

Mr. MACