the language is pretty clear. Let me expand on... on... regardless of where you're at on... on conceal carry or whatever, let me explain that there was an agreement between Representative Phelps and those of us that worked with our colleges, where we have colleges and community colleges, to agree with language that is sensible. Because if you realize and look at college campuses where city streets, where county highways, where other thi... things occur, where you have to actually travel through the campuses because some of them are so massive, we worked with them to put specific language together. This destroys... destroys negotiations. At a time when we're working so hard to try to... to bring together something that's sensible and... and workable, when you bring up language like this, and as far

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

as I'm concerned, from what we just heard, the Sponsor doesn't really know what the Bill does because I can read it and I can understand what it does, which is a direct violation of the agreement that we had. Now, she can say that the universities agreed... she can say the universities agreed, but they didn't. Or if they... they did, they came and said, well, maybe that's what we wanted. I don't know what kind of conversation she had with them because we had a... I don't ... I can't describe to you the amount of hours, to be sensible, that we put in place when negotiating this. And to have something like this come forward just to... just to destroy the negotiations that have occurred, it's more than just a disan... disagreement. There are some pre... true problems that will occur on our college campuses to anyone who has a concealed carry permit if the existing language that we worked out with the universities is not put in place and instead, this is put in place. We will once again make criminals of law-abiding citizens by this universities throughout this state if this becomes law. Please, Representative, this is bad language. Go back to the language that we had drafted that's in Amendment 27. Drop this one, allow Amendment 27 to go ahead and go through, then we have sensible language. This is not sensible."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, as I look at the Amendment, I'm trying to figure out exactly how would somebody know if a

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

university or a college controlled or leased a piece of property or a facility that was officially recognized by a student organizations or officially recognized university related organizations. How would somebody know that? Will there be a sign on the facility that says this is owned and operated by some... a frat house, or it's a... I'm not exactly sure what it might be, but will it have a sign on there that says U of I, or EIU, or Elmhurst College?"

Jakobsson: "Very often, and I'm not going to say every building, but very often those buildings have some kind of signage letting you know where you are or what it is that you're looking for in its university."

Reboletti: "That's interesting, Representative, because that's not true, because having represented..."

Jakobsson: "And this..."

Reboletti: "...Elmhurst College for a long time, they are landlocked. So, they own an office building that is near the campus, but it's not on the campus. It doesn't say Elmhurst College. It just says... looks like an office building. So, what you're saying is it's controlled by Elmhurst College so, therefore, I could not conceal and carry there. And so, I would be in violation because they control or exercise some dominion over that property, right?"

Jakobsson: "Elmhurst College will be able to establish its own regulations."

Reboletti: "Oh. Does this Bill require Elmhurst College to put a sign on that building that says that they control the piece of property?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Jakobsson: "It doesn't require it, but if they're going to develop their regulations..."

Reboletti: "Right."

Jakobsson: "...perhaps they'll consider that."

"So, what will happen, Representative, is more Reboletti: faulty prosecutions because each one of these Amendments fails to show notice to anybody who walks by that the property is controlled by the entity that it does. And so, that's where this fails. And we'll arrest students and people visiting, or maybe stopping by to see a family member at the office building in Elmhurst. And when they have a felony, they spend the night in a DuPage County jail, I'll tell them to call Representative Jakobsson because she said in a floor debate that that can't really happen and that's not what Amendment #10 said. Do you see how silly this exercise is? Everybody, wake up. I know people are tired, but when people go to jail, it's not a joke. And because there's not notice, people are going to spend time in custody. And when those federal lawsuits come, look out. But I know that this floor debate and the legislative intent that's crafted here, tonight, will carry the day once again."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Hammond."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Hammond: "Representative Jakobsson, I... as part of my district,

I represent Western Illinois University. There are a number
of farm parcels that are adjacent or in close proximity, if
you will, to the campus of Western Illinois University.

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Under your Amendment, Representative, would the owners of those parcels, with a conceal carry permit, be allowed to hunt on their property or carry in their trucks or tractors?"

- Jakobsson: "If you're talking about private property that's adjacent, the private property owners may, you know, have their... they're not affected by their laws and regulation... or rules and regulations that Western would develop."
- Hammond: "Representative, the way your Amendment is drafted, I don't see where it exempts private property. I read that it says adjacent to or in close proximity. And, Representative, I want to be clear that in House Bill 997 the protections for colleges and universities were very carefully worked out, and I think that they were agreed to by a number of folks. So, I am not... I'm not trying to direct this at what your intention is, but I question the drafting."
- Jakobsson: "This does refer to university-owned property, not their neighbors' property. And then, you know, we're talking about... the bottom line of this is Second Amendment. The Second Amendment would not allow the universities to impose their regulations on private property."
- Hammond: "Representative, is it directly spelled out in your Amendment that these properties that are adjacent to or in close proximity are exempt?"
- Jakobsson: "This Amendment does not include a map of Western University and the adjacent properties."

Hammond: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Brauer: "Representative, I think it was brought up with the last speaker, do you have any idea how much a state universities own in ground around this state?"

Jakobsson: "Are you... are you talking how many..."

Brauer: "I'm... I'm..."

Jakobsson: "...acres?"

Brauer: "...talking about farm ground, not... not actual acres that's the campus."

Jakobsson: "Sure."

Brauer: "But actual farm ground acres that we've had people that will give it to the universities in their estates."

Jakobsson: "Well, I know that there is a lot of that kind of farm ground, but if... if it's not adjacent and I know you're, you know, referring to something that might not be right next to it. Again, if the university owns it, they can develop their rules and regulations for that particular area. If it's an area that's been used for hunting, they may or may not let it continue to be used for hunting."

Brauer: "So, do you have an idea how many acres in this state of farm ground are owned by the universities?"

Jakobsson: "Well, it sounds to me like maybe you have an idea.

What is it?"

Brauer: "No, I'm just trying to find out. But I know it's quite a bit because as you drive around you will actually see a lot of signs that says owned by the university given through an estate of such and such."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Jakobsson: "Oh, I didn't disagree with you on that. And I'm glad that you said that, you know, there are signs that say owned by. That might help some of your colleagues understand that many places do post."
- Brauer: "Well, I think that the… the point is here you're having an unintended consequence that you're having university ground that is going to be subject to rules and adjacent and proximity that will be affected by this. I think it would be a proper time to take this out of the record and be sure that we're not having an unintended consequences with this Bill."
- Jakobsson: "Since they can develop their own rules and regulations, I believe it's certainly the proper time to keep moving with this Amendment."

Brauer: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you."

Jakobsson: "Since... maybe you need to ask some of your colleagues to tone it down a little bit because I did answer your question."

Brauer: "Could you repeat the answer?"

- Jakobsson: "Because we're allowing universities and colleges to govern their own property, they will be able to set their own rules and regulations that will not only cover their dorms and labs but also farm ground, as you're referring to."
- Brauer: "Well, if... if you go out and take a piece of ground, it's donated to the University of Illinois, and all of a sudden you have adjacent property that will not... basically, not have the hunting rights because of the rules that are put forth by the university, then you're hurting the value

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

of that adjacent ground. And I would daresay that you're going to increase the amount of ground that will not be going to the universities but then will be in some sort of an estate otherwise."

Jakobsson: "Adjacent property is private property that's not affected by this. The universities and colleges will not be developing rules and regulations for privately owned property next to them."

Brauer: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Costello: "I just... for a point of clarification. I would like to know if the Sponsor acknowledges the fact that there was an agreement made between Mr. Phelps, who has House Bill 997, and the colleges and universities."

- Jakobsson: "What I do know is that the representatives from public, private college... colleges, universities, and community colleges worked together for this language."
- Costello: "For this particular language, so you're saying this differs from the agreement because you've worked with colleges and universities in this state, correct?"
- Jakobsson: "I can't speak for an agreement that I wasn't there to witness. This is... this is what was brought to us and, again, it was brought to us by private, public colleges, universities and community colleges."
- Costello: "Okay. I... I would personally, again, for just my own personal knowledge, I'd like to be able to hear just a little bit about the agreement that Representative Phelps

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

came to with the colleges and universities so we can find out where the differences are here."

Jakobsson: "Well, that wasn't my Bill."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Pritchard."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Pritchard: "Representative, I know you're aware that the only university in the State of Illinois that had a shooting in a college campus was on my district. Is there anything in this Bill that assures people with mental illness stay on their medifica... medications?"

Jakobsson: "There isn't anything in this. But again, remember that each college, each university can set its own rules and regulations."

Pritchard: "Is there anything in your Bill that requires mental health counseling for those that are at risk?"

Jakobsson: "That... that's not in this Amendment."

Pritchard: "Is there anything in your Bill that prevents someone who brings a firearm into this gun-free zone, with the intent of doing damage, to be immediately stopped?"

Jakobsson: "They, colleges and universities, will establish their own rules and regulations how to deal with those who violate. And right, and then there is law enforcement that will be able to enforce other laws that are enacted."

Pritchard: "Well, Representative, to this... to the Bill. We have a significant risk, but I don't see where this legislation does anything to reduce that risk or to give relief from the risk that may happen. I wish we could go further than this does to do that, but it doesn't. And I don't think

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

this is going to help us with the problems that really exist."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"
Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Kay: "Representative, there's been a good deal of conversation this afternoon about, and I'm just quoting here from the language in... in my analysis, and it talks about close proximity to their campuses. And I'm not sure I have a definition of what 'close proximity' means. So, I'd like to go through the same, if I could, the same kind of... Mr. Speaker, I... I can barely... barely hear."

Speaker Lang: "So, Mr. Kay makes a good point. I know the hour is late. I know we've been talking about these Amendments for quite some time, but the people speaking, Ladies and Gentlemen, are entitled to your attention. So, please proceed."

Kay: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, Representative, I... I'd like to know your definition, or I can give you what I think the good, legal definition would be of 'close proximity'. We can do it either way."

Jakobsson: "Sure. Why don't you."

Kay: "Okay. Would you agree that 'close proximity' means close
to, in or about?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Kay: "Is that agreeable?"

Jakobsson: "I said yes."

Kay: "Oh. I'm sorry. I... I apologize. I didn't hear you. Near,
would the word 'near' fit?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Jakobsson: "Yes, it does."

Kay: "Okay. Contiguous?"

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Kay: "Okay. And for legal purposes, those are real simple definitions, but for legal purposes, would you agree with me that it would have to embrace the word 'dangerously close to'?"

Jakobsson: "I'm not sure that that's something I would consider right now."

Kay: "Well, I... again, I think the clear ... "

Jakobsson: "Because that makes it more ambiguous, I think."

Kay: "Well, we're talking about concealed carry and a way to protect any number of entities here, and people here. And, I think, one of the problems this afternoon, in all due respect to the Sponsor of these Bills, is that we can't define what it is that we're trying to put into law. And I, frankly, think that that's not right. Now, I've spent some time with really rudimental definitions, which I think all of us should have known when we came to the floor based on a fair hearing. So, if it's not 'dangerously close', is it something not 'dangerously close'?"

Jakobsson: "I'm not an attorney, but I believe that there is case law that defines close proximity."

Kay: "Well, and is there not case law that defines it as
 'dangerously close' to an area?"

Jakobsson: "If you cite that for me, I'd be happy to listen to it."

Kay: "Well, I... I guess... I don't... I can't cite it. But, I guess,
as a practical matter, it's not my Bill and we're talking

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

about a serious matter here. It's your Bill, Representative, and..."

Jakobsson: "It's my Bill, but I don't have that phrase in there."

Kay: "Well, you have an attorney sitting next to you, or standing next to you. What's his opinion?"

Jakobsson: "It's not his Bill."

Kay: "Well, it's somebody's Bill."

Jakobsson: "The... the definitions that you gave, and I said yes,
 I agree to; I think they are good definitions; That's where
 we are."

Kay: "Okay. Well, and then I... I would assume that you're
including in that... in that summary, for me, that
'dangerously close' falls into that definition of 'close
proximity'. Is that correct?"

Jakobsson: "It's not in the language that I have in my Amendment."

Kay: "Well, Representative, let me just say this, not to be argumentative, but it should be. And that's one of the... the problems we're having this afternoon is we're not even operating with basic legal definitions or understandings because my next question, if you would agree with me, would be how would you define 'dangerously close' because that's something that a court would ask and have to... have to be defined in a legal proceeding. I'm... I'm not going to go any further, but I... I think the next time it would be very, very beneficial to understand some of the rudimental terms to lay a good foundation for a Bill just like this. Thank you, Representative."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

- Davis, M.: "Representative Jakobsson, I have a very simple question and that is, how is one to know what each university decides? If I drive from Chicago to one of the downstate universities, how would I possibly know what their law or rule is in reference to carrying a weapon?"
- Jakobsson: "I would think if someone is carrying a weapon and they know that they're going to a place that has rules and regulations, they would check them out."
- Davis, M.: "But I don't think that one would think that every university may have a different rule or regulation. I mean, a person could be coming from Alaska to visit his or her child in Illinois and they would not necessarily say, well, I better see what the gun law is at that school. I would think there would be some conformity; That's all. I just... I would think that each university would adhere to some one rule or regulation that affected all of the Illinois universities. I think it's expecting too much for someone to have to look up each location in Illinois and see if it's safe to carry a weapon there."
- Jakobsson: "Well, I think that each university, as you know, and most of us, there are universities throughout this state, and we know that there are different areas of the state that have different ideas about concealed carry, for example. And so, this is why the… the universities know their… they have a pretty good understanding of their student population and who they are and… and it's… and what

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

they run... what programs and they would develop their rules and regulations, really, in mind."

Davis, M.: "So, you don't see any... you don't see any problem..."

Jakobsson: "...So, even their faculty, their staff..."

Davis, M.: "...with our 12 universities each having different and separate rules in reference to conceal and carry?"

Jakobsson: "This is, again, I would remind you, that it's something that the universities and colleges wanted."

Davis, M.: "They want to make this separate."

Jakobsson: "Yes."

Davis, M.: "They want to make their own decisions. Okay. I appreciate that answer, but that... that means I'll have to vote 'no' on your Amendment because I think it's perhaps confusing. And it could lead to the arrest of a very innocent person, a person who had no intentions of violating any law, but because your rule was not made clear and available to all, that person is subject to arrest. Therefore, I will vote 'no' on your Amendment."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I would like to answer the previous speaker's question. Representative Davis, when they're done with this, you won't be able to carry anywhere. And don't laugh, all of you got the same list we do. Read this. You won't be able to carry anywhere. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Absolutely, Sir."

Reis: "Representative, you know the University of Illinois has the South Farms, and the South Farms used to be closer to campus than what it is now. It's several miles out of town.

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Will your Bill prohibit workers and people from carrying on the South Farms?"
- Jakobsson: "My Bill will allow the university to set its own rules and say where people can carry."
- Reis: "Why didn't we do that with all the other Amendments instead of telling businesses and churches and everybody else that you can't carry, but you're saying that the U of I can set their own rules? Is that what I heard you say?"
- Jakobsson: "If... right. Because each university and each college has unique programs for their campuses, for their students, they want to set their own rules and regulations."
- Reis: "But every church and every business is... and every day care service is unique, too. Shouldn't they be able to decide whether or not they want to have concealed weapons in their businesses?"
- Jakobsson: "They're not part of this Amendment."
- Reis: "I am well aware of that. But I'm just thinking of all of the other stuff we've already passed where you didn't give the individual owner that right. I guess... why do we need this Bill? Couldn't they decide this on their own anyway?"
- Jakobsson: "We wanted... we wanted to agree with them that they should be able to develop their own, each university, each college, develop their own rules and regulations."
- Reis: "What about their sports venues? Can they decide at Memorial Stadium, the U of I, that they want to be able to carry guns there?"
- Jakobsson: "We... we adopted an Amendment that Representative (unintelligible) had that prohibited from sporting events."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Reis: "What's the difference between Memorial Stadium and everywhere else on campus? Why are they allowed to say, we... you can carry somewhere on campus, but you can't carry at Memorial Stadium?"
- Jakobsson: "If they feel that they want... I mean, when Memorial Stadium is not allowed... designated place, it's because they know that there are thousands and thousands of people in there, and they want to make sure that they are doing the best they can to protect the public and the students."
- Reis: "I don't know whether to laugh or cry today. One other thing. In your Bill it talks about prohibiting, restricting or otherwise regulating firearms on or in close proximity to their campus's grounds and other property, including but not limited to sidewalks, commons and highways. Including but not limited to."

Jakobsson: "Right. Finish the sentence."

Reis: "Are they going to be able to..."

- Jakobsson: "Finish the sentence. Owned by the school district, community college or public or private college or university."
- Reis: "But it's not limited to that. It could go well beyond that. Including but not limited to."
- Jakobsson: "Owned by. It's talking about the ones that they own, not the ones that they don't own."
- Reis: "Representative... Representative, I... I understand that may be your intent; that's not how we think that the Bill is drafted. And once again, for the 100th time today, this is going to be a hodgepodge of absolutely nothing when we're done. And I don't know why we're going beyond what was

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

agreed to in Representative Phelps' Bill. Continue this charade, get a vote on this, let's move on to the next one."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello. Mr. Phelps."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A while ago, I asked the Phelps: Speak... the Sponsor to pull this out of the record so she could confirm with the universities and the colleges if we had an agreement. I'm... I would still like her to do that, but just so you know, the language in Amendment 27 is what is agreed to. If they changed their minds, they did not talk to Mr. Vandermyde with NRA about this. And what... Representative Monique Davis, what our agreed language was, is that it's... you can have it through a right-of-way passthrough. You can even carry in your vehicle when picking up your kid. That was the agreed language. It's in 27. I would still like for her to nicely pull this out of the record, find out from the universities if they changed their mind because they did not tell us and we had a deal. A deal is a deal especially in this General Assembly."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Jakobsson to close."

Jakobsson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the language that all of those units that I spoke about, private colleges, public colleges, universities, community colleges, this is the language that they talked about. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Lady's moved for the adoption of the Amendment.

There is a request for a verification by Mr. Sullivan. So,

Members will be in their chairs and vote their own
switches. Those in favor of the Lady's Motion will vote

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Record yourselves, Members. Have all voted who wish? Verschoore, Rita, Hays, Fortner, DeLuca. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 50 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is defeated. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #11 is offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for the adoption of Floor Amendment #11. This Amendment is pretty straightforward. It provides that no person may knowingly carry a firearm into any establishment that dispenses alcoholic beverages on the premises. Currently, 21 states, including D.C., prohibit the carrying of concealed loaded weapons in bars and taverns and a subset of those have language similar to what I'm proposing today. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

And the Chair recognizes Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, I just need a couple definitions 'cause this is a very straightforward Amendment of course.

What would your Amendment say to what an establishment is that dispenses alcohol?"

Williams: "Well..."

Sullivan: "So, what... what do you think that is?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Williams: "I think of that as language that is found elsewhere in the Illinois Compiled Statutes and it means restaurant, bar, anywhere that dispenses alcohol for consumption on premises. It does not include, say, a liquor store."

Sullivan: "So, I have a home and I dispense alcohol. Where in your Bill says that I won't be caught up in the statute?"

