

Rep. Sara Feigenholtz

16

17

Filed: 2/25/2013

09800HB1155ham016

LRB098 08475 MRW 41615 a

1 AMENDMENT TO HOUSE BILL 1155 2 AMENDMENT NO. . Amend House Bill 1155, AS AMENDED, by inserting the following in its proper numeric sequence: 3 "Section 138. Firearm carry prohibition; zoo and museum. 4 5 (a) No person may knowingly carry a firearm into any public or private zoo or museum open to the public, or any adjacent 6 property or parking lot area under control of or owned by the 7 8 zoo or museum. 9 (b) The exemptions and provisions in subsections (a), (b), (f), (g-6), (g-10), (h), and (i) of Section 24-2 of the 10 Criminal Code of 2012 apply to this Section. 11 (c) The United States Supreme Court in District of Columbia 12 13 v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570, 128 S.Ct. 2783 (2008) has recognized 14 that the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution 15 does not confer an unlimited right and that states may prohibit

the carrying of firearms in sensitive places. The Supreme Court

stated in the Heller decision: "Although we do not undertake an

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

exhaustive historical analysis today of the full scope of the Second Amendment, nothing in our opinion should be taken to cast doubt on longstanding prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill, or laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings . . . " The Supreme Court also noted in a footnote referencing this statement in the Heller decision that: "We identify these presumptively lawful regulatory measures only as examples; our list does not purport to be exhaustive." This recognition was reiterated by the U. S. Supreme Court in McDonald v. the City of Chicago, 561 U.S. 3025, 130 S.Ct. 3020 (2010), which incorporated the Second Amendment against state action. The Supreme Court again stated: "We made it clear in Heller that our holding did not cast doubt on such longstanding regulatory measures as "prohibitions on the possession of firearms by felons and the mentally ill," "laws forbidding the carrying of firearms in sensitive places such as schools and government buildings . . . We repeat those assurances here." Further, the federal 7th Circuit Court of Appeals in Moore v. Madigan, 702 F.3d. 933 (7th Cir., 2012) cited the "sensitive place" statement of the Supreme Court in both the Heller and McDonald decisions and concluded: "That a legislature can forbid the carrying of firearms in schools and 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." Therefore, the

- 1 General Assembly finds that the places and locations set forth
- in subsection (a) of this Section are sensitive places and the 2
- prohibition on the carrying of firearms will promote public 3
- safety in these sensitive places.". 4