

We are now put in the position here of the Judiciary Committee not being able to agree on any bill itself, but now advocating the taking of a bill that was written on the floor of the other body, and adopting it here without any opportunity for amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. I think the facts on that speak for themselves, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COLMER. I think they did very loudly.

Are there any questions of Mr. Dingell?

Mr. SMITH. I would like to commend the gentleman. I think this is one of the finest statements that I have ever heard presented to the committee. It is nonemotional, forward, and honest. I appreciate it very much.

I only wish the whole Judiciary Committee could have been here and heard that statement and the whole House. I think they would have a much better idea of the problem which I did not see before your presentation. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. DINGELL. Thank you.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Madden.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no questions.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would like to commend the gentleman for what I think is a very reasoned and dispassionate statement on a very controversial subject. Some of us want a bill, but we think it can be a better bill than it is at the present time. It was hastily written and adopted on the floor of the other body.

I do have one question. If this bill could be amended, chapter 12 and section 231, to take out those words, "having reason to know" which I found, I think, in a couple of places—at lines 15 and 16, on page 46, and line 2 on page 47—do you think that would cure the concern that you have expressed, that a person such as an instructor in a firearms program or an incidental shipper of firearms could be arrested because of future actions of others?

Mr. DINGELL. It would go a long way.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. From your knowledge and experience, do you think that would substantially improve this?

Mr. DINGELL. I think, if you were to make one change in the bill by striking "or having reason to know," it would probably do as much to correct the objection that I have asserted to this section as any one thing.

I have to say that, in all probability, in matters of this kind the court will, in more mature deliberations, apply their wisdom. I am less sure that prosecutors and grand juries will do it equally because they will be operating much closer in point of time to the unpleasant circumstances that were triggered in the use of this section.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. If I could site one hypothetical case to make sure that I understand the language of subparagraph (a) dealing with transportation or making for transportation: say the Colt Co. up in Connecticut should, within the last week, have shipped some firearms into the Memphis, Tenn. area, which exploded in violence this week; could it be argued under the language of this section that Colt should have had reason to know that those firearms would be going into the hands of the people that would use them in a civil disorder and, therefore, Colt would be amenable?