Williams: "That's actually defined separately in the UUW statute and you're already permitted to deny carrying weapons in your own home. So, that's a separate issue."

Sullivan: "Well, the... the whole point of this exercise today...
well, there's many points to the exercise."

Williams: "Or allow."

Sullivan: "But what we're talking about is UUW statutes have been struck down. We don't have UUW statutes, so we are devising new UUW statutes. So, what you just said, really, I mean, I'm not a lawyer, but from what I understand we don't have UUW statutes only stay for 180 days 'til approximately the second week in June. So, we're building new law here."

Williams: "Yeah, I think..."

Sullivan: "So, how do you define an establishment..."

Williams: "I think it's the plain..."

Sullivan: "...that dispenses alcohol?"

Williams: "Sure. I think it would be the plain language of establishment which dispenses alcohol, which I think under most of our understanding would be a restaurant, bar, tavern, establishment being a business establishment in the common use of the word."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sullivan: "Is there a better way to describe the establishment..."

Williams: "You know..."

Sullivan: "...that can be tracked a little bit more properly?"

Williams: "Interestingly, that is the same language that I saw earlier in House Bill 997. So, whatever meaning is described to it there, I would say is probably what we're... have in mind in this language as well."

Sullivan: "Well, I'm... I'm glad you bring up 997 because if you read 997 there's a little word there called licensed; licensed to dispense alcohol, in 997. This one does not have licensed to dispense; it just says establishment that dispenses. I know it's a word play, but it's a very critical word and that's why I'm going down this line of discussion. How... you see, when you say license, the state gets involved, we can track who they are because we license them. But in your Bill, you don't say that."

Williams: "Well, I don't know what... what would you be referring to? What sort of establishment would be nonlicensed. I... I don't know. I can't envision a scenario of a business establishment."

Sullivan: "Well that gets down to the nuances of what establishment that dispenses alcohol is."

Williams: "Well, we're still talking about..."

Sullivan: "Could it be my house? Could..."

Williams: "We're still... Yeah, but we...

Sullivan: "Could a rogue... I'm sorry, go ahead."

Williams: "Oh, that's okay, Eddie."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Sullivan: "But my point is, you don't have that established in your law or in your Bill, so you can get into some nuances of what an establishment is. It... would I get in trouble know for serving, you know, Mike Bost a beer in my house?"
- Williams: "Establishment to dispense alcohol, as written in the language in my proposed Amendment, is the intent same as in 997. They're both... of establishments."
- Sullivan: "Well, then why don't… but why don't we clarify that further, because in 997 it says licensed and we can track that better? Why don't you pull your Bill, we add that, and then I'll vote for it."
- Williams: "I don't think that word 'licensed' is a game changer on this particular line."
- Sullivan: "It's the biggest game changer."
- Williams: "I disagree."
- Sullivan: "Because you now have the ability to differentiate, because I'm not going to be licensed to dispense alcohol in my home, so there's no threat of a rogue state's attorney saying, well, my interpretation is you're an establishment that dispensed alcohol."
- Williams: "You're already permitted to control the carrying of a firearm in your own home already; that's in existing law. It has nothing to do with this Amendment. You're going beyond the scope of the Amendment with that... with that issue."
- Sullivan: "Yeah, but there's a lot of ambiguity in a lot of the Amendments that we're doing today because we are writing new UUW statutes."
- Williams: "I think it's pretty clear."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Sullivan: "So, we have to be very crisp and clear about what we're talking about and so adding 'licensed' would do that, don't you think?"
- Williams: "I think that licensed is ancillary to the issue of what establishment to serve alcohol is, similar to what you have in 997."
- Sullivan: "What about a hunting club?"
- Williams: "So, I... I don't think 'licensed' is an operative term."
- Sullivan: "What... what happens if you have a hunting club?

 They're licensed to dispense alcohol."
- Williams: "Okay."
- Sullivan: "Are you not going to be able to have a gun in a hunting club?"
- Williams: "If they serve alcohol, under my Amendment, you would not be able to have a gun."
- Sullivan: "So, you have a hunting club that I would go to hunt with and so you're going to... you're going to push these guys out and they can no longer... they can either no longer be a hunting club or they can no longer serve alcohol. That's what your Bill is going to do to them."
- Williams: "One moment. Was there a question? I'm sorry."
- Sullivan: "No, you said one moment and I've been waiting on you."
- Williams: "Oh. Then there, yes, if it's an establishment that serves alcohol, it's an establishment that serves alcohol."
- Sullivan: "Thank you for your honest answer."
- Williams: "You can certainly... you can certainly add another

 Amendment to exempt shooting clubs that makes some sense."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sullivan: "We could also add in another Amendment that says licensed."

Williams: "I don't think that's as necessary."

Sullivan: "Oh. Okay. Thank you for your honest answer. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, so now we're going to attack hunting clubs. Is that the direction that we want to go in rewriting UUW statutes? I don't think that's the direction we want to go. Ladies and Gentlemen, we can talk about some Bills and some Amendments that might make sense, and here and there, and a little tweak, we can do them. Even those of us that believe in concealed carry, believe that there should be limitations, but this is not the one that we need to do. I certainly would appreciate a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

Durkin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Durkin: "Representative, dispense, there's no definition for dispense either, is there?"

Williams: "Representative, I... like I referenced, you can refer to that exact same language in all the other concealed carry statutes that have been proposed. So, I think, again, it's a common definition."

Durkin: "Well, does dispense mean that there has to be money exchanges hand which the purchaser, the person who's seeking to buy the alcohol, must hand over United States currency to the person who is dispensing the alcohol?"

Williams: "That is not part of this Amendment."

Durkin: "So, it could be a party in which a family member is throwing for another. They rent out a location which is not

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

exempt under your Bills, but they bring the alcohol in and then they serve the alcohol. Would that be a dispense of alcohol?"

Williams: "That appears to fit within the def... definition of dispense."

Durkin: "Wow. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative, would a church fundraiser parking lot, in the backyard, constitute where alcoholic beverages are dispensed for consumption?"

Williams: "I'm sorry. A church parking lot?"

Reis: "Yeah. We have a lot of... we have beer gardens in our church fundraisers all over the state."

Williams: "Well, if it requires a permit, that would be addressed in the next Amendment, so..."

Reis: "No. The exemption would be covered in the next Amendment, but are you prohibiting it in the way your Bill is... your Amendment is..."

Williams: "If alcohol is served, yes. That's the point of this Amendment, and let me just speak to that issue. You are talking about where we're, you know, which institution or which establishment was serving alcohol, but let's realize what we're talking here. We're talking about alcohol and loaded weapons. When Gary McCarthy, the Superintendent of the Chicago Police Department, testified, he said the most critical thing to consider when determining concealed carry issues is the issue of where alcohol is served. And the NRA

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

website also specifically addresses the issue of whether you should mix alcohol and other substances and weapons and says whether handling or shooting weapons, the two should never mix. So, it's common sense. Where we have loaded guns, we should not have it where alcohol is being served. It's that simple."

Reis: "My point is, is your Amendment says that St. Mary's
Church can't have concealed carry in their beer garden on
the Labor Day picnic, but the next Amendment says that
unless the church decides they can."

Williams: "I... we're not on Amendment #12 yet, but again, back to this one is where alcohol is served, that's the turning point."

Reis: "Do you see that the adversarial language being a problem? It's the... Amendment 13."

Williams: "Well, we're only on #11."

Reis: "I know you don't... you don't have one of these."

Williams: "I haven't yet got to #13. That's not my Amendment."

Reis: "But Amendment 13, Representative, says that you can't carry at a church or a place of worship or any property that they have unless authorized to carry the firearm by the church."

Williams: "We are discussing Amendment #11. I have... that's not my Amendment, so I can't answer that."

Reis: "But your Amendment says they can't carry on a church ground because they have open alcohol, but Amendment 13 says they can."

Williams: "My Amendment says establishment which serves alcohol on the pre... for consumption on the premises."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Reis: "Right. Which you agree would be a church ground beer garden."
- Williams: "If alcohol is served, you cannot have a concealed, loaded weapon where alcohol is dispensed in an establishment."
- Reis: "But Amendment 13 says you can if the church group says you can."
- Williams: "I haven't read that Amendment. I can't speak to that Amendment."
- Reis: "Our point, for the one thousandth time today, none of these Amendments make sense when you put them all together into one Bill. Nothing further."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "To the entire process, which I continue to find extremely interesting and very informative and a nice way to build a Bill that makes a lot of sense that will have no support at the end. But I... I have to take a... a moment of pause here and try to figure out what exactly we're trying to accomplish on Amendment #11, 1 through 11. I know, actually, Mr. Speaker, I think even 30 has been filed and I'm sure your staff is busy crafting even newer ones that will take even further time for us to... to vet. So, at the end of the day, we're going to continue to do this exercise and I would assume maybe, eventually, this will all come to an end on a Bill that will fail. So, it's interesting to continue to listen to this where we have language that won't pass constitutional muster, that will fail courtrooms, that won't provide any protection that anybody says, but the political exercise works tremendously. In the

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

City of Chicago, I had a chance to ask the superintendent of the Chicago police about what the problem in Chicago was. He didn't say it was law-abiding citizens that carried a FOID card. As a matter of fact, he said the City of Chicago has a gang problem and a drug problem, and that the fights are usually over that turf and the money and all the other assets that they use in their criminal enterprise. So, how this helps stop that, I'm not exactly sure. I know that Representative Phelps' Bill has a clause in there that deals with this. But we'll continue on this mission to make sure that every Member can take all these difficult votes. And we can pretend in about 18 months that when the mail pieces come that, really, we didn't mean exactly what it said because I voted for a different Bill that actually said something else. Why do we continue to do this? Every Member of this chamber should be appalled. Every Member of this chamber should get up, take their keys and leave and stop the shenanigans. Let's vote on a real conceal carry Bill that comports with the Seventh Circuit decision. And let's get on with the rest of the business of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Costello."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Costello: "Ann, have you ever heard of a meat shoot?"

Williams: "Thankfully, no."

Costello: "Okay. Oh, I can tell you I was at one this weekend.

Eagles Clubs, Elks Clubs, Moose Clubs, VFWs, American

Legions, FOPs; they typically are fundraisers. And so, 25

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

yards out, you take a shotgun, you shoot at a card. Whoever gets closest to the bullseye with a pellet wins. Okay. Typically, this involves drinking at times, but at the same point in time, it's a very safe situation because you check your gun in a rack and you only load it right when you get to the window where you're going to shoot. As I read this, that is something that I believe would be illegal under this current Amendment."

Williams: "Well, again, the Amendment says 'establishment' where alcohol is served to be consumed on the premises, but I do have a solution for that, Representative. I think a little bit later on we're going to be considering an Amendment that deals with the issue of local control and that may deal with both of our concerns in one Bill. So, I would ask you to consider the issue of local control, allowing the unique geography and diversity of our state to be reflected in any concealed carry law that we pass."

Costello: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Appreciate your support for this Amendment."

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? Record yourselves, Members. DeLuca, Franks, Kosel, Thapedi. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 53 voting 'yes', 57 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Amendment #12, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #12 is offered by Representative Williams."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment provides that no person may knowingly carry a firearm into an organized public gathering including street fairs, festivals, carnivals, outdoor con... concerts, et cetera. However, it does provide that the municipality or county that licenses a permit for these functions can affirmatively allow the carry of concealed weapons on those... for those events. So, it does cover and it does have an option for municipalities that choose to allow guns for, say, a gun show or something like that or maybe one of the... Representative Costello's events. This is actually modeled after current law. Current law provides that licensed, permitted gun holders that are allowed to carry weapons, currently, cannot take guns into these places. So, we're just looking to keep this exemption in tact as we move into a structure for concealed carry."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Bost: "I noticed in this one that there's... protests are part of this, as well. Is that correct?"

Williams: "Yes."

Bost: "Sometimes we have, in the City of Carbondale and along with other cities around, that people will hold signs along the edge of a boulevard in protest of different things and... and whether it's war... all of these different protests. Under... what... under the way this reads, a person that's walking down the street, walks into an area where one of

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

these are occurring, they are in violation. Am I incorrect?"

Williams: "Okay. Again, we're going to go back to the knowing standards. So, it requires that they knowingly carry a firearm at an..."

Bost: "Okay. I..."

Williams: "...organized protest or rally. So, it's a little bit different."

Bost: "And... and I'm going... I'm going to say that if someone has a sign saying, you know, 'stop the war' or whatever, that you're pretty well knowing you're walking down the street. Now, I didn't know that I was going have to walk through this, but I'm going from point A to point B. I have a legal concealed carry permit. I just need to get through. Now, all of a sudden, I'm in violation and I have to change my... either I have to change my route or walk through and be a criminal, correct?"

Williams: "Well, if you know you're violating the law and you're... see an organized protest within that parameter, and there's a 500 feet requirement, you might have to cross the street to make absolutely sure that no prosecutor would find you in violation of this component."

Bost: "Listen to what you just said. Listen to what you just said. I'm a free person in my own town, a free person. I have certain rights. I get a concealed carry permit. I want to walk down my street. Someone else is... is... has their right of free speech. Now, their free speech has made it to where I can't carry the other right, my ability to bear arms through there."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Williams: "Well, I think it applies to ..."

Bost: "Now, that's the problem with this stuff."

Williams: "...all the sensitive areas. It applies to ..."

Bost: "You're an attorney, know the Constitution."

Williams: "...all these areas, Representative."

Bost: "Good heavens. So, free speech is more important than the freedom of the Second Amendment of a law-abiding citizen.

That's what you just said."

Williams: "The purpose of this Amendment is to address very dense, sometimes packed events and gatherings and those do not, again, mix with loaded guns."

Bost: "I know what the purpose is, Representative. I know what you're trying to do."

Williams: "Public safety sometimes requires..."

Bost: "So... so, what you're saying is some... some constitutional rights are more important than others, correct?"

Williams: "I did not say that, but it is true that constitu..."

Bost: "But... but that's what this Bill does."

Williams: "Well, let me read from the Heller decision, if you'd like, where they..."

Bost: "Oh, no, no, no. I saw how it was put in there. I mean, I think that's amazing that we've actually done that in this Body, all of a sudden started putting them in language."

Williams: "Well, it does provide for sensitive areas to be identified where concealed, loaded guns..."

Bost: "Sensitive what, the sidewalk?"

Williams: "Well, I would say..."

Bost: "Sensitive... sensitive to you."

Williams: "...a street fair."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bost: "Maybe... maybe what..."

Williams: "...a festival..."

Bost: "Maybe what's..."

Williams: "...a parade, a gathering, are sensitive."

Bost: "Maybe what's sensitive to you isn't sensitive to me."

Williams: "Local control then. That would cover us both."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Lady yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, having been a former prosecutor, I have some concerns about how would an individual know that the protest, concert, parade had actually had a permit from the jurisdiction that would control that, be it the municipality or the county?"

Williams: "Well, the same way that current permit holders are aware that they're not allowed to carry loaded guns into those gatherings. It's already in existing law."

Reboletti: "I see. But, again, so what if a protest breaks out downtown by the Thompson Center. Now, that would not be covered because that doesn't have a permit. So, you could concealed carry in an unorganized protest, but not at an organized protest, right?"

Williams: "That... yes, that goes beyond the scope of this Amendment."

Reboletti: "When you... you say festivals and street fairs, does every festival and street fair have to have a permit because on my block, we have a street... a block party. I don't... I know... I think we have to get a permit; I'm not exactly sure. But what if I didn't know? What if I was

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

walking to get to my home on the next block and I walked through the block party. Would, then, I be in violation or would I have to travel a different route with my firearm?"

Williams: "Well, in Chicago you do… or are required to get a permit for a block party, but an informal gathering as you suggested, would not be covered within the scope of this Amendment."

Reboletti: "Representative, I... I appreciate what you're trying to accomplish here, but as each of the other previous, minus the first Amendment, which actually was just the title of the Bill, is we could... we get into this language of how does somebody really know where they can be and where they can't be with a firearm. It's going to cause a ton of confusion. And at the end of the day, I know that Cook County and President Preckwinkle would like to have a 'may' issue and we'll get to that, I know that's a different Amendment, and would like to have preemption ... so it would not have preemption, so that the city of Chicago could do something different. But that's the danger of the road that we're weaving, here, with this Lego building blocks of a Bill, is that this language is... I don't even know what... at the end of the day, if we get to Amendment 27, which is actually the meat and potatoes of this legislation. So, all of this could be for naught. So, while we're doing this backwards, we have not given a lot of attention to the language we place here. We're going to put 13 million people in jeopardy of violating the law every day. And I think this could be a catastrophe if these Amendments continue to be placed together like this without

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

having some type of mechanism with consistent language that everybody will know exactly where they can and cannot be. But eventually, it seems that the people of the City of Chicago and Cook County do not want to have conceal and carry at any rate and, eventually, all the zones will look like the fact that you can probably drive almost nowhere in the State of Illinois and be able to conceal and carry legally, pursuant to the language in the Seventh District opinion."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sullivan."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, in looking at your Bill, there's some discrepancies that maybe you can explain to me. In Section (a), you talk about a protest, obviously, various different things that are... that are not to be done, and you talk about how a municipality issues a permit. Okay. Why do you, then, go into Section (b) and don't talk about that same permit for that same protest?"

Williams: "That's actually got another, more specific, requirement and that's the 500 feet requirement from government buildings. So, whether there's a permit necessary or not which, actually, in my experience, most organized protests do require permits, but for that purpose... the purpose of that Section, it's not necessary to include that."

Sullivan: "But... but doesn't it have some problems because how...
you know, I would say, yeah, if you're going down on a

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

parade and you probably have a permit for that and I don't know because, you know, they're not posting that permit. But you... you have discrepancies in... in the two Sections that how are people supposed to follow. And I get what you're trying to do on the second... in Section (b), it's tied to the amount of people, 10, and a government building. But... so, does that mean if I only have 5 people, that we're okay if we're next to the government building?"

Williams: "Yes."

Sullivan: "As long as it's not permitted by the county?"

Williams: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. So, I got 9 people, I'm fine. I got... someone walks up on accident and they're not... how do you define whether they're part of the protest to get to that ninth... that tenth person?"

Williams: "Well, to answer your first question. The reason that they're separated out like that is because we are modeling that first Section about gatherings, festivals after current law which says you cannot carry a gun even if you're legally permitted to carry one. You cannot bring it into these places for obvious reasons of safety; a lot of people packed into a dense area. The protest is an issue where large amounts of people may gather. We saw that in Chicago this past fall. And this is... the design and the intent of this Amendment, is to cover that as well even if it's not currently covered in the UUW statute on which this is modeled."

Sullivan: "Well, why... why wouldn't you put a number of people for the protest, or the gathering, or the street fair in

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

the first Section? Why the confusion between a number in one Section and not a number in another, and not a permit in one Section and a permit in the other?"

