

Mike Quigley: Welcome. you know, coming from Chicago, I can't help from reflect on there's a trial taking place there and while I don't ask you to comment on that, I note that there always seems to be a trial taking place there or other places in the country that deal with public integrity. As you know, the court has struck down the honest services section of the statute, a very valuable tool that prosecutors had to go after public officials using their office for personal gain. We could really use your office's help preparing a replacement. I think it was probably appropriate the statute was struck down because it was probably, as they said, too vague. But I appreciate your comments on what we need to do to fill that void.

Eric Holder: Well, there's -- that obviously is a very valuable tool. It's been used over the years at any number of instances. It's a statute that has a some had what troubled history. It's been declared unconstitutional, applied on a couple of occasions. I guess we need to come up with a statute that will survive constitutional scrutiny once and forever. Obviously we would be willing to work with this committee and others so that we could have that tool back in place.

MQ: Thank you. And liked to afford you the opportunity here to talk about another issue that's important to everyone here, and that's the recent extraordinary increase in police officer shootings in the country. I think since January, 29 police officers have been shot in this country. This is an increase in fatal police shootings of more than 50% over last year. I believe you convened a conference on this last month. Again, would appreciate your office's help on what else we can do to help you in this vein.

EH: That is something that is of great concern to me, the reason why I convened that summit a few weeks ago, one of the reasons why we have tried to increase our funding of bulletproof vests that are made available to agencies and why we have tried to require a mandatory wear policy. That's why we also have something called a valor program so officers can be trained

on how to handle themselves in these situations when their lives are most likely to be put at risk. That is something that I think is worthy of this committee's time, certainly my time, and I would be glad to work with you in that regard to try to keep our law enforcement officers safe.

MQ: I can't help but inject another statistic that is bothering to me. Of the 29 officers fatally shot this year, 20 were killed by individuals who would have been barred by federal law from possessing guns. In my vein, this gets to the greatest loophole of all, and that's the gun show loophole. The fact that you could be barred from getting on an airplane, you can have multiple felonies, you could have been adjudicated as being dangerously mentally ill, but you can go to 33 states and go to a gun show and buy just about anything you want without a background check whatsoever. Your thoughts on this?

EH: Well, I think we have to look at the laws that we have on the books. We need to certainly enforce them we need to be asking questions about whether they're adequate, whether they're keeping our people safe, law enforcement officers safe. I think we also have to focus on -- and I think your point is very good -- who has these guns. It's not only a question of what guns we're dealing with but also who has them. Obviously everybody has second amendment rights; the Supreme Court ruled that in the Heller case. This Department of Justice respects that decision. But I think questions can be asked about, are there too many felons who for whatever reason are in possession of guns, people who have mental issues, whether they should have guns, people who have domestic violence issues, whether they should have guns. There are a whole variety of questions as to the 'who' I think we need to focus on as well.

MQ: I agree. To close, I would suggest to those who are very supportive of the second amendment that, while that case did grant second amendment rights, the majority opinion did talk about limitations. One was 'who' and one of the others was 'what'. I think it's fair to ask if you're out to protect your home or you're hunting deer whether you need a 30-round clip. That's my own editorial comment for the day. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.