Williams: "Sure. We already, like I said, Section (a) is modeled, and I believe the language is identical, to the UUW statute which already prohibits the carrying of guns in those places for people that are allowed to carry them, currently, without concealed carry. So, retired law enforcement, certain security guards, et cetera, that are permitted to carry guns, that... that language is taken exact, just so I could, you know, be clear on that. This extra Section was to deal with large protests. Obviously, you're walking down the street, you might be in a clump of 9 or 10 people; that's not an issue. But you start getting into organized protests, 10 and more people, it can be 10, 20, 30 and then it becomes an issue of a lot of people in a small space. And that's what we're trying to get at here."

Sullivan: "Sure. So, let me give you a hypothetical. There's a parade, and I live on the parade route, and my wife calls me and says my two kids are really sick, come home right now. I get a desperate call from my wife for... not even desperate, but I need you home right now and, you know, you know my wife, so you know I'm coming home, and I have my concealed carry permit on me. And I... I come home and I get pulled over by the police walking, you know, by this parade route, so I knowingly went into the parade route to go to my home 'cause my wife just called me. What happens?"

Williams: "If you're in the parade or the festival, this would apply, but again, I think there is, again, as someone

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

referenced earlier, there is prosecutorial discretion. If you explained that you're going home, to this Amendment, you probably would not be prosecuted for this. The intent of this is clearly to keep loaded guns out of large gathering spaces and it's currently the law. We've decided long ago..."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Williams: "...that this should currently be the law and we're just hoping to extend it..."

Sullivan: "But... but..."

Williams: "...as we move into the concealed carry structure."

Sullivan: "But... but... Representative, we don't have UUW statutes. We're rewriting them. Where in your Bill says that there is prosecu... prosecutorial discretion?"

Williams: "Well, all UUW statutes were not founded by the court, just certain Sections were. Right now, you are... certain people are allowed to carry concealed weapons. Right now, a retired law enforcement officer, for example. However, under current law, they are not allowed to carry them into the Roscoe Village neighborhood festival in my neighborhood or the St. Patrick's parade downtown."

Sullivan: "Okay. And... and..."

Williams: "It's already not allowed."

Sullivan: "...the Roscoe Village festival I know very well from my days of going to the Roscoe Village festival. My friend lived in the building right behind the old town tap, right at the corner there. So, if he's got a gun and a permit and he walks home, he's got to go through that festival to get

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

home to the very one that you just said. What happens to him?"

Williams: "Again, it's a matter of prosecu... prosecutorial discretion."

Sullivan: "But it's not... it's not spelled out in your Bill."

Williams: "Or he can go around the festival. I mean, I've been to that festival myself. It's only a couple blocks from my house and there's multiple streets that feed into it. It's just one street that's blocked off."

Sullivan: "Sure."

Williams: "So, it's not necessary."

Sullivan: "I realize that. It's Roscoe Village. Everybody knows Ros... well..."

Williams: "Well, it's... then maybe we should look at amending the current statute then because that's exactly the same issue that we're dealing with now."

Sullivan: "But we don't have current UUW statutes. They have been thrown out and stayed until January 9. We don't have them. So, we're rebuilding them from scratch and you don't point that out in your Amendment."

Williams: "Representative, the public carry part is the part that the court addressed in the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals case."

Sullivan: "Okay."

Williams: "The exemptions still apply in full."

Sullivan: "Thank you."

Williams: "Other crimes, et cetera."

Sullivan: "To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I keep going back to this point mainly because we don't have UUW statutes. We

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

are building them from scratch. Why I point it out at the very beginning, why I tried to send this back to Judiciary, where I believe the... the Representative sits on, we should be talking about those in Judiciary where we say, hey, we're rebuilding things from scratch. Maybe we should have prosecutorial discretion, but we don't. That's the problem, the unintended consequences of what is happening today and specifically with this Amendment. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "To the Amendment. I had some Legislators come up to me. This is not in Amendment 27. When you have concealed carry and you do all the training, do the background checks, you ought to be able to... you're supposed to be able to carry in public. This takes completely all that away from us and it's way too broad. So, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Representative, I'm going to, again, for legislative intent, go back to the original question I asked Representative Burke earlier. Adjacent property or a parking lot area used, do you agree with the definitions that Representative Burke and I came to with respect to your Amendment?"

Williams: "Sure. I accept those definitions."

Kay: "Each one?"

Williams: "Well..."

Kay: "Each definition?"

Williams: "Definition of ... adjacent, yes."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Kay: "Okay. Here's what concerns me with your particular Amendment, which, I think, is a little more expansive than the previous. The Second Amendment of the Constitution says that the right of the people is to keep and bear arms. Is that not right, keep and bear arms?"

Williams: "Yes, but not without restriction, Representative."

Kay: "Really?"

Williams: "Restriction for the benefit of public safety."

Kay: "Is that your take or is that the take of the Constitution?"

Williams: "Well, again, I could sight Heller, but I think it's in all of our Amendments and we've read it multiple times..."

Kay: "Well, the truth..."

Williams: "...but they're allowed to make exemptions."

Kay: "The truth of the... the truth of the mat... I'm sorry, I
 didn't mean to interrupt."

Williams: "Go ahead."

Kay: "The truth of the matter is that we have circuit splits now; we have three. We'll have two more within a month is my... my read on that. But until this is really decided and we think about policy, don't you think that the... the foundation of what we do is found in the U.S. Constitution? And all I need is a yes or no."

Williams: "Absolutely."

Kay: "Very good. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reis."

Reis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Two things: one, if this Bill should get simple Majority, I'd like a verification of the vote."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Request is acknowledged, Sir."

Reis: "And Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill. We are so wrapped up in the minutia of little bitty, tiny Amendments here. We are forgetting that you're going to have to go through training, you're going to have to be certified, you're going to have to have a FOID card, you're going to have to go through a background check. There can be no mental health issues for each and every person that gets a concealed carry permit. These aren't the people that are going to go terrorizing through a... a organized gathering or a street fair or any of the other things we talked about. The people that are, are the criminals and they're not going to do any of those things. And they could give a rat's behind if someone's got a ban on a concealed carry in a street fair. Let's keep that in mind. Not everybody's going to be carrying. Just trained, certified people are going to be having these abilities to carry."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "You know, Representative Reis is right. We are wrapped up in the minutia of this discussion, but we're missing the big picture here. We're talking about large gatherings that require a permit. We are also providing, in this Amendment, that the local municipality or county can determine that guns can be carried any particular, so there's an out for a gun show or any other event that the local municipality wishes to provide for the carrying of guns. But we're talking about lots and lots of people packed in very, very small spaces, often where alcohol is served. This is not a good recipe when you mix it in with

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

loaded guns. I think we all can agree with that, and that's why we already have in our law that even people legally permitted to carry guns under current law, shouldn't be in places with their guns. And someone Representative Sullivan I think, referenced unintended consequences. We're not worried about a legal, lawful gun owner responsibly carrying his weapon in this particular Amendment. What we're worried about is the unintended consequences. An accidental shooting, someone understanding what noise they heard, and the crowd mentality mixed with alcohol which can be a recipe for disaster. So, again, I ask for an 'aye' vote to pass Amendment #12."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment 12. To remind the Members that there's been a request for a verification by Mr. Reis. Please be in your own chairs and vote your own switches. 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? Record yourselves, Members. Record yourselves. Thapedi, Smith, Hurlev, Hoffman, Harris, Fortner, Ford, DeLuca. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 46 voting 'yes', 61 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. Amendment 13, Leader Currie. Mr. Clerk, withdraw Amendment 13. Amendment 14, Representative Mell. Please read the Bill... the Amendment."

Clerk Hollman: "Amendment 14 is offered by Representative Mell."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mell."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Mell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to ask for adoption of Amendment 14 to House Bill 1155. Amendment 14 prohibits carrying firearm into any public transportation facility or on any bus, train or other transportation paid in whole or in part with public funds. Includes adjacent property or parking lots owned or controlled by the facility. Over 2 million people ride every day on our public transit systems. Mass transit are unique areas. Riders are from many different backgrounds. They are going to many different places for different reasons and at different speeds. Oftentimes, these trains and buses are very crowded. They sway, they jostle people, they are hot and there's a lot going on. An unintentional push, even an intentional push, a dirty look or even an iPhone snatching could escalate and resulting into a shooting. Allowing people to carry concealed weapons in a confined space with no option of escape and no place to hide is a risk... recipe, kind of like Representative Williams said, a recipe for disaster. All transit systems and the Chicago Police Department support this Amendment. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lang: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Reis."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Reis: "Representative, will this affect taxi cabs?"

Mell: "No, it will not. No."

Reis: "Are you sure? I mean, they're supported by public funds."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Mell: "I thought they were private companies."

Reis: "We'll check on that one again 'cause I'm not sure."

Mell: "Okay."

Reis: "That'd be at least one benefit from your Amendment. Will this also affect public transportation in, like, Peoria, Champaign, Springfield?"

Mell: "Yes, it will."

Reis: "What about... now, you said the stations, as well. So, you're going home late at night, you're by yourself and you're at the 'L' station at 12:00, maybe a time when you might need a gun in your purse or in your pocket. This would prohibit that as well?"

Mell: "Yeah, it could but you... you know, you could carry, like, a whistle or mace or other protection items for yourself."

Reis: "The hour grows late, Mr. Speaker. We're... we're saying some funny things. All right. Say, we have public transportation between Fairview Heights, Illinois and St. Louis that goes both ways. So, what if someone from St. Louis gets on the public transportation and comes to Illinois, are they going to be a criminal?"

Mell: "Yes."

Reis: "So, now we're trying to affect their Second Amendment rights, as well. Are you sure that's constitutional?"

Mell: "I feel pretty good about it."

Reis: "Okay. I think you... you've summed it up, Representative.

To the Bill. You said nearly 2 million people a day take
public transportation. You are restricting the ability of
them to protect themselves; 2 million people with one fell
swoop of this Bill. You're limiting them of their ability

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

to protect themselves and... and their loved ones. I go back to Representative Monique, when this is all finished, nobody will be able to carry."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Bost."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Bost: "Representative, this does include Amtrak, correct?"

Mell: "Yes, it does."

Bost: "Is Amtrak in... in other states? Under their concealed carry legislation, are people able to carry aboard Amtrak right now?"

Mell: "Yeah, I guess... I guess if the other state allows it, sure."

Bost: "Okay. Well, so you're... you are a person that has a concealed carry permit, you're in another state, you're coming in, you have a... I hope that we will finally put this so it has reciprocity. Now all of a sudden, you're riding on the train, you've got your concealed carry, you're coming in through Kentucky, you're coming in through Indiana, you're coming in through Missouri, and all of a sudden you cross the state line. Now, you're already carrying and all of a sudden, now you're in violation of the law as soon as you cross the state line, here, in the State of Illinois. Do you see a problem with that?"

Mell: "I do... I do not."

Bost: "Okay. All right. There are things that we need to look at here. Look, and... and another concern I have, you... you and others on this floor, along with I, there... there's things that we say we don't want to discriminate against. I

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

believe that there are certain people that take mass transit because of their financial status, because maybe they just choose not to own an automobile. But what we are saying here is, is we will discrim... discriminate against those who their only means of transportation is mass transit so that they could not possibly use their concealed carry permit to go about their daily business, and... and that's a concern I have. I... I understand that... that you're trying to under... I... I don't question that you're trying to keep it safe on the trains and... and the buses and everything like that. But what we're... what we're saying, here, is that if you only use mass transit, you shouldn't have that right to protect yourself under a concealed carry permit. You shouldn't be able to apply for that carry permit because there's, at no time, you could really use it during your daily walk and... and your life. I hope that you see the problems with this. I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Sacia."

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

Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor yields."

Sacia: "Representative Mell, in your... in your introduction, I...

I found it rather interesting, in fact, I think it was the very last statement you made. It was something to the effect that most police or law enforcement endorses this.

Did... did I understand that correctly?"

Mell: "Yes."

Sacia: "Would you tell me what law enforcement says that's the right thing to do?"

Mell: "Yeah, the Chicago Police Department."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sacia: "No, no. Chicago Police Department, who? The superintendent or the rank and file?"

Mell: "The superintendent and the rank and file. I've... I've talked to many officers in my district."

Sacia: "Representative Mell..."

Mell: "Yeah, the Chicago Police Department."

Sacia: "...with... with all due respect, mass transportation is what gets people around. If we get... if we pass a concealed carry Bill, which is becoming highly questionable, and people have to get from point A to point B, I was under the impression, in House Bill 997, this had been a worked out agreement. And I... I guess I'm going to ask Representative Phelps if he would address that at some point because it is a significant issue. But one of the other things you said, Representative, and I found it rather interesting, you said that people are in a crowded environment or... or words to that effect. Work with me here. You're... you're jostling along and it may prompt somebody to maybe become irate and... am I right in what you said, words to that effect? Maybe produce a firearm. Something very dangerous could occur."

Mell: "Well, I was saying that, I mean, and first of all, you're talking to me about mass transit. I grew up on the CTA, Representative..."

Sacia: "I respect that."

Mell: "...and many of my friends. And I still ride the CTA, so you don't need to tell me about the CTA."

Sacia: "Whoa, whoa, whoa."

Mell: "But what I'm saying is... is what I'm saying..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Sacia: "And you don't need to tell me about carrying a gun, Representative."
- Mell: "Let me answer your question, Mr... Representative. Is that when you're on these trains and it's late at night and people are coming home and there's a lot going on and there's a lot of activity and, you know, there's a lot of areas of escalation and overreaction."
- Sacia: "Representative, for 30 years of my life I carried a gun. I carried it many, many times on mass transit. I was packed into those trains much like you have been. Now, I didn't grow up on mass transit, I... I certainly give you that. But if a person qualifies to carry a firearm, what we hope is that they have the mental ability to carry one. We're not just going to randomly issue them. So, once again, we're going after the good guys, not the bad guys, Representative, and... and that's what's so disheartening about this legislation the way we're... we're dealing with it tonight."
- Mell: "Right. And, Representative, I would argue that even the most well-intentioned, best marksman would have a very difficult time on the CTA and being... you... he would need pinpoint accuracy with how crowded and how crazy it is on our transit systems at times."
- Sacia: "But, Representative, with all due respect, I don't... what you just said is absolutely correct, absolutely correct. But why would I pull a gun on mass transit? I'll tell you what, you'd have to be pounding on me pretty hard before I would do that, and I believe any respectable, lawabiding citizen would react the same way. I respect..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Mell: "Well, we don't know that."

Sacia: "Could I finish? Could I... could..."

Mell: "We don't know that though. I mean, I... I truly believe that you would be very reluctant and careful with brandishing your weapon but, you know, we don't know that."

Sacia: "But you fear others. You fear others, Representative.

Is that fair to say?"

Mell: "Yeah. That... yeah."

Sacia: "I would request verification should this reach the... the requisite number."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged. Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. So, Representative Sacia, to be... to be clear, we had public transportation for the last two years in House Bill 148, if you remember. No one batted an eye. We never heard from them. Now, we're hearing from them. 'Cause they know, because of the court ruling, everybody wants to give their two cents now. So, here's what I wanted to know, and I think we need to remember this and kind of think about this, talking about vague, line 6, let me read this to you. No person may knowingly carry a firearm on buses, trains or any form of transportation paid for in part or whole with public funds in any transportation facility and the surrounding premises under its control. Now, speaking of vague, does that mean highways, public roads, our bridges 'cause they're all funded through our public funds, am I right? So, that's something we need to think about there. And then also... I think, also, we're going to, by doing this, we're... and I think Representative Reboletti said this the other day in

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

committee, I think we're causing more trouble here, so what's this mean now? Say, Representative Sacia and I are getting ready to get on the bus and we're legally carrying. Does that mean before we get on the bus, we take out our weapon, unload it so everybody can see? And so, what if you... what if we have 15 or 20 people doing it at the exact same time? I think that's... pandemonium's going to break out, that's what I think is going to happen. So, I think we're going to need to be careful with this Amendment. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Riley."

Riley: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "The Lady yields."

Riley: "Representative Mell, you know, it's... we've been going a long time. It's, you know, gotten a little loud in here so you might have already addressed it, if you did, I'd like your indulgence. But have any of the service boards taken a position on your Amendment..."

Mell: "Yes."

Riley: "...one way or another?"

Mell: "Yes, they're all in favor of the Amendment."

Riley: "All of them are in favor?"

Mell: "Yes."

Riley: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Kay."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Kay: "Thank you. Representative Mell, I'm going to ask you the same question that I asked Representative Williams and that

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

is the simple language in the Second Amendment and I'd like your opinion on it. It says, 'a well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.' Is that not what you're trying to do, here, is to infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of people to bear arms?"

- Mell: "Representative, I would think we're trying to keep people safe."
- Kay: "Could I just have a yes or no answer as to whether or not you're trying to infringe on the Second Amendment rights?"
- Mell: "I... I know you would like that, but no you can't have a yes or no answer from me on that."
- Kay: "Well, what is... what is your... your opinion on the language
 of the Second Amendment where it says that people have the
 right to keep and bear arms?"
- Mell: "I support the language in the Second Amendment, but I do feel that it is necessary to put in place regulations for the… for the public safety."
- Kay: "I see. Let me ask you, and again, I don't like hypothetical questions, but I'm going to ask you one. And I... I asked the very same question a week ago in the Judiciary Subcommittee hearing and, you know, you don't have to answer this if... if you don't want to, but I want you to think about it. You're a slight woman. You're... you're small. And forgive me, you don't..."
- Mell: "Well, thank you, Representative."
- Kay: "You don't look... That's all right. Take those compliments when they come. You don't look like you're a weight lifter. And as a... as a practical matter, I want you to think about

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

this. Because you are a slight built woman, you get on the CTA that you talked about riding all the time and either getting off or coming off... on, or during transit, you're approached by a male who's 225 to 250 pounds and he's armed. How do you feel about not being armed yourself?"

Mell: "You know, I feel... you know... and... and growing up in a big city, you learn how to adapt to these kind of situations and you learn how to protect yourself. And... and I've been doing okay since, you know, I'm going on 45 now and I, you know, I'm doing all right, so..."

Kay: "So, you're... what you're saying to me is you'd feel more comfortable not being armed, taking on this 225 pound man, who's likely violent and who has intentions that are not honorable? You'd feel more comfortable being disarmed, have no concealed carry, and simply trying to talk him down?"

Mell: "Well, what I would like is, you know, trained police officers to... to take that role and not armed citizens."

Kay: "Let me ask you one more time, as a practical, everyday matter, do you feel that you would be in a better position in the scenario I laid out not being armed as opposed to being armed?"

Mell: "I would... my... myself, and... and I do ride the... the CTA, would feel better not being armed in that situation."

Kay: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Mell: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Nekritz."

Nekritz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. We heard some very compelling testimony in the Judiciary Committee last week about this very... this very topic. And it came

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

from the father of Blair Holt, who was a young man who was killed on a bus in the City of Chicago by a gunman, who I believe jumped on the bus and started shooting in a... in a crowd of teenagers. And... and as the father of this young man who had been killed, his testimony, I thought, really captured this... this Amendment more than anything else by saying that the last thing we needed in that confined space was other people drawing a gun and trying to shoot and... because there would have been more carnage and more death than actually occurred. And I felt that Mr. Holt really, actually, very much captured what this Amendment is trying to get at. And I think that that, we all need to pay attention to someone who's actually lived this and has suffered a terrible loss as to his sense of what would create safety on our mass transit systems. I urge a 'no'. I'm sorry, 'yes'."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Reboletti: "Representative, I heard you talk about more police officers on the streets, and having them ride on the CTA, and on the 'L' tracks, and everywhere else. Does this Bill do that?"

Mell: "No, it doesn't."

Reboletti: "Does this Bill ban gang members from the CTA and mass transit?"

Mell: "No, it doesn't, but I would love to introduce a Bill like that."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Reboletti: "You know why you couldn't, Representative? Because it would be unconstitutional. Just like this will be unconstitutional. That's where the problem exists. I also was at that hearing in Chicago, and I asked the CTA's President about the amount of crime on the CTA. And I was concerned about taking firearms away from law-abiding citizens when they had to try to protect themselves when armed robbers were busy stealing iPhones, or grabbing purses, and pushing senior citizens down a flight of stairs to their death. That's what I'm concerned about. I have no doubt you are as well. But the gang members will continue to conceal and carry their firearms on the elevated tracks, at the 'L' stations, on the trains and buses, and the average law-abiding citizen won't be able to defend themselves. And I think the Seventh Circuit talked about this, that recognizing that a complete gun ban would no longer survive Supreme Court review, the city required all gun owners to obtain training that included one hour of live range instruction, then banned all live ranges within the city limits. This was not much of a nod to the importance of live range training, as it was thumbing the municipal nose at the Supreme Court. I would suggest that's what the City of Chicago is doing."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Mell to close."

Mell: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and everyone. I think this was a great discussion. I mean... you know, my friends and... and my wife, she takes the bus to the 'L' every day to and from work, and... and I don't think twice about it and her safety, but I definitely would if... if we didn't pass this

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Amendment. I just, you know, I've been on trains before where... where, you know, there... there might be a character that is a little agitated and... and... and just the thought that, you know, all of a sudden people might be like pulling out guns and... and there's being a big shootout or... you know, I think it's just too risky. And... so, I urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you so much for everyone. This is... was a great discussion."

- Speaker Lang: "The Sponsor has moved for the adoption of the Amendment. There is a request for a verification by Mr. Sacia. Please vote your own switches. 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? DeLuca, Fortner, Smith, Thapedi. Please take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Excuse me. I've... Mr. Sacia... Mr. Sa... I apologize. Mr. Sacia withdraws his request. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Hollman: "Amendment 15 is offered by Representative Zalewski."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, at the request of the Sponsors,
 Amendments 15 through Amendment 26 are withdrawn. And
 please put Amendment 27 on the board and read the
 Amendment."
- Clerk Hollman: "Amendment #27 is offered by Representative Phelps."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, finally we get to the… what I think, the main

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Amendment, because the court has spoken and said that we have to pass a reasonable Bill by June the 9th. As many of you have talked to me over the summer, we felt like we had a very reasonable Bill in House Bill 148. And a lot of you said if we ever put that back up, that you could vote for it because now if we don't pass something by June the 9th, what the court says, Constitution Carry will set in; there will be no restrictions. So, what we did would do today, or what we did today, would actually be null and void. You could be able to carry anything you want, wherever you want. And trust me, there's a lot of pro-gun groups in this state that want that. But we've made a lot of negotiations years on this. through the People like myself, Representative Bradley, Representative Verschoore Beiser, Representative Bost, Representative Reboletti and Representative Sullivan, to name a few. I could go on and on; Sacia, and Mitchell, Burke, all of them. But I think now more than ever we understand we have to get something done. Every one of these Amendments today are... is in my Bill, which is Amendment 27. The qualification's there, the training's there, it's a 'shall' issue which 39 other states do. All I'm asking is not kick the can down the road anymore. Let's pass this for the law-abiding gun owners of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman's moved for the adoption of the Amendment. The Chair recognizes Mr. Dunkin."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a point of clarification.

I noticed that you, and I'm no math major, but you went
from 14 to 27. Can you explain?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "All of the other Amendments were withdrawn, Sir."

Dunkin: "Excuse me?"

Speaker Lang: "All of the other Amendments were withdrawn."

Dunkin: "Okay. Because I have an Amendment that's just outstanding and this... this chamber has been waiting with bated breath to hear the Amendment that requires gun owners to have a million dollars of insurance if you want to conceal and carry. They've been chomping at the bit for this. So, can you explain the scenario again?"

Speaker Lang: "I understood that your Amendment was withdrawn, Sir."

Dunkin: "I don't recall that, Mr. Speaker. Unless it's in Amendment #27. Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "No way."

Dunkin: "Oh. Hold... hold on now. Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall doing the withdraw. I've been through withdrawals but not tonight. Can you line up some clarification for me, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lang: "Staff will get back to you on that, Sir."

Dunkin: "Staff will... which staff? Is it Jodi, Buffy, Heather?"

Speaker Lang: "Do you have any comments on the Amendment, Sir?"

Dunkin: "What is... Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps.

I've never called him Representative Phelps. I call him

Johnny Cash."

Phelps: "Yes, indeed."

Dunkin: "Can you enlighten us to your Amendment? What is some of the... the highlights and tenets of your Amendment? What does it do?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Pretty much everything we did today, Representative Dunkin, is in this Bill, in this Amendment. Okay. Without the parking lot and the adjacent or near talk that we had earlier which I think is way too broad. There's a 'shall' issue in here. You have to be 21 years old. You have to have a FOID card. You have to be a U.S. citizen. You have to complete eight hours of training, and this year we put in live fire training so you know how to handle a gun."

Dunkin: "Representative..."

Phelps: "Criminal history checks, mental health checks..."

Dunkin: "...a quick question. Friend and colleague, does your

Amendment require a... an insurance liability for carry as a

conceal... of a... of a concealed wea... weapon?"

Phelps: "No. Representative Dunkin, there's not one state that does that. And I don't know of one insurance company that will do that for in... intentional acts."

Dunkin: "So, what happens if a person who carries accidentally or negligently shoots someone else?"

Phelps: "It... it happens now and, I mean, it'd just be up to the prosecutor, I would assume."

Dunkin: "So, what's a penalty for ... "

Phelps: "Or... or if it's justified self-defense, Representative Dunkin."

Dunkin: "No. I'm speaking of, if there's an accident, you know, most of us have cars and if we have an accident, there's an insurance company that typically would cover the liability claim, correct?"

Phelps: "Correct."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Dunkin: "We have insurance on our fur coats, our boats, our houses, our apartments, our condos. Why not guns?"
- Phelps: "Well, I mean, I think that's just a... a difference of opinions. I mean, we know it like I said."
- Dunkin: "Well, Representative, a gun is a dangerous instrument.

 Am I correct?"
- Phelps: "The courts still allow for civil damages, but like I said, not one other state in this country has ever done anything to this degree."
- Dunkin: "So, all right. So, I understand that we're a progressive state. That's probably why we're the last state to actually deal with this issue. But wh... what I'm trying to get some clarification on is, if someone is negligent or there is an accident and someone is accidentally shot, someone is accidentally killed, who is liable? And is there insurance to cover that respective gun and person who was injured, maimed, or killed?"
- Phelps: "That's for civil and criminal courts to decide. We've not put it in this Bill, nor we felt like we had to. I think, too, Representative Dunkin, if you talk to the… the insurance lobby, I think you can also put this under your homeowner policy. Something like an umbrella policy, or a rider, or things like that, but we're not going to mandate that for our law-abiding gun owners. I just think that's another hurdle for them to… a lot of these are not going to be able to afford that."
- Dunkin: "Okay. Point... point taken. Just a... let me move to a couple other... other questions. Under this Bill, can a

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

person who has a DUI, are they allowed to carry a gun under your legislation? Concealed and carry."

Phelps: "No..."

Dunkin: "I have a DUI let's say, right? I don't have one but let's... let's pretend."

Phelps: "We... I... I believe we have some different language on this and that's something we'll correct because the 'shall' issue lang... Amendment that I had, I believe if you had two DUIs within a three... four year, that you cannot and it will be revoked. Two within three. I'm sorry, two DUIs within three years, your permit will be revoked."

Dunkin: "Okay."

Phelps: "So, we... we did... we thought that was a big issue..."

Dunkin: "So, two DUIs?"

Phelps: "Right."

Dunkin: "Within two years or four years?"

Phelps: "Two DUIs within three years, I believe, is what we have."

Dunkin: "Within three years. What's... is that a fair amount of time?"

Phelps: "It... it is because there was a lot of Legislators that came to us about that and wanted us to be specific on that."

Dunkin: "Sorry, there... there were..."

Phelps: "There were a lot of Legislators that wanted that to be put in there..."

Dunkin: "Oh, really?"

Phelps: "...and... and... well, we've been negotiating this for a long time and I... I think that's fair."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Dunkin: "So... all right."

Phelps: "We don't want a repeat offender to keep driving drunk and then..."

Dunkin: "Absolutely."

Phelps: "...we don't want him to carry a... a gun."

Dunkin: "No, I... I agree. So, Representative, now elected officials, politicians down here in the State of Illinois, in the House and the Senate, we're not as popular as we used to be in terms of being well-liked. Are we in your Bill to be allowed, very similar to the Chicago aldermen, to conceal and carry as Leg... Legislators?"

Phelps: "I don't… we're not going to put that in this Bill, but if… I know what… I think Heather's right there. She said that anybody can file Bills, so that's one that I would probably join you on."

Dunkin: "So, okay. So, it'll be okay for Legislators with proper training, who would like to carry, to receive..."

Phelps: "All… all they would have to do… all they would have to do is apply for this and I… if you pass the qualifications and you meet the standards, you would be able to get a concealed carry permit in this state."

Dunkin: "Well, again, I... I think it's important for us to at least mirror locally elected officials, you know, state, then there's Home Rule or Chicago. They're able to potentially defend themselves against... some of us Legislators, we don't live in the really wealthier areas. Some of us live in very crime, strongly crime-ridden districts... myself included, in the State of Illinois. We live in some very tough areas."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Representative Dunkin, and that's why..."

Dunkin: "Some of us."

Phelps: "...I absolutely, positively agree with you. And that's why, if you wanted to do that liability insurance, there'd be a lot of people in this state that are law-abiding gun owners, would not be able to afford this permit. They would not be able to get and... and exercise their Second Amendment, God-given right. That's the problem. And... and, you know, and there's... there's some, I think, Representative Sims has one on mental evaluations through a psychiatrist. That's a thousand dollars or more. I just don't know how we're... we're... why are we putting roadblocks in front of law-abiding gun owners? And..."

Dunkin: "So, Representative..."

Phelps: "...and, Representative Dunkin, real quick. We even started, when I say we, the NRA in this, we even started the permit at \$25 so people could afford that. But now, because of the negotiations, people wanted to get a little... little bit more money, so we moved it up to 80, which we think is fair and is with, kind of, the rest of the states."

Dunkin: "Representative, if a Chicago police officer, for example, stops and pulls someone... someone over and they find out that they don't have a conceal and carry license, could they be... could the City be held liable or could they be sued?"

Phelps: "They could, but we have duty to inform in the Bill.

And if a police..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Dunkin: "So, how will that be indicated? Will it be on the license plate, will it be... will they have..."

Phelps: "It's usually done during a traffic stop. You have... if they ask if you have a concealed weapon, you have to show them your permit immediately. If not, there would be penalties and he's got to show his license, of course."

Dunkin: "So, under your... your Bill, what happens if one carries a gun, a weapon, into a school?"

Phelps: "Under my Bill..."

Dunkin: "Is there a penalty?"

Phelps: "Under my Bill, yes. You cannot carry in a school. You cannot carry in a school. But what we did is, if you are a parent and you know you can't carry in that school, so where are you going to leave your concealed weapon? We believe that you need somewhere to be able to securely lock it up and that's why we believe that parking lots would be fine because you got to leave it somewhere."

Dunkin: "So, this includes private schools, as well?"

Phelps: "Yes."

Dunkin: "If your... if it's a Jewish school, a Muslim school..."

Phelps: "Private businesses."

Dunkin: "...Montessori, Catholic school..."

Phelps: "Temples, private businesses, you name it, we allow businesses to post, so if they don't want you to bring their concealed weapon, that you can't or there will be penalties."

Dunkin: "So, I just want to bring some clarification again. So, you're going to make an Amendment to this Bill to allow State Representatives and State Senators to carry

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

automatically with a.m. a modest amount of training on gun proficiency and..."

Phelps: "You... if you're a State Legislator and you pass all of qualifications and meet the requirements, you can apply for a Illinois permit to conceal carry. Or if you don't, you don't have to."

Dunkin: "And so, you..."

Phelps: "You just got to meet the requirements just like everybody else."

"Okay. All right, thank you. So... I appreciate your... Dunkin: your... your years and years of commitment to this issue. Obviously, it's a little different dynamic for some of us urban Legislators who are, to saddle with, trave... travesty after travesty in the City of Chicago or the County of Cook and other parts of our state. And we're not proud of that fact. That over 500 murders, people who were killed by guns, exist in our respective state. Now, you have to double or triple that when it comes to individuals who were shot, who were injured by guns. Injury is a pretty significant issue here, certainly within a cost analysis of those emergency room visits, hospitalization, as well as paying for funeral costs. I mean, it's an untenable experience for families, for the communities at large, students. And so, I... I really hope that you take up... take another look at the liability insurance for negligence and who's going to pay for some of this cost given the... the real... the realistic dynamics in our respective state. Thank you, Representative."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Representative Dunkin, let me just say this, every state, we're the only one that has no concealed carry permit process whatsoever. Every state that has this..."

Dunkin: "Why is... why is that, Representative?"

Phelps: "I... I don't know if I want to answer that because..."

Dunkin: "Oh."

Phelps: "...I'm not... I don't live in that area because I think Chicago, in the history... history of Chicago and Cook County, always been in a gun-free zone."

Dunkin: "And why is that?"

Phelps: "I just think that's the politics of it, I... I guess.

I'm not from there, but..."

Dunkin: "No, but what... is it the politics of violence with handguns? Is that real?"

Phelps: "Well, then, okay. So, peop... so, can... Representative Dunkin, let me just ask... let me just... I think maybe this will answer it and I don't think I have to. Right now, in this country, Cook County and Chicago have the strictest gun laws in the country that lead the country in shootings and murders, so obviously the strict gun laws do not work, Ken. That's all I'm saying. Let me just say this, when Florida got this, Miami was the murder capital of the world and everybody said, Oh, my God, more... more guns that means more killings. Crime went down. Crime has gone down. It's never gone up where there's been concealed carry. And La Shawn Ford will tell you that in our task force. No other state has repealed concealed carry. Representative Dunkin, it works."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Dunkin: "So, what about our surrounding states, Indiana, Iowa, Wisconsin, Michigan?"

Phelps: "Crime has never gone up where there's been a concealed carry state."

Dunkin: "So, you're predicting that crime is going to decrease in Chicago because of conceal and carry?"

Phelps: "Ken, if it goes down one percent, that means everything to me and it should be everybody in this Body."

Dunkin: "Thank you, Representative."

Phelps: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Zalewski."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Zalewski: "Representative, first of all, let me say that I... I certainly appreciate the amount of work and effort and time you, along with the law-abiding gun owners of... of Illinois, have put into this particular issue. And in no way are my questions meant to be disrespectful of that effort or... or... or meant to degrade what you're trying to accomplish here. One very specific... oh, I have a few specific questions, but your Bill, Amendment 27, is a 'shall' issue law, correct?"

Phelps: "It is a 'shall' issue law."

Zalewski: "Can you describe for me why a 'shall' issue is more appropriate for Illinois than a 'may' issue statute?"

Phelps: "Well, we believe that 'shall' issue, everybody should be treated the same as what the court said. We believe that a bureaucrat should not dictate who gets a permit or not get a permit like they do in New York. In New York, you have to be a political donor, you have to be a celebrity,

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

or somebody's friend with the mayor, so to speak, to get a concealed carry. We think everybody should be treated the same and if you meet the requirements, you ought to 'shall'... you 'shall' be issued that permit. I don't think we want anybody in the Governor's Office dictating who gets a permit or not in this state."

Zalewski: "And... and I don't want that either, Brandon. I... my Amendment 25 said the State Police would get the application for licensure, they would forward it to the sheriff, sheriff would have 14 days to do a background check, mental health check, all the necessary... run the necessary traps, and get back to the State Police. So, putting aside the... the comparison to New York, 'cause I don't necessarily feel that New York's statute is what's right for Illinois either, putting aside that for a second, is... is it at all possible for you to consider putting in provisions that would allow the State Police to exercise discretion when they're issuing the licensure of the firearm?"

Phelps: "Well, that's something that definitely we can talk about. Of course, there's... I'm... there's people bigger than me on this that we've had a coalition negotiating this for years. But you know, the State Police said they didn't think they could implement this with a \$25 fee so we raised it to 80. They have 90 days to process these permits. We believe in a low end that this could bring in \$15 million right off the top. In Wisconsin, 67 thousand applicants did it in the first, I think, month. We... we think maybe we can

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

go up 175 thousand, which will bring in 14 to 15 million dollars."

Zalewski: "You... you mentioned the difference between a 'may' issue law and a 'shall' issue law. Is it accurate to suggest that other states besides New York have had 'may' issue laws?"

Phelps: "Yeah. Representative, I believe there is 39 states that have 'shall' issue, as we speak, in this country. And I believe there's only six to eight that have 'may' issue or some form of 'may' issue."

Zalewski: "My... my recollection from the Judiciary Committee hearings was that there were nine."

Phelps: "Okay. Well..."

Zalewski: "So, I..."

Phelps: "I'll say six to nine."

Zalewski: "It's possible for a constitutional result that includes 'may' issue. You'd acknowledge that, correct?"

Phelps: "Yeah. And the way we understand with the court ruling that it's... it's got to be 'shall' issue."

Zalewski: "I... I think reasonable people can disagree about that, Brandon. I... I think... I think if 'may' issue is good enough for nine other states, even with the Seventh Circuit's opinion, it can be good enough for Illinois. My next... I'll move on from that. The next question is why only eight hours of training for... for the licensure?"

Phelps: "I'm sorry. Say that again."

Zalewski: "Why... why only eight hours of training?"

Phelps: "Well, because we felt that that's going with the other states. That we felt was fair with the amount of people

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

that may have to take off work or can't afford to take off work. And... and the cost of the program, I think, is going to be another issue, Representative."

Zalewski: "So..."

- Phelps: "And we... and remember, this year we put in live fire, so people have to prove to the instructor they know how to handle their gun. And if they can't, the instructor can fail them. And that's another safeguard that we put in this year to make this Bill more reasonable."
- Zalewski: "So, if a private operator that was able to offer instruction had more required hours of training, would that be acceptable to you?"
- Phelps: "Well... and... once again, back what Heather said, I think if you want to put that in as Amendment, I mean, that's something we will look at. But I think everybody... we're all taking Amendments on all the gun issues right now."
- Zalewski: "Yeah. Well, I'll be two... two more quick questions and I'll get out of here... I'll get out of... the... I'll move along. We didn't get to it, but parks and recreational areas. It's... it's not in 997. Would... would parks be something that could be considered in the exemptions to... to your Bill?"
- Phelps: "Once again, I... I'm not going to go on the record and agree to that just because, you know, I have to talk to other people about that. But we feel like state parks and things like that, you ought to be able to carry 'cause it's a public place."
- Zalewski: "Okay. You know what, Representative, to the Bill. I...
 I, again, I commend the Representative. He's shown a... he's

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

endured a lot of patience today. I... I think, for what it's worth, there's... there's going to be a lot of people that disagree with me, but I actually think that reasonable people can come together on this particular issue and... and come to a... a Bill that satisfies the concerns of some of those who wish to see public safety protected while at the same time abiding by the constitutional right to carry a firearm. I'm not quite there on the Gentleman's Amendment, so I'm not going to be able to support it. But I thank him for answering my questions, and I continue to look forward to the debate."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you. For the Body's knowledge, there are 10 speakers willing... wishing to speak on this legislation.

The next one... Sorry, 11. The next one is Mr. Sullivan."

Sullivan: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Sullivan: "Representative, we went through an exercise on certain Amendments. I just want to cover what I think is in your Bill that covered some of the Amendments. Within your Bill, we have prohibition within schools."

Phelps: "Yes."

Sullivan: "We have prohibition in child care facilities."

Phelps: "Correct."

Sullivan: "That was another Amendment that was here before. We have prohibition in sports stadiums and events."

Phelps: "Correct."

Sullivan: "We have prohibitions where establishments that are licensed to serve alcohol."

Phelps: "Correct."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sullivan: "Another Amendment..."

Phelps: "But different... different, if the 50 percent of the revenue is more..."

Sullivan: "Added on to the 50 percent."

Phelps: "Right."

Sullivan: "I'm just trying to cover within your Amendment..."

Phelps: "Right, right."

Sullivan: "...what we have been debating all day long. So, we also have something to do with places of worship."

Phelps: "Yes."

Sullivan: "Okay. Also within your Amendment... if you bear with me a quick second here until I find my notes. Heck with it, I can't remember it. We have expanded the time by which the State Police can institute this program."

Phelps: "Yeah. We... we've worked with them on this, you know. We gave them 90 days to process the permits. And we're going to give them the... the revenue to do it."

Sullivan: "And so, within the revenue, we've increased the fee from \$25 to \$80 per their request."

Phelps: "Per their request, for a five-year permit."

Sullivan: "And also embedded in that revenue of \$80, there's \$5 that we, as those that are concerned about mental health, said why don't we use that \$5 for mental health? Is that in the Bill as well?"

Phelps: "Five dollars is there for mental health reporting, correct."

Sullivan: "Per permit?"

Phelps: "Correct."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Sullivan: "So, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a Bill that has been worked out for many years. This is the Bill that we want to push forward. This is your vote. If you believe in concealed carry, today is the day that you need to vote on this Amendment. I applaud the Sponsor. He's worked very hard to bring all groups together to really, at the end of the day, have one of the most restrictive concealed carry Bills in America. In America. So, this is the time... this is the time to put it forward. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "David Harris."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Phelps: "Earlier today?"

Harris, D.: "Yes."

Phelps: "Yes. And I have two more, too, but I didn't remember withdrawing them, but here we are."

Harris, D.: "Okay. I just want to... just want to understand.

Amendment #1, of course, begins by saying it replaces everything after the enacting clause. Amendment 27, however, says it inserts in the following its proper numeric sequence. In other words, everything that we have done today becomes part of the Bill, correct?"

Phelps: "Correct."

Harris, D.: "Okay. I can... I can compliment you on all the hard work that you have put into the Bill, not just... not just now, but also in previous years. And I sense an excitement in your voice because you're getting close to a... a goal

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

that you have been... been pushing for, for quite some time, and a lot of us share that. But I have a question for you, a couple of questions. Let me first ask, you addressed the Gentleman from Cook there when you talked about carrying a weapon on to a school ground. A parent comes up to meet their child on a school ground and you talked about how that weapon would be put in a car once they got to the parking lot or something like that. As I read Amendment #2, as soon as that parent sets foot on that parking lot, if they are carrying, they are in violation of the law. They don't have time to get out of the car and put it in their back... in their trunk. As soon as they enter that parking lot, they are in violation of the law. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "Representative Harris, that's not in mine, but there is a conflict there, what we talked about earlier. I think we're trying to get a ruling here, so if you want to bear with me on this."

Harris, D.: "Well, my point..."

Phelps: "I understand where you're going."

Harris, D.: "I don't need clarification. My point is this."

Phelps: "Okay, okay."

Harris, D.: "You have worked extremely hard on this legislation.

And what has happened here today, to my mind, has watered down this legislation substantially with... with language like 'adjacent to' and 'nearby' and 'next door to'. Do you... do you think that's the case?"

Phelps: "Well... yeah, of course I believe that. I wish we would have just done Amendment 27 first to begin with."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Harris, D.: "Okay. So, it... it has been watered down, fine.

 Having said that..."
- Phelps: "So, Representative, we know we have conflicting provisions. We know that this is not an end all; this is going to be negotiated for many weeks. So..."
- Harris, D.: "Okay."
- Phelps: "...we definitely want to have a chance to get this here because without that, those Amendments we did today will become, what we feel, law. We don't want that."
- Harris, D.: "Well, brings me, really, my last question. If this Bill got to Third Reading, in the form that it is in, are you comfortable with a 'yes' vote saying this is the concealed carry Bill that we should put into legislation in the State of Illinois?"
- Phelps: "With both conflicting provisions?"
- Harris, D.: "Say again."
- Phelps: "With both the conflicting provisions in that Bill?"
- Harris, D.: "Well, as we've... as it stands here right now, because that's what... that's what we're vot... that's what your Amendment does."
- Phelps: "I... I want to rectify that before we vote on something that we want and we think is reasonable."
- Harris, D.: "So, we can we expect further Amendments to this Bill?"
- Phelps: "I... I... Representative Harris, I know where you're going. I can't I'm not driving the train on this Amendment. I don't want any hostile Amendments to go on this, for sure. And I'll say that on the record."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Harris, D.: "I... I understand you're not driving the train. You don't want hostile Amendment. Let's assume it's not a hostile Amendment. Or if it's not amended, if there are no other Amendments, if this comes to Third Reading, can I put my 'yes'... on your recommendation, can I put my 'yes' vote on this Bill?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Harris, D.: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Arroyo."

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

Speaker Lang: "Sponsor yields."

Arroyo: "Representative Phelps, if this Amendment passes, how many guns can you carry? What's... what is conceal and carry mean?"

Phelps: "Well, here... here's what I will say. That if we don't pass something, and June 9th comes or June 8th as some people say, it's unlimited. I mean, I can even put a AR-15 on my shoulder and go down your neighborhood."

Arroyo: "Why you got to come to my neighborhood? Can you go in your neighborhood?"

Phelps: "Well, I'm just saying... 'cause you're talking. No, 'cause you're talking. I'm just saying... or I can go... I can go..."

Arroyo: "We got… we got them in my neighborhood, too, Brandon.

I'll tell you that. But here, I…"

Phelps: "But we want the good guys to have them."

Arroyo: "No, we don't want to have them. We're trying to get rid of them. Brandon, but how... how many guns can you have if... if this Amendment passes? Can you have one gun? Can you

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

have one on your leg? Can you have one on your back? How many guns can you carry?"

Phelps: "Yeah. We... we don't have that in this Amendment. That's something we can work on. But usually there'd be one on your person, one in your bag. I mean, I don't know very many people that carry more than one to be honest with you."

Arroyo: "I... I need to know a... I need to know a number. How many guns can you carry with... if this Amendment passes?"

Phelps: "We did not specify..."

Arroyo: "1, 10, 15? Brandon, I'm not trying to be sarcastic."

Phelps: "No, no, no, I know what you're saying."

Arroyo: "I'm not trying to be sarcastic, but it's not on any of these Amendments. So, I would like to put on the Amendment that you should... conceal and carry one gun, if it passes."

Phelps: "Yeah. Representative, we did not put any limitations."

Arroyo: "So, there's no limitations. So, if this gun passes...
this Amendment passes, the way you've written it, you could
have 5 or 10 guns in your body before... to go anywhere,
right?"

Phelps: "I... I may even do that myself. But we... but we didn't put in any limitation and I'm not... I'm not trying to be funny."

Arroyo: "Okay. You know, the other reason why I'm asking that question, Brandon, is 'cause I have a one gun a month and I've been carrying that Bill for a while. How would you... how would you vote on that one gun a month, if I brought that to the floor?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Well, I voted 'no' in the past, as you know that, just because I believe in collecting. I collect myself."

Arroyo: "Well, the gun... the... the collections won't be hindered with that. It doesn't have any... any state... saying that you can't collect guns. It doesn't pertain to that. But I... I think that that's a problem for me to... to vote on this Amendment when you can't tell me how many guns I will be voting for. I would like to support your Amendment, but I can't support your Amendment without telling me how many guns this is going to allow you to... to carry. Especially when you come into my neighborhood, just like you said. I want to know how many 'cause you're going to be in my neighborhood with... with, you know. You're not telling me how many guns you're going to bring in my neighborhood."

Phelps: "I... I don't have... I mean, that's concealed carry. I don't have to tell anybody. I mean, we... we didn't put... I'm just being honest with you. We didn't put any limitations in this Bill."

Arroyo: "Okay. Well, the way this Bill... this Amendment is, I can't... I couldn't vote for this, Brandon. If you could tell me... if you could come back and tell me... I would like to put an Amendment on this, should only be one gun. You know, because then the other thing is, what kind of gun can you carry? Are you going to carry a... a .22? That doesn't say that. Are you going to a .38, a .45 Magnum, a automatic? It doesn't say that..."

Phelps: "Remember, and I know you know this, automatic weapons are completely illegal in this country."

Arroyo: "Okay."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "You cannot even own one."

Arroyo: "But you can carry a .45..."

Phelps: "Yes, you can."

Arroyo: "You could carry a .45, two or three of them?"

Phelps: "Well, yeah, you could 'cause we don't have limitations in this. But remember, it's going to be far much better than having constitution carry set in. A lot of people can't believe we're even running this Bill 'cause they thought we wanted constitution carry. And there are a lot of people that want that. I don't think any of us want that, really."

Arroyo: "This still is too vague for me, Brandon..."

Phelps: "Well, you know what? We voted on a lot of vague Bills today. And I think you agree with me, there was a lot of Amendments today that were too broad."

Arroyo: "Oh, absolutely, absolutely."

Phelps: "I mean, you know, our... our law enforcement, you know, would they... well, I'm not even going to go there. So, I'll answer your next question."

Arroyo: "Well, I... I don't think I could vote for this Amendment the way it's written unless you put an amount of how many guns. I would like to support you on this, but I can't support you on this Amendment. Brandon, this is not personal. And I'm not going to hold it... you're going to send somebody with an Uzi or with a AK-47 in my neighborhood. But I'm going to... I'm going to not vote for this, and I urge some of my colleagues to consider how many guns, before you vote on this Amendment, how many guns can

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

you carry? I mean, this is too vague to not know how many guns you... it's conceal and carry, you know, that's..."

Phelps: "Representative Arroyo, but let me just say this again, for the record, there is no other states that have limitations. We're following a lot of states 'cause, guess what, we're the last one to do this."

Arroyo: "I understand."

Phelps: "So, we're... we're following a... and we're actually... this Bill that I'm doing, this Amendment, is actually more restrictive than we ever wanted it to be. But we know the alternative is constitution carry. And I don't think... so before you vote 'no', I would be careful because you may end up with constitution carry and I don't think you want that. I'm just being honest."

Arroyo: "I'm going to pay a little attention, Brandon. Thank you."

Phelps: "Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Will Davis."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Davis, W.: "I've got a few pages here of things that I want to bring out, Representative. But I'll... I'll start with, I guess, what I think is probably the most important as it relates to conceal and carry. I think the term is called 'duty to inform'?"

Phelps: "Yes, Sir."

Davis, W.: "So, what invokes 'duty to inform'?"

Phelps: "Any traffic stop, and if the law enforcement... any... actually any stop at all could be a carry stop, but any

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- stop at all, police ask you if you have a permit, you have to immediately show him your... that and your license."
- Davis, W.: "So... so, if I get stopped, that is what invokes 'duty to inform'."
- Phelps: "Right, and... what we cut, we did some negotiations with all the law enforcement. That's why most of law enforcement support this Amendment."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I personally don't care what law enforcement negotiated. I'm talking about my own personal safety. So again, what invokes 'duty to inform'? Is it simply just a traffic stop?"
- Phelps: "Simply that, yes."
- Davis, W.: "So, if a police officer decides that he wants to stop me for no reason whatsoever, is that enough for the officer to then ask me to present?"
- Phelps: "It could be an investigative stop, yes."
- Davis, W.: "When you say an investigative stop, so what's the difference there?"
- Phelps: "No, I mean, if you're walking down the sidewalk or... or traffic stop, stop in the streets, all the above."
- Davis, W.: "Well, again, I'm trying to understand..."
- Phelps: "Yeah. That's exactly what it says."
- Davis, W.: "...what invokes 'duty to inform' because if... if I'm driving, maybe I'm not breaking the law, maybe I'm driving under the speed limit. I... I don't know, but if I'm just driving my car, then for what reason can an officer pull me over and then ask me to present this licensure?"
- Phelps: "It would be at that law enforcement's discretion."
- Davis, W.: "At their discretion?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Correct."

Davis, W.: "That's it?"

Phelps: "Yeah. Yes."

- Davis, W.: "Okay. So, it is possible that someone like myself actually could be profiled under this legislation then?"
- Phelps: "I mean, I could be stopped as well, Representative."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I understand that, but let's be real. If that's what we're talking about, what's the likelihood that you're going to be profiled versus me being profiled?"
- Phelps: "I... you know, Representative, like I said, we took a lot of this from other states where there's not been a huge problem that I know of in other states. That's why we copied this language."
- Davis, W.: "Well, you know, Representative, I don't live in another state. I live here in the State of Illinois."
- Phelps: "But we had to come up with legislation and language because we're the last ones to do this."
- Davis, W.: "You are absolutely right. You had to come up with something, but it seems like what you've come up with puts me in jeopardy."
- Phelps: "Representative, and then I... and... and look, we've known each other for a long time. And I would say then maybe that you ought to put Amendment in and I'm just being honest 'cause that's what they said today. Anybody that has some problems with we ought to put some Amendments in."
- Davis, W.: "I get to file an Amendment and then get ridiculed by the other side of the aisle because I filed an Amendment on something that I think is important?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "I... I don't believe so. I mean... I know it's important to you so I would do that. I'm just..."

Davis, W.: "Well, I... I appreciate that. But again, as you've indicated with the last speaker, you very clearly indicated that if we don't pass something, then we're going to get something that maybe we don't want. So, in your efforts to try to craft a Bill that's appropriate for Members of this Body to vote on, I am simply asking something that is not, how can I can say, uncommon maybe in certain parts of the Illinois. You know, State of where individuals, particularly people of color, may get profiled in various communities. So again, now we're talking about introducing guns into the mix of that kind of situation. So again, I simply ask about what invokes 'duty to inform'. Is it something... is there anything more to this than simply an officer deciding that I'm the guy that he or she is going to stop tonight? And then they ask me do I... am I carrying a weapon therefore, no other reason. So, is... is that really all it takes under this legislation?"

Phelps: "Representative, if you have the proper I.D. and license and the permit, I would assume that would all go away."

Davis, W.: "Well, the question is, why do I have to show it?"

Phelps: "Because..."

Davis, W.: "If I'm not doing anything wrong..."

Phelps: "Because the law..."

Davis, W.: "If I've not done anything wrong and an officer pulls me over, then why must I show my carry license or my FOID card or whatever the Bill requires? Again, if we're

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

going to pass an appropriate Bill that satisfies this Body, then please, I'm asking you to figure out a way to help satisfy me in this legislation. And the irony in it, Representative, is that as we've talked about conceal and carry and I've heard the arguments that we're the last state to do it. And many of us probably feel that at some point this is going to come, court notwithstanding, that we're going to pass some type of conceal and carry Bill. So, I've asked the NRA. I've asked the advocates how do we deal with the issue of racial profiling. Because, unfortunately, what I see in this Bill is that this situation getting much worse before it ever gets better. And then what happens?"

Phelps: "And... and I know we're going to agree to disagree,
Representative, and you know that 'cause of this is one of
those wear... wear on your issues... wear on your sleeve issues
and I understand that."

Davis, W.: "I'm not wearing it on my sleeve, Representative."

Phelps: "...but once you give your permit, you're free to go.

Once you give that permit and you have that license, you're free to go."

Davis, W.: "But the question is, why do I have to show it? Why does this legislation require me, under no other circumstances, to show that I am carrying a weapon..."

Phelps: "He could still ask you for your driver's license."

Davis, W.: "...license, whatever. I'm sorry?"

Phelps: "He could still ask you for your driver's license."

Davis, W.: "But if we pass this, and I'm assuming that it's going to pass, again, is there anything that invokes 'duty

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

to inform' that other than the fact that I get stopped by a police officer?"

Phelps: "Will, here's what... Representative Davis, excuse me, here's what the deal is. At least we have something that the court said we have to do, we have to do. There's a whole lot of better that we can do this tonight than get constitution carry. I'm just telling you."

Davis, W.: "So, now it's simply because the courts say we got to do it. So, regardless of who it offends..."

Phelps: "The courts said we had to do it."

Davis, W.: "...so, regardless of who it offends and what other situations come as a result, the court said we got to do it. So, you know what? It doesn't matter whether you're a person of color in this... in this state. And for no other reason..."

Phelps: "Representative, Representative, you... you know me better."

Davis, W.: "...they want to stop you, they can stop you 'cause the court says we have to do it."

Phelps: "That is not fair. You know me better than that. What we did..."

Davis, W.: "That's what I'm asking, Representative, help me."

Phelps: "We tried to craft a reasonable Bill..."

Davis, W.: "Help me."

Phelps: "...what other states have done."

Davis, W.: "Help me."

Phelps: "If you want to put an Amendment in, let's look at it, but not on my own 27."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Davis, W.: "I'm asking you... this is your... this is your issue. This is your Bill. This is the one that you've ran on. You've done a lot of things to help move this issue forward. And you're to be commended for getting it to this point. So, I'm asking you, as the Sponsor of this Bill, to help me, help... help your colleague to understand why, if for no other reason, under this Bill, can an officer just stop me for no reason?"
- Phelps: "Representative, this is not a Bill. This is only an Amendment. So, if you want to put your own Amendment in, that's something we can talk about. Right now, this is my Amendment, not a Bill."
- Davis, W.: "Well, let me ask a question then since you want to make that distinction. So, what is the… what does it say in Bill, I believe it's House Bill 997? I believe that's the original Bill, correct?"
- Phelps: "Representative, hang on. Hang on, Representative. Hang on. Okay. Representative, I've had people to talk 'cause I told you there's a lot of coalition in... involved in this. We will revisit this. We will revisit this, but we're going to go ahead with this tonight because of all the time. This is the beginning of the negotiations. We will revisit of what you want to do."
- Davis, W.: "Is that... is that before or after we pass the Bill that we're going to revisit this?"
- Phelps: "Well remember, this isn't the Bill. This is just an Amendment. This is just an Amendment to House Bill 1155.

 This is Amendment 27."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Davis, W.: "So, assuming that this Amendment passes, again, and it's put on to Bill 1155 and then possibly moved forward. So again, are we going to talk about this before or after your Amendment, say it passes? Are we going to do it before or after?"
- Phelps: "Because there would be other Amendments that we will help you revisit this on all the other states, so we can get a better understanding. I'm not going to take this out of the record tonight 'cause this is only an Amendment. But you have my word and you know me, you've known me for a long time..."
- Davis, W.: "Absolutely."
- Phelps: "...you've got my word. We will revisit this and try to come up with some common language, if we can."
- Davis, W.: "Well, I didn't... I didn't ask you to take it... take it out of the record. Again, I'm just..."
- Phelps: "No, no, I'm just saying, if you were going there."
- Davis, W.: "I'm... I'm... as many others in this chamber are asking questions relative to how they feel about this Bill, what's important to them, again, that's something that's very important to me. And again..."
- Phelps: "Absolutely. And I understand."
- Davis, W.: "I... I am not... I am not a gun owner, you know, so, I maybe don't fall into that category. And... and maybe this kind of issue scares me more than it scares other people in here because of their own personal experiences or what have you, but there are some realities that exist for me that are different than many of the people in this chamber. And again, the way I see conceal and carry, you know, when I

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

think about it, is that this presents a lot more challenges for individuals than it does... than it does the... the help and the protection that many of... many of you have argued that it does provide for individuals. So, again, now I'm just telling you that's my... that's one of my issues. But nevertheless, I'll move on. So, in the Bill it indicates that based on the fees that are charged, that money would be deposited into a fund and that dollars from that fund can be invested. So, are there any provisions or would you accept a... would you accept, again, whether it's another amended and support another amended, where those dollars can't be invested in companies, you know, that sell assault weapons, that... that manufacture ammunition? Would you be willing to support anything like that?"

Phelps: "Well, the... under this Amendment, the courts said we didn't have to do anything on that because what we're trying to do is what the courts, more or less, said we had to do reasonable. Now, the State Police is really worried about implementing this... this... this process, this permit process. That's why we were going to give a lot of money to them at their discretion. So, I don't know. There's no language saying where this is going to go, but if you're asking not invest in Illinois manufacturers, I would disagree because they bring in over one billion, with a b, dollars and employ 15 thousand or so people in this state. I don't... I just don't want them to leave."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, you're not interested in that. Got it.

Moving on. So, also in the Bill's that, and I believe under

the..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Phelps: "Yeah. Representative, wait, wait, just real quick, just out of respect. That's not the way I am. If you want to bring an Amendment, you can. This is my Amendment. I'm not going to put anything on this tonight because this is what the court said we have to do. In all fairness, you know... you know me better than that, Will."
- Davis, W.: "I didn't say it. But the courts don't say you...

 don't... didn't explain how you have to invest the money, so

 I just simply said would be willing to support not
 investing money in companies that manufacture assault
 weapons or ammunition, that's all. And... and that's..."
- Phelps: "Personally, I would not. Personally, I would not, but I can't speak for my colleagues."
- Davis, W.: "Okay. Like I said, fair enough. Moving on, something different. So, also, I believe under your exemptions, one of the exemptions is that if an individual has been, and I'll use the word convicted and I'll have... if you question it, I'll have to go back and look, but it says two or more convictions for a DUI or DWI, that's an exemption. So, we allow somebody two driving while under the influence or driving under the influence convictions. under your Amendment? Two are allowed?"

Phelps: "They're prohibited from carrying..."

Davis, W.: "Why are we allowing any?"

- Phelps: "If they get two or more, they're prohibited carrying a concealed weapon."
- Davis, W.: "Why are we allowing any, if somebody has been convicted?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Well, that's... that was years of negotiations, we allowed one but not more than... more than two or more."

Davis, W.: "Negotiations with... well, I want to say with whom, but I'm sure there's probably a long list of individuals. But again, if we're talking about a Bill that supports some of our interests, Representative, that's problematic, I think. I think that's problematic. Now, again, you may say, well, I've negotiated this. Unfortunately, I wasn't a part of your negotiations. You know, I'm sure I could have been there, I guess, if I really wanted to be but, nevertheless, here we are and we're looking at your Amendment and running through parts of your Amendment. So, again, if you're looking for people to support the Bill, then maybe that's something you might want to consider changing. I'll just leave it ... leave it at that. There's a lot of conversation about a number of other states and what they do. So, if you had to put Illinois on a continuum based on your Amendment to the Bill, where does Illinois rank in terms of ... with other states? Is this... is this the more restrictive end or this more permissive, if you will, or is this somewhere... somewhere in the middle?"

Phelps: "This... this is probably one of the most restrictive 'shall' issue carrying Bills in the country, this Amendment 27 and it..."

Davis, W.: "You feel confident about that answer?"

Phelps: "Absolutely."

Davis, W.: "And the reason... and the reason that I ask that question is because in the Bill, excuse me, in your Amendment, it allows for individuals coming from other

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

states to then be able to apply for a carry license here in Illinois. So, again, now if your Amendment puts us on the very restrictive side, then that's great. But if it doesn't, and I don't know, but if it doesn't, then again, problematic if somebody comes from a state that's less, or should I say more, if that's the case, than we are, and then they come here where it's a little easier for them... for them to get a carry permit."

Phelps: "Act... actually."

Davis, W.: "But again, just reading... just reading your Amendment."

Phelps: "No, no, Representative, actually, I think you will agree with me on that because reciprocity is in there. But they still have to apply for... if we want to submit them to a background check, if they want a Illinois permit and... and we wouldn't mind taking their money."

Davis, W.: "So, you would consider the possibility of that?"

Phelps: "Of... of what, Representative?"

Davis, W.: "I'm sorry."

Phelps: "A nonresident may obtain a license to carry a handgun in Illinois if the person meets the above requirements and provides a notarized document stating the person is eligible under Federal Law, his home state to own a firearm, agrees to the subject to the jurisdiction of Illinois and is familiar with Illinois laws pertaining to firearms. And is still subject to background checks."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, if they meet our background check, then that's fine. And is it... how difficult is it to do a background check for somebody who's coming from another

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

state versus it is from someone here in this state? And if so, is that application held up until that time? Because you have..."

Phelps: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "...provisions in here that say that you have windows by which to issue a license. So, if it's beyond the window of what... what your Amendment says because you're trying to get the information from another state, does that invoke the principles or the provisions in your Amendment that allows someone now to sue the State of Illinois because they didn't get it within the window that you provide?"

Phelps: "I think, actually, if another resident has a permit from another state, they can call the State Police in a matter of minutes, can find out if they passed their background check."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I didn't know the answer to that question. I didn't realize it was that simple. So, is it that simple in Illinois where you place a phone call and that's it?"

Phelps: "Supposed to be."

Davis, W.: "Supposed to be."

Phelps: "But we've never done anything under concealed carry.

We're trying to pass something. We've never had the opportunity to do that."

Davis, W.: "All right. Supposed to be. So, also in the… in the Bill when it talks about schools, it talks about how an individual wants to enter a school that they have to inform… inform, I guess, the principal or an official of the school, and then they have to inform law enforcement or someone in the school that someone's being allowed to

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

enter. Now, where it says that about a school that that's the only provision that it provides that you have to notify, say, the principal. But when it comes to a library, it almost, if I'm not mistaken, it says that you have to actually get permission from the library board in order to bring a weapon into a library. So, why is a library so different than a school?"

- Phelps: "Well, I mean... that was the negotiations that we did for a few years to try to do that and put some restrictions on it. And that's what we came up with."
- Davis, W.: "So, again, because we got to... got to force this through, libraries and schools are treated different?"
- Phelps: "Representative, at least we got restrictions. If constitutional carry sets in, we're not going to have any restrictions. In all due respect, we're not. And look, everything you said tonight, you can put an Amendment forward and we'll talk about this and I've said that."
- Davis, W.: "We... we've been through the Amendment process and we kind of know how that works. And again, I'm not trying to, you know, be number 33, 34, or 35 on the... on the Amendment continuum necessarily, and we know, again, how the other side has treated the Amendments that people feel are necessary that they want to talk about. They're just, oh well, another Amendment. Here we go again. You know, just because the rules allow we're going to, you know, file another Amendment. So, you know, I'm just... just simply saying in terms of what I read in your Amendment that libraries and schools are treated differently. Do you agree?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "Okay. That's a problem, as well. Again, this is about trying to get consensus to support what you're trying to do and..."

Phelps: "I would on that. You know what, Representative, I...
we've been waiting... I wish you would have came to me a week
or two ago when we were doing all of this. We may have had
something done."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Phelps: "Like I said, if you want to..."

Davis, W.: "Well… well, in interest… in the interest of time, let me continue. So, next question. Does this… does your Amendment close any of the gun show loopholes that we've talked about?"

Phelps: "No."

Davis, W.: "Does not?"

Phelps: "It's already closed. The gun show loophole is already closed."

Davis, W.: "Oh really? We don't have any gun show loopholes in Illinois?"

Phelps: "You got to get a background check to buy a gun in the State of Illinois."

Davis, W.: "Okay. So, you're saying we don't have any gun show loopholes in the State of Illinois?"

Phelps: "If you're talking about a background check, yes."

Davis, W.: "Well, I just said gun show loopholes..."

Phelps: "Yes."

Davis, W.: "...and you said they're already closed. So, you're telling me that we don't have any?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "We... to do that at a gun show, you have to have a background check to buy."

Davis, W.: "But private sales are exempt?"

Phelps: "Yeah. Oh yeah, private sales are exempt, yes."

Davis, W.: "Oh. So, there is a loophole. Maybe not a gun show loophole but there's a loophole."

Phelps: "Now, that's not a gun show loophole though,

Representative."

Davis, W.: "Okay. But your... your Amendment doesn't address closing such a loophole?"

Phelps: "No."

Davis, W.: "Does not. Okay. Moving on."

Phelps: "There's another Amendment for you."

Davis, W.: "Moving on. So, also in the Bill, it talks about, I believe, when you're in a car or maybe even on your person, it says carrying... that you have the right to carry an unloaded weapon. So, why would someone want to carry an unloaded weapon?"

Phelps: "There's, I think, there would be a lot of people who carry unloaded weapons in their car. We don't believe that is necessarily has to be unloaded under concealed carry. We wish... we hope it is loaded, but that's the discretion of the driver. We're not making that person load their gun. They want to carry unloaded, they can carry unloaded. That's up to the individual, not us."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Phelps: "You just can't take them into the buildings."

Davis, W.: "So, this is all about being able to carry a weapon loaded or unloaded?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "You can. It's your discretion. And guess what? Even if you... you don't want a permit..."

Davis, W.: "At your discretion."

Phelps: "...you don't have to get one."

Davis, W.: "Fantastic. So, also in the… in the… in the Bill, and I believe at least on the analysis is page 4, it says that about his or her person, something 'about his or her person'. So, what does about his or her person mean?"

Phelps: "That it's on your..."

Davis, W.: "So, is it... does it mean it's near, far, on..."

Phelps: "On your person, on your body."

Davis, W.: "Well, but the… but… but in the… in your Amendment it says 'about his or her person'. I'm looking on page 4 specifically. It says…"

Phelps: "About his or her person..."

Davis, W.: "About."

Phelps: "...we believe that to be about his or her person on your person."

Davis, W.: "So, 'about' means 'on'?"

Phelps: "Yeah. But let me tell you something, though. Now remember, here's again, we have restrictions in there, Representative Davis, because if constitution carry comes in, we can even open carry. We can even open carry. So, I would think you... anybody would want this Amendment. And it's... remember, it's not a Bill. But all the other things you're saying, you can file Amendments."

Davis, W.: "Okay."

Phelps: "Anybody can."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Davis, W.: "Absolutely, Representative. So, moving on. If someone has a pending order of protection against them, are they able to apply for a carry license?"

Phelps: "I didn't hear the first part of that, Representative."

Davis, W.: "If someone has a pending order of protection against them, are they able to apply for a carry license?"

Phelps: "No. No, Sir."

Davis, W.: "They're not?"

Phelps: "No."

Davis, W.: "Is that specified in your Amendment?"

Phelps: "If it comes up on the background check, he or she will not be granted a permit."

Davis, W.: "Okay. I said pending, which means that someone has applied for in the court system, pending."

Phelps: "It would still be on the record is the way we understand that. And they can report... anybody in law enforcement can report into the State Police not... to make sure that it's red-flagged."

Davis, W.: "Okay. Fair enough, fair enough. So... so, I can come to a close here. In one of your statements to another Representative you said that, I... I believe and... and I don't want to misquote you, but you said that being able to carry is a God-given right."

Phelps: "We believe it is because it's a right, not a privilege, under the Constitution that we're all supposed to uphold. And the court said we have to pass a reasonable conceal carry Bill, and we believe we have that."

Davis, W.: "So... but you feel it's a God-given right?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "I believe in the Constitution. I do, Representative Davis."

Davis, W.: "Well, I didn't realize... I didn't realize the Constitution..."

Phelps: "Because the law-abiding gun owner believes the same thing."

Davis, W.: "I didn't realize the Constitution was given from God, so I'm asking. You say it's a God-given right. I just want some clarity."

Phelps: "Representative, I'm not... Representative..."

Davis, W.: "I just want some... just want some clarity, that's all."

Phelps: "No, no, no, nope, no."

Davis, W.: "Just wanted some clarity. Thank you very much."

Phelps: "One nation under God."

Davis, W.: "One nation under God. Okay. Fair... fair enough, Representative. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill... or to the Amendment. Again, I think I've illustrated several problems with the Amendment. Now, the Representative said he's willing to work on these things maybe before or after an Amendment is adopted. I don't know. But there are a number of problems with this Amendment. Again, if the objective here is to craft a piece of legislation that Members can accept or vote positive on, clearly this Amendment is not it. We need to send it back to the drawing board, do some more work on it, and then move it forward. And yes, I can file an Amendment if I want to. But if his Amendment is essentially the Bill, then why not ask him to work on the Bill, what it will be, a little bit more. So,

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

again, I encourage you to not support this Amendment, give us an opportunity to go back and work more on the Amendment. And if this Amendment should pass with the requisite number of votes, I hereby request a verification. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Your request is acknowledged, Sir. Mr. Cavaletto."

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

Cavaletto: "We've been here about, I don't know how many hours, talking about laws. But there's a man back long time ago named Thomas Jefferson, said, 'Laws that forbid the carrying of arms disarm only those are neither inclined nor determined to commit crimes. Such laws make things worse for the assailed and better for the assailants. They serve rather to encourage them to prevent homicides. For an unarmed man may be attacked with greater confidence than an armed man.' He also said this, 'Those who hammer their guns into plows will plow for those who do not.' And I think that's all we've been talking about here today, for your own protection, for your own safety. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Ford."

Ford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And would the Sponsor yield?" Phelps: "Gentleman yields."

Ford: "Thank you, Representative Brandon Phelps, for representing the people in my district that would like to have a concealed carry permit. But there are also members in the district that speaks to... against it. I want to ask you a question. Now that the Circuit Court has made their

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

ruling, do you think the NRA is still willing to negotiate?"

Phelps: "I... absolutely. I believe that. I mean..."

Ford: "Yes."

Phelps: "I mean, here's the deal. I'm... I mean, I don't speak for the NRA, but I'm willing to negotiate just like I told Representative Davis."

Ford: "And now that the Seventh Circuit has made their ruling, could you just explain what a Bill would look like or a law would look like if it's imposed on Illinois?"

Phelps: "Well, Representative Ford, it's hard... all the court said is that we have to pass something reasonable within 180 days. And the clock is still ticking. I believe that goes out like June 8 and June 9, if I'm not mistaken."

Ford: "So, we don't know what it would look like if a law was imposed on Illinois because I keep hearing you say we don't want that to happen to Illinois."

Phelps: "Well, we... we've spent a lot of years, as you know, negotiating this Bill where people had come to us from all sides, pro and anti, and said we'd like to keep that out of here, and do this, and we did that. And we went to other states that have reasonable Bills and we've actually made our... made our Amendment tonight more restrictive than probably a lot of the other states that have 'shall' issue."

Ford: "All right. Do you know how many hours that police train to carry a firearm?"

Phelps: "I... what ver... 20... is it..."

Ford: "How many hours does it..."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "I think, what is it, 80?"

Ford: "Eighty hours. So, would you be willing to say that in order to carry a gun in Illinois you should qualify just like a peace officer?"

Phelps: "Yeah. We... we think that this is reasonable 'cause we had it at 4, we moved it to 8."

Ford: "So, you think that a individual that's trained with 8 hours is better able to handle a weapon better than a peace officer with 8 hours, but the police would need 80 hours. I'm... this... these are some of the things that I would like to see if I can vote for it because there are people in the district that will like it. But I think that a police officer is better trained. And it makes no sense that a police officer has to train 10 times the number of hours that... to qualify to carry a weapon than a civilian. So..."

Phelps: "I believe... I believe it's sufficient, Representative Ford. And that's why we also put another safeguard in that you have to pass a live fire course, so to speak, and the instructor, if he or she doesn't think that you know how to handle a firearm, they can tell you and you will not get a permit."

Ford: "All right. Do you know if the police could just carry any gun that they would like to carry when they're on duty or do they have to select a gun to carry while on duty?"

Phelps: "Representative, let me back up too. I... I've just been told and I thought I was right when I said it the first time, it's... I think it's 40 hours for the law enforcement."

Ford: "Forty, I think it's 80."

Phelps: "Because... because that's their profession."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- Ford: "I think it's 80, you were right, but we won't debate that. But do you know if a police can carry any gun when on duty or do they have to select a gun and be trained with the gun that they're going to carry while on duty?"
- Phelps: "I don't think there's any specification, Representative Ford."
- Ford: "Well, I think that the police have to be trained with a particular gun and that's what I'm hoping that you would go back to the table and sort of compile a list of guns that qualify in Illinois for individuals to choose from to carry as a concealable weapon. So, if you go back to the table and you identify a certain amount of guns or a certain qualifying gun to be a concealable weapon, I think that would be great."

Phelps: "Well, Rep..."

- Ford: "Because, right now, a concealable weapon is any weapon that you can conceal. And I think it would be better for the people of Illinois that we identify the type of weapons that qualify. And once a person decides that they would like to carry the particular weapon, then they're trained with that weapon and they're only able to carry that one weapon at the… on their possession. Would you be willing to look into that?"
- Phelps: "Well, just a real quick clarification. This Amendment only applies to handguns, first and foremost. So, I'm letting you know that... say that on the record. But also, I mean, I would think that would be in an Amendment that you may want to bring forward that we will look at."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Ford: "You know, I want to… actually, I don't want to file an Amendment. I just want to negotiate with you and ask you if you're willing to do that."

Phelps: "Well, it wouldn't be tonight because we're... we're here on Amendment 27 right now."

Ford: "So, no, you don't want to do it."

Phelps: "I'm... I'm not saying no."

Ford: "Okay."

Phelps: "Now, don't put words in my mouth. I'm not saying no."

Ford: "All right."

Phelps: "I'm not saying no."

Ford: "So, take that into consideration, please."

Phelps: "Okay."

Ford: "And the next thing that I... the last thing that I have is training for police. I think that police will be under a lot of pressure. They're already under a lot of pressure right now, and now when you have so many people that the police believe are carrying in the City of Chicago or wherever, police are pulling people over. Do you think that this will ramp up the adrena..."

Phelps: "That would rack up their what?"

Ford: "Ramp up their adrenaline."

Phelps: "Representative Ford, a while ago you... you started off by saying police training. Nothing in this Bill is about police training."

Ford: "Well, that's right. And I'll tell you... right, it doesn't. I would like for it to deal with training because you're going to have more people in cities and suburbs that

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

will be carrying guns and that's going to put more burden on the police."

Phelps: "And... and Representative, with all due respect, it... all the other states, we're going off with all the other states because we got to start somewhere and we got to follow what a lot of our neighbors have done in the... in these states in the country. So, that's while we're following their amount of hours per training."

Ford: "So, I just want to... I mean, going back to a previous speaker's, one said that... that they would like one gun; police carrying one gun. The other speaker said that he would like for your Bill to read that there's one gun. I'm saying that if everyone in the State of Illinois will... that qualify to carry a gun, I think that it would put pressures on the police. And I've already seen, in the City of Chicago and other parts of the state and other parts of the country, other states, where police have shot and killed people because they thought that the person that they were pursuing had a gun, but it was really a telephone or it was a BB gun or it was a radio or something that the police misconstrued to be a gun. So, I think that if you put something in there for police training to protect the police so that they are more sensitive and... and better able to serve with more guns on the streets, I think that that would be helpful. Would you be willing to do that?"

Phelps: "I... you know what, and I said I'll... that... we will take that under advisement, like you said, 'cause like I said, there's a lot of people, we've negotiated this on the

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

coalition. And like I said, I would look at this if you bring that up in Amendment form. Absolutely, I will."

Ford: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Brauer."

Brauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Brauer: "Representative, I want to commend you on bringing this forward. It's been a long time coming. I know you've done a lot of work on it. One concern I have is some of these Amendments seem to be conflicting and I apologize if you've answered that question before. But what happens in the final draft when that happens? Does it become unconstitutional?"

Phelps: "Yeah. And like I said, I don't think the… the people that would want to vote 'no' would want that. I think they would want one set of rules because if it's unconstitutional, we don't get anything passed, June 9 comes, it's constitutional carry. So, that means… let me explain constitutional carry. Constitutional carry says if you have a valid FOID card and you live in this state, you can carry whatever you want, whenever you want and I don't think we want that."

Brauer: "No, I... I don't think we do either. I think we want some commonsense approach to it and I certainly, again, commend you for... for giving us a vehicle to do that. I got here in my hand, it's... it's a Florida concealed and weapon firearms license. Do you have any idea why they would give that to me?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Yeah. I mean, reciprocity. I believe... they believe in it. It's worked for them."

Brauer: "I think that's right. I think any time you have a background check, you have proper training, you have recertification, it has proved itself time and time again that law-abiding citizens will actually lower the crime rate as opposed to be part of the problem. I guess I'm... I'm concerned with some of those numbers. Do... do you have with you, offhand, some of the states and... and how the crime rate has dropped?"

Phelps: "I... no, but we can get that to you, Representative."

Brauer: "Well..."

Phelps: "I'll be glad to do that. We... and we have that, but I don't have it with me."

Brauer: "Well, I... I think that's very important. I think we've looked at some things like uniform..."

Phelps: "We... we did that on the task force, so I can get you the copy of that. I'll be glad to."

Brauer: "Okay. I... I think we've looked at some other things in the state like uniform speed limit with big trucks. When we've done that, the accident rates have actually gone done. We were a long time doing that. And I think this is the same thing that with a conceal and carry, we're going to see a drastic drop. So, I certainly think that we should move this thing forward. I think that if it does create problems, then we're going to address that and make changes."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "Absolutely. And you know, the… the more of the states got concealed carry, the national crime rate went down. So, we believe it works."

Brauer: "Well, I've had some people come to me quite concerned with the conceal and carry that they're not really comfortable with it. And my response is, have you ever been on vacation and been intimidated by somebody else with conceal and carry, and they look sheepishly and say they haven't."

Phelps: "No..."

Brauer: "And I would challenge anybody to give me examples when they've been out in other states that they've been intimidated by their conceal and carry. I think it's a good Bill. I'm certainly going to encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Phelps: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Lang: "Representative Cassidy."

Cassidy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. You know, we all represent very, very different districts, different communities, different cultures, and they all have different needs. The difference between my incredibly diverse, urban, congested district and a rural, southern Illinois district where sporting and hunting are part of the character of the area, suggest a need for different approaches for different areas, in particular, with an issue like this one. As Representative Williams referenced, as we debated the various exemptions, local control could go a long way. Representative Zalewski talked about 'may' versus 'shall'. You know, the Sponsor talked about this

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

being the most restricted 'shall' issue proposal out there. Once again, that... that issue of local control could go a long way. In my neighborhood, we actually just celebrated 100 days without a shooting. That doesn't mean 100 days without hearing gunshots from my living room, that means 100 days since someone's been hit. I don't believe more guns are the answer. I respect the culture of the areas that are pressing for this, that believe that their... their communities support it. I also ask that our communities, that are being devastated by gun violence, get that same respect. And I urge a "no" vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Durkin."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a very interesting Durkin: afternoon and I have not, in all my years of ... dealt with a Bill in this type of process. But at the end of the day, we've heard some good ideas, some good Amendments, some of them not so good, other ones too vague, but I think that a vote today in support of this Amendment, in moving it along, is extremely important. I mentioned earlier some of the problems that... the consequences that may unfold if we do not pass a Bill that is consistent with the Seventh Circuit's opinion. That, right now, is the law of the State of Illinois and we have 180 days to be able to... to pass a law that is consistent with that opinion. And I mentioned earlier some of those consequences. If we don't, we do not have a UUW statute, we do not have an aggravated UUW statute and even if you think that the gun problems in the City of Chicago and the tragedies that we are seeing throughout the area are going to be any lesser, don't think

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

that, that's foolish. It is going to get worse. So, what I'm saying is that it's not a question of whether or not we should do it, we have to do it. We should work on this, and to the Sponsor, I take him at his word, he's going to negotiate and take some of the suggestions that have been brought to him on this floor and perhaps incorporate those into his Bill. But let me just give you just fair warning on two issues that have been brought up. One of these is about... is 'may' versus 'shall.' If you read the opinion, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals analyzed what the Second Circuit did in the Kachalsky v. The County of Westchester opinion, and they have rejected the New York law. That is the discretionary 'may' law. Be careful, that is a deal killer. I also suggest that if we are going to allow municipalities or local governments to have higher restrictions, that, again, will be... will fall short and that will not be in compliant with the Seventh Circuit opinion. The opinion which we dealt with the Moore and Shepard opinion versus the Attorney General of Illinois, deals with an analysis under the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution. The issue of local government and Home Rule preemption is a creation of our State Constitution in Illinois and at the end of the day, it is the analysis from the Seventh Circuit with respect to the United States Constitution will override that. So, be very careful and think and to suggest that we... none of us have a... or we have to have some type of discretion where there is a 'may' or we are going to allow for local governments to have higher standards, those will be deal killers. And

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

we don't want to come back here during the summer, next fall, year after year, to try to be... to pass something which will be compliant with this law. So, I'd suggest we get it done, pass this Bill out of the... out of the House, move it over to the Senate, and I know that Representative Phelps will take reasonable suggestions to make this a better Bill 'cause some of those Amendments I voted for them and I think that they should be incorporated in it as well. But let's keep the process going. And I appreciate the work and all the good comments that we've had today."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Reboletti."

Reboletti: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. This kind of reminds me of Goldilocks and the three bears, except that it's more like 27 bears or the 27 Amendments, except we removed 10 of them and people didn't even know they had removed their own Amendments. So, I think the process has been somewhat flawed, but hopefully we have a product that I'm sure will result in this Bill moving to Third Reading and probably sit there. So, while the media is going to write about how conceal carry has passed the Illinois House of Representatives, if this Amendment passes, it really hasn't. I'm not sure if this will be called on Third Reading. I'm not sure if there's a different Bill out there that we'll review. Who knows? But at the end of the day, the Seventh District wrote an opinion that said we 'shall' have conceal and carry, not that it's an advisory opinion that we can probably avoid and we can still prosecute UUW cases. This has been an issue that's been here forever and we're only forced to deal with it because the Federal

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Courts have dealt with it. It's amazing how people say will you work with us on this Amendment, will you work on us... with us on this Amendment and that one. And the interesting thing is about three or four years ago, most of the folks here didn't want to work on any Amendment. All they wanted to say was too bad, we're not going to do it. The City of Chicago will pass their ordinances, and they'll make up stuff as they go along just like Cook County, and eventually case after case had to be decided. As soon as those cases were decided, there'd be a change in the ordinances. So, now the game is over, musical chairs have stopped. We're within 60 days or so of constitutional carry that Representative Phelps has eloquently stated as you can carry whatever you want, wherever you want, however you want. That is not something that is tolerable; I don't think any of us want that. So, while this process is not, I think, the most fluid way to do it, I think it has a lot of negative ways of handling things, but however, we're here. I'm not sure what will happen next. This will probably sit around for awhile, we'll talk about it, maybe some more Amendments will be filed. I'm sure... 'cause I only know... I'm not sure what will happen with the other Amendments that have been filed, what is it 30, 31, 32. I'm not exactly sure what number we're on of that and what House Bill 997 has. Why are we playing games with the United State Constitution, the Illinois Constitution, and the public safety of the people of the State of Illinois? Enough already. Let's vote on this. Let's pass this Bill, it's overdue. Vote 'yes'."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Martwick."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Martwick: "Representative, first of all, thank you for your hard work on this. Clearly, the courts that interpret the Constitution that we all swore to uphold has said that we must do this, so thank you for your hard work in getting this done. I do have a couple of questions though. In your Bill, you address many of the Amendments that were brought up today. So, in your Bill... or in your... excuse me, in your Amendment, someone who can conceal and carry cannot bring a gun into a school, is that correct?"

Phelps: "Right."

Martwick: "Okay. And there are many of the other restrictions that we had here that were... that were brought up, the Amendments, your Bill also addresses those as well, correct?"

Phelps: "Correct. 'Cause we give the ability, Representative, just to go a little step further, we... we believe that the businesses can post or hospitals can post, if they wanted not to bring your weapons in."

Martwick: "Okay. So, the... the concern that I have, Representative, is while I believe that we should... I agree with you that we should allow law-abiding citizens to exercise their rights, I'm concerned about enforcement against those who would commit crimes. What is the penalty in this Amendment for someone who, against this Bill, would bring a gun into a school?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Phelps: "It's a fine and then in... depends on the different types of offenses or how many times they do it. But usually it's a fine, they're asked to leave. Right, and then your... and you FOI... your card... your permit's suspended after so many offenses."

Martwick: "Okay. So, there is no... there is no criminal offense...

there's no criminal charge for someone who... who has a

conceal and carry permit and who brings a gun into a

school?"

Phelps: "No."

Martwick: "And..."

Phelps: "Especially not in the first offense."

Martwick: "Or... or any of the other places that... that we mentioned that would be restricted, they would be fine only. There would be no misdemeanor charge, no felony charge. Is that correct?"

Phelps: "Correct."

Martwick: "Okay. And is there... for someone who would carry a gun who does not have the permit, but would otherwise be eligible for the permit, in other words, would've completed all of the requirements to get a permit but has not obtained a permit and that person carries a gun anyway in contravention of the law, what would be the penalty for that person?"

Phelps: "We're trying to find that out. Hang on for a second."

Martwick: "I... I believe it's also a petty offense. I could be wrong."

Phelps: "I think it's petty offense. By no means is it a felony."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Martwick: "Right. So, to that point, I understand that this is an Amendment..."

Phelps: "If they were eligible to get it, it's a petty offense.

If they were eligible to get it, it would be a petty offense."

Martwick: "Okay. I... I understand that... that the... that this is just an Amendment and not a Bill, but I would be very interested to see or... or would be interested to know if you would consider in a future Amendment, because I would very much consider sponsoring one, that would raise those penalties to misdemeanors, like they are, or... or felonies, depending on the... the situation, as it... as it calls for. I... I would be interested in that sort of Amendment to this Bill because I feel that... that, while we should allow the rights of someone to... to exercise their... the law-abiding citizen to exercise their constitutional rights, there... there must be penalties for people who would just... would... would contravene these laws. There must be some penalties. And... and a petty fine is... is nothing; that's a... that's a parking ticket."

Phelps: "We would definitely be willing to consider what you're talking about, Representative Martwick."

Martwick: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. Franks."

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

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman yields."

Franks: "Representative, first of all, I commend you. It's been a long, tough day."

Phelps: "Yeah."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Franks: "Been a long, tough decade some would say."

Phelps: "Long."

Franks: "I appreciate the work you've done on this. Last Session, we talked a lot about some of the changes and you were kind enough to incorporate some of those and as a result, I was proud to cosponsor the Bill. Now, in our last Bill that we had in the last Session, as I recall, there was a provision for, one of the previous speakers was talking about, if you had a DUI, that you would lose the privilege of being able to conceal carry, correct?"

Phelps: "Correct."

Franks: "And in the previous Bill, in the last Session, it was for one DUI, correct?"

Phelps: "Correct."

Franks: "And in this Bill, inexplicably, it's been reduced... I mean it's been... you... you have to have two DUIs within a short... within, I think, three years..."

Phelps: "I think that's right."

Franks: "I'd like to ask you to revisit the prior Bill to strengthen it, to have it as it originally was, to have one DUI and then the person would lose that privilege."

Phelps: "And just like everything else that you and I have talked about to make this Bill better, we would definitely take that under advisement."

Franks: "Well, thank you."

Phelps: "Absolutely, and thank you."

Franks: "I appreciate it. And you know, today we did a bunch of Amendments, as 1 through 9, and those were all passed and they were pretty similar to what you had in... in this... this

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Amendment except for the location in the parking lots, in the adjacent areas, correct?"

Phelps: "Absolutely right."

Franks: "So, this Bill, assuming this Amendment passes and I hope it does, what... would that supersede the prior Amendments or would we need to run a different Amendment clarifying that intent?"

Phelps: "That would be... and that's what we talked about earlier and some of the other Legislators, those being conflicting. So, we would try to work that out, hopefully, because like I said, this is just a first night of a long-term negotiations."

Franks: "Okay. Well, thank you and I wish you well on those negotiations."

Phelps: "Thank you, Representative Franks."

Franks: "I look forward to working with you on it."

Phelps: "I appreciate it."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico."

D'Amico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to the previous question."

Speaker Lang: "Mr. D'Amico moves the previous question. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Mr. Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to commend many, many Legislators on this House floor for the years of negotiations to get to this point. Remember, we are under a court order. We believe we have a reasonable Bill that complies with the court's decision and direction. We should have one standard for our

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

state. Otis McDonald should have the same rights in Chicago as someone in DuPage County, Saline County, Williamson County, or Jackson County. Last December 7, the Circuit Court of Appeals found our ban on carrying a gun for selfunconstitutional. If we let this defense go constitution carry will set in and I say, again, none of you want that 'cause there will not be any restrictions. And remember what we said on 148, this day would come, this day is here. Let's do it for people like Mary Shepard, Otis McDonald, and the law-abiding gun owners of this state. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lang: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. There is a request for a verification by Representative Will Davis. Those who support the Gentleman's Motion vote 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Flowers, Smith. Please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', and 48 voting 'no'. Representative Davis, do you withdraw?"

Davis, W.: "Yes, Mr..."

Speaker Lang: "Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. The Amendment is adopted. Chair recognizes Mr. Verschoore."

Verschoore: "Announcement and a personal privilege. Personal privilege, I would like to thank Todd Vandermyde and Heather Wright with the Farmers Insurance for supplying pizza tonight. Everybody was getting a little hungry. So, let's give them a hand. Thank you. An announcement, if we're still having committees, the Ag Committee will meet

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

- immediately after Session here, in Room D-1. And I would urge everyone to get there as soon as possible because as soon as there's a quorum, we're moving forward. Thank you."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Clerk, the Bill will be held on the Order of Third Reading... on Sec... The Bill will be held on the Order of Second Reading. Representative Nekritz, for what reason do you rise?"
- Nekritz: "For person... purposes of announcement. The House Judiciary Committee will meet at 8:30 tomorrow morning instead of 8:00."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Williams, for what reason do you rise?"
- Williams: "For purposes of an announcement. Just wanted to let everyone know that the inaugural meeting of the Green Caucus is tomorrow at 4:30, in Room 413 of the Stratton Building. It will be immediately followed around 5 on an update on the fracking legislation that was recently introduced. So, please stop by if you want to hear more about the Green Caucus or get an update on the recently introduced fracking Bill. Thanks."
- Speaker Lang: "Mr. Phelps, for what reason do you rise?"
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're going to have Public Utilities in C-1, but it will be very quick."
- Speaker Lang: "Representative Monique Davis, for what reason do you rise?"
- Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Insurance Committee is canceled for this evening."
- Speaker Lang: "Bless your heart, Representative. Chair recognizes Representative Mayfield."

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Mayfield: "Thank you so much. I know you guys were hoping we would probably bypass our Black History Month moment for the month, but I will not. Today, I'd like to recognize Constance Baker Motley. She was an African-American civil rights activist, a lawyer, a judge, a State Senator, and she was the Manhattan Borough President from New York City. She was born in New Haven, Connecticut, the nine... the ninth of twelve children. Her parents had immigrated from Nevis in the Caribbean. Her mother was the founder of the New Haven chapter of the NAACP. With financial help from a local philanthropist, Clarence Blanksdale (sic-Blakeslee), she initially attended Fisk University, a historically black college in Nashville, Tennessee, before deciding to return north to attend integrated north... New York University where she received her Bachelor of Arts degree in 1943. Motley then attained her law degree from Columbia University School of Law in 1946. Her legal work began as a clerk for the NAACP at that particular time. She did work for Supreme... Supreme Court Associate Justice Thurgood Marshall. Forgive me, I'm tired. She is mostly known for her civil work. She... she wrote the original complaint of the case Brown... Brown v. the Board of Education. We are all very familiar with that. She is definitely somebody that should be remembered for her works within the community and, particularly, for her civil rights activism. So, again, Constance Baker Motley is your little known black history fact for the month. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Jefferson, for what reason do you rise?"

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Jefferson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the way of an announcement. Tomorrow, at the Governor's Mansion, 6:00, the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus will hold their annual soiree. And we just want to extend an invitation to everyone in the General Assembly, come out and celebrate with us. Thank you."

Speaker Lang: "Thank you, Sir. Mr. Clerk, Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hollman: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 89,

offered by Representative Fine. House Resolution 90, offered by Representative Osmond. House Resolutions 92,

offered by Representative Acevedo. House Resolution 93,

offered by Representative Martwick. House Resolution 94,

offered by Representative McAuliffe. House Resolution 98,

offered by Speaker Madigan. And House Resolution 100,

offered by Representative Cross."

Speaker Lang: "Leader Currie moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'yes'; oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, committee announcements. Members, there's a lot of changes here, please listen to the committee announcements."

Clerk Hollman: "The following committees have been canceled tonight: Revenue & Finance, Insurance, Transportation: Regulation, Roads & Bridges. Meeting immediately after Session is the Executive Committee in Room 114, Agriculture & Conservation in Room D-1, Public Utilities in C-1. Meeting tomorrow morning is Elementary & Secondary Education and Human Services at 8:00 in the morning. At 8:30 in the morning is Judiciary. At 10:00 is the

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Transportation: Vehicles & Safety and the Health Care Licenses Committee. And at 11:00 the Executive Committee has been canceled."

Speaker Lang: "And now, leaving perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Currie moves that the House stand adjourned 'til tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27 at the hour of 11:30 a.m. Those in favor say 'yes'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House does stand adjourned 'til tomorrow at 11:30 a.m."

Clerk Hollman: "House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution 88, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 91, offered by Representative Hammond. House Resolution 95, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 96, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 97, offered by Representative Kifowit. House Resolution 99, offered by Representative Ford. House Resolution 101, offered by Representative Flowers. House Resolution 102, offered by Representative Cross. House Joint Resolution 18, offered by Representative Tabares. House Joint Resolution 19, offered by Representative Kay. House Joint Resolution 20, offered by Representative Moffitt. And House Joint Resolution 21, offered by Representative Poe. These are referred to the Rules Committee. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 2782, offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2783, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for Act health. House Bill 2784, offered concerning Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning public

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

aid. House Bill 2785, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2786, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an 2787, offered concerning public aid. House Bill Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 2788, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2789, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2790, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for concerning business. House Bill 2791, offered Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2792, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2793, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an concerning education. House Bill 2794, offered Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 2795, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2796, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2797, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2798, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2799, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for concerning economic development. House Bill 2800, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2801, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

2802, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2803, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2804, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2805, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act Bill 2806, offered concerning safety. House Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2807, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2808, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2809, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2810, offered by Representative Feigenholtz, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2811, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2812, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2813, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 28... correction... House Bill 2814, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2815, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2816, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2817, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. House Bill2818, offered Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

education. House Bill 2819, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2820, offered by Representative Mitchell, Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2821, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2823, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2824, offered by Representative Bill Mitchell, a Bill for an Act concerning pharmaceutical assistance. House Bill 2825, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2826, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2827, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2828, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2829, offered by Representative Hatcher, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2830, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2831, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2832, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2833, offered by Representative Jefferson, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2834, offered Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning firearms, which may be referred to as the Illinois Public

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Safety Act. House Bill 2835, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2836, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2837, offered Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2838, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2839, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2840, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2841, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2842, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2843, offered by Representative Harris, David, a Bill for an Act concerning support. House Bill 2844, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 2845, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2846, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2847, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2848, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2849, offered Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 2850, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning housing. House Bill 2851, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2852, offered by Representative

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2853, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2854, offered Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2855, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2856, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2857, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2858, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2859, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2860, offered Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2861, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2862, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 2863, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2864, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning renewable energy. House Bill 2865, offered by Representative Tracy, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2866, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning interstate mutual emergency aid. House Bill 2867, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2868, offered Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act appropriations. House Bill 2869, offered by Representative

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Harris, Greg, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2870, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2871, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2872, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2873, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2874, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2875, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2876, offered by Representative Burke, Daniel, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2877, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2878, offered Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2879, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning violence prevention. House Bill 2880, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2881, offered Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2882, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2883, offered by Representative Brauer, a Bill for an Act Bill 2884, offered concerning revenue. House Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2885, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2886, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

concerning elections. House Bill 2887, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2888, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 2889, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2890, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2891, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2892, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning job creation. House Bill 2893, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2894, offered by Representative for an Gordon-Booth, a Bill Act concerning government. House Bill 2895, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2896, offered by Representative Hatcher, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2897, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2898, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2899, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2900, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2901, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act 2902, House Bill offered concerning revenue. Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2903, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2904,

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2905, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2906, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2907, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2908, offered by... Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2909, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2910, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2911, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2912, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2913, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2914, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2915, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2916, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2917, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2918, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2919, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning workers' compensation insurance. House Bill 2920, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2921, offered by

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 2922, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning utilities. House Bill 2923, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2924, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning regulations. House Bill 2925, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2926, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2927, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2928, offered Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2929, offered by Representative Schmitz, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2930, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2931, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2932, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2933, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2934, offered Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2935, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 2936, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2937, offered Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2938, offered Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

employment. House Bill 2939, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 2940, offered by Representative William Davis, a Bill for an Act concerning brownfields. House Bill 2941, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2942, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2943, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2944, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2945, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2946, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2947, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2948, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2949, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2950, offered Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2951, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2952, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for concerning criminal law. House Bill 2953, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2954, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2955, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2956, offered by

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 2957, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2958, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an concerning economic planning. House Bill 2959, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning capital improvement planning. House Bill 2960, offered Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2961, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2962, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for concerning regulation. House Bill 2963, offered Drury, a Bill Representative for an Act concerning government. House Bill 2964, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning ethics. House Bill 2965, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2966, offered Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2967, offered by Representative Smiddy, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2968, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2969, offered by Representative Smiddy, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2970, offered by Representative Smiddy, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2971, offered by Representative Smiddy, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 2972, offered by Representative Smiddy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2973, offered by Representative Sims, a

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bill for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 2974, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2975, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2976, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2977, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 2978, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2979, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 2980, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2981, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2982, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2983, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2984, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2985, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 2986, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 2987, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 2988, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2989, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for concerning transportation. House Bill 2990, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue.

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

House Bill 2991, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2992, offered by Representative Harms, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2993, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 2994, offered by Representative Thapedi, a Bill for an Act to revise the law by combining multiple enactments and making technical corrections. House Bill 2995, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 2996, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 2997, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 2998, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 2999, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3000, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3001, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3002, offered by Representative Golar, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3003, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3004, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3005, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act 3006, offered concerning employment. House Bill Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3007, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3008,

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3009, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3010, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3011, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3012, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3013, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3014, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3015, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3016, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning human trafficking. House Bill 3017, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 3018, offered by Representative Reis, a Bill for an Act insurance. House Bill 3019, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3020, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3021, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3022, offered by Representative D'Amico, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3023, offered by Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3024, offered by Representative Hurley, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3025, offered by

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Representative Rosenthal, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3026, offered by Representative Poe, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3027, offered by Representative Martwick, a Bill for an Act House Bill 3028, offered concerning revenue. by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3029, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3030, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3031, offered by Representative Cloonen, a Bill for an Act concerning 3032, offered by Representative education. House Bill Cloonen, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3033, offered by Representative Cloonen, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3034, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill3035, offered by State Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 3036, government. House offered State by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House ${ t Bill}$ 3037, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Bill 3038, offered State House by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3039, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3040, offered by Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. Bill 3041, offered House Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

revenue. House Bill 3042, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House 3043, offered by Representative Harris, David... correction... Representative David Harris, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3044, offered by Representative Arroyo, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3045, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3046, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3047, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3048, offered Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3049, offered Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3050, offered State Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 3051, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3052, offered by Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3053, offered by Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning 3054, offered by Representative education. House Bill McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3055, offered by Representative McAsey, a Bill for an 3056, offered Act concerning revenue. House Bill Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3057, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Bill 3058, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3059, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3060, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3061, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3062, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3063, offered by Representative Roth, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3064, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3065, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3066, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill correction... 3067, offered by Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3068, offered by Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3069, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning property. House Bill 3070, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3071, offered Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3072, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 3073, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3074, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3075, offered by Representative

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3076, offered by Representative Davis, Monique, a Bill for an Act concerning children. House Bill 3077, offered by Evans, a Representative Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3078, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3079, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3080, offered Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3081, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3082, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3083, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3084, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3085, offered Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning the labeling of foods that contain genetically engineered material. House Bill 3086, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3087, offered by Representative Mell, a Bill for an concerning criminal law. House Bill 3088, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill3089, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3090, offered Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3091, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

3092, offered by Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3093, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 3094, offered by Representative business. House Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3095, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act House Bill 3096, concerning regulation. offered Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning... concerning government. House Bill3097, offered Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3098, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3099, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3100, offered Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3101, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3102, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3103, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3104, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3105, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning gaming. House Bill 3106, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning Bill 3107, offered State government. House Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Bill 3108, House offered Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

criminal law. House Bill 3109, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3110, offered by Representative Mayfield, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3111, offered by Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning assistance. House Bill 3112, offered Representative McAsey, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3113, offered by Representative Mitchell, Christian, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3114, offered by Representative Drury, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. House Bill 3115, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 3116, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3117, offered for Representative Beiser, a Bill an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3118, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning wildlife. House Bill 3119, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3120, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning real property. House Bill 3121, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3122, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act Bill 3123, offered concerning finance. House Representative Mautino, a Bill making appropriations to the Auditor General. House Bill 3124, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3125, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3126, offered by Representative Mautino, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3127, offered by Representative Smiddy, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 2138... correct... 3128, introduced by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3129, offered by Representative Conroy, a Bill for an concerning regulation. House Bill 3130, offered Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. House Bill 3131, offered an Act Representative Golar, a Bill for concerning education. House Bill 3132, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3133, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3134, offered for an Act concerning Representative Franks, a Bill revenue. House Bill 3135, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3136, offered by Representative Burke, Kelly, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3137, offered by Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3138, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill 3139, offered by Representative Smith, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3140, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 3141, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3142, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

3143, offered Act concerning revenue. House Bill Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3144, offered by Representative Jones, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3145, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3146, offered Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3147, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3148, offered by Representative Flowers, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3149, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning public utilities. House Bill 3150, offered by Representative Jefferson, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3151, offered by Representative Acevedo, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3152, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3153, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3154, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3155, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning appropriations. House Bill 3156, offered by Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3157, offered by Representative Evans, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3158, offered Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government, which may be referred to as the Fairness in Transportation Taxation Act. House Bill 3159, offered by

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3160, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3161, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning political funding reform. House Bill 3162, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3163, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3164, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act Bill 3165, offered concerning safety. House Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3166, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3167, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3168, offered Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3169, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3170, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3171, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning fish. House Bill 3172, offered by Representative Tracy, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3173, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3174, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3175, offered by Representative Hatcher, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3176, offered Representative Hatcher, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

courts. House Bill 3177, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3178, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an concerning local government. House Bill 3179, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3180, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3181, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3182, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3183, offered by Representative Rita, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3184, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3185, offered Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3186, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3187, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3188, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3189, offered by Representative Bellock, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3190, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an concerning education. House Bill 3191, offered Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3192, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3193, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3194, offered

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning job creation. House Bill 3195, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3196, offered by Representative Moylan, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3197, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3198, offered by Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3199, offered by Representative Riley, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3200, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3201, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3202, offered by Representative Welch, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3203, offered by Representative Sacia, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3204, offered by Representative Sommer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3205, offered by Representative Sommer, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3206, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning propane sellers. House Bill 3207, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3208, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning Tactical Medicine Providers. House Bill 3209, offered by Representative Cassidy, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3210, offered Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3211, offered by Representative

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3212, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3213, offered by Representative Yingling, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3214, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3215, offered by Representative Reboletti, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3216, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3217, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3218, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3219, offered Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3220, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3221, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3222, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3223, offered by Representative Beiser, a Bill for an Act concerning wages. House Bill 3224, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for Act concerning courts. House Bill 3225, offered bv Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3226, offered by Representative Zalewski, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3227, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 3228, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

elections. House Bill 20... correction... House Bill 3229, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3230, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3231, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3232, offered by Representative Gordon-Booth, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3233, offered by Representative Leitch, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3234, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3235, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3236, offered by Representative Lilly, a Bill for an concerning education. House Bill 3237, offered Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3238, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3239, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3240, offered Representative Hernandez, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3241, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3242, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Bill 3243, offered House Representative Mell, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3244, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3245, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

government. House Bill 3246, offered by Representative Bradley, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3247, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3248, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3249, offered Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3250, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3251, offered by Representative Franks, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3252, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3253, offered by Representative Lang, a Bill for an Act concerning the lottery. House Bill 3254, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3255, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3256, offered by Representative Nekritz, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3257, offered by Representative Mitchell, Bill, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill offered by Representative Mitchell, Bill, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3259, offered by Representative Davis, William, a Bill for an Act concerning 3260, offered by Representative education. House Bill Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3261, offered by Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3262, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

transportation. House Bill 3263, offered by Representative Farnham, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3264, offered by Representative Roth, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3265, offered by Representative Roth, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an concerning elections. House Bill 3267, offered Representative Davis, William, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3268, offered Representative Scherer, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 3269, offered by Representative Manley, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3270, offered by Representative Soto, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3271, offered by Representative Williams, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3272, offered Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3273, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3274, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3275, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3276, offered by Representative Turner, a Bill for an Act concerning health. House Bill 3277, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3278, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3279, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

concerning criminal law. House Bill 3280, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3281, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3282, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3283, offered Bill for Act concerning Representative Sims, a an education. House Bill 3284, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3285, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3286, offered Representative Jakobsson, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid. House Bill 3287, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning guardians ad litem. House Bill 3288, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3289, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3290, offered Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3291, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning public benefits. House Bill 3292, offered by Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3293, offered by Representative Sente, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3294, offered by Bill for Representative Sente, a an Act concerning business. House Bill 3295, offered by Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3296, offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

concerning education. House Bill 3297, offered Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning Representative criminal law. House Bill 3298, offered by Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3299, offered by Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3300, offered Representative Kifowit, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. House Bill 3301, offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3302, offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3305, offered Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3306, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3307, offered by Representative Sosnowski, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3308, offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3309, offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3310, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3311, offered by Representative Osmond, a Bill for an Act Bill 3312, concerning government. House offered Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3313, offered by Representative

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Ives... correction... Representative Hays, a Bill for an Act Bill 3314, offered concerning government. House Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3315, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3316, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3317, offered by Representative Wheeler, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3318, offered by Representative Cavaletto, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3319, offered Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3320, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3321, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3322, offered Representative Pritchard, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 23... correction... House Bill 3323, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning elections. House Bill 3324, offered Representative Fortner, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3325, offered by Representative Harms, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3326, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3327, offered by Representative Durkin, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3328, offered by Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3329, offered by Representative Rosenthal, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

offered by Representative Brown, a Bill for an Act Bill 3331, concerning revenue. House offered Representative Bost, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3332, offered by Representative Meier, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3333, offered by Representative Hammond, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3334, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3335, offered by Representative Cavaletto, a Bill for an Act Bill 3336, offered concerning revenue. House Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3337, offered by Representative Harms, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3338, offered by Representative Halbrook, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3339, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3340, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3341, offered by Representative Harms, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3342, offered Representative Rosenthal, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3343, offered by Representative Hatcher, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3344, offered by Representative Cavaletto, a Bill for an Act concerning veterans. House Bill 3345, offered Representative Wheeler, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3346, offered by Representative Hatcher, a Bill for an Act concerning military service. House Bill 3347, offered by Representative Tracy, a Bill

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3348, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for concerning safety. House Bill 3349, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3350, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3351, offered by Bill for an Act concerning Representative Tryon, a business. House Bill 3352, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3353, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning job creation. House Bill 3354, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3355, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3356, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3357, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning criminal law. House Bill 3358, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3359, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3360, offered an Act concerning Representative Tryon, a Bill for education. House Bill 3361, offered by Representative Verschoore, a Bill for an Act concerning animals. House Bill 3362, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3363, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3364, offered by Representative Roth, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

3365, offered by Representative Tryon, a Bill for an Act Bill 3366, offered concerning government. House Representative Tracy, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3367, offered by Representative Fine, a Bill for an Act concerning transportation. House Bill 3368, offered by Representative Dunkin, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3369, offered by Representative Moffitt, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3370, offered by Representative Daniel Burke, (sic-Kelly), a Bill for an Act concerning House government. Bill 3371, Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3372, offered Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3373, offered Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3374, offered by Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning government. House Bill 3375, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 3376, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill... a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill offered by Representative Sandack, a Bill for an Act in relation to public employee benefits. House Bill 3378, offered by Representative Tabares, a Bill for an Act Bill 3379, offered concerning education. House Representative Tabares, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3380, offered by Representative Tabares, a Bill for an Act concerning business. House Bill

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

3381, offered by Representative Tabares, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House 3382, offered Bill Representative Tabares, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation. House Bill 3383, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill... a Bill for an Act concerning higher education. House Bill 3384, offered by Representative Costello, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3385, offered by Representative Chapa LaVia, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3386, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning safety. House Bill 3387, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning courts. House Bill 3388, offered by Representative Ford, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. House Bill 3389, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning... regarding education. House Bill 3390, offered by Representative Sims, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3391, offered by Representative Mussman, a Bill for an Act concerning education. House Bill 3392, offered by Representative Ives, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3393, offered by Representative Cabello, a Bill for an Act offered concerning revenue. House Bill 3394, by Representative Senger, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3395, offered by Representative Pihos, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3396, offered by Representative Demmer, a Bill for an Act concerning State government. House Bill 3397, offered by Representative Morrison, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3398, offered by Representative

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

Rosenthal, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3399, offered by Representative McAuliffe, a Bill for an Act concerning revenue. House Bill 3400, offered Representative Cavaletto, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 3401, offered Representative Davidsmeyer, a Bill for an Act concerning economic development. House Bill 3402, offered Representative Kosel, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3403, offered by Representative Unes, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3404, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3405, offered Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3406, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3407, offered by Representative Kay, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3408, offered by Representative Willis, a Bill for an Act concerning child support. House Bill 3409, offered by Representative Hoffman, a Bill for an Act concerning finance. House Bill 3410, offered Representative Harris, David, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. House Bill 3411, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act concerning public employee benefits. House Bill 3412, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act concerning employment. House Bill 3413, offered by Representative Crespo, a Bill for an Act concerning education. These House Bills are referred to the Rules Committee. Committee Reports. Representative Daniel Burke, Chairperson from the Committee on the Executive

19th Legislative Day

2/26/2013

reports the following committee action taken on February 26, 2013: do pass Short Debate is Senate Bill 10; do pass as amended Standard or correction... do pass as amended Short Debate is Senate Bill 20. Correction on Senate Bill 10. Senate Bill 10 should be do pass Standard Debate. Second Reading of Senate Bills. Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act concerning civil law. Senate Bill 20, a Bill for an Act concerning government. Second Reading of these Senate Bills. These will be held on the Order of Second Reading. There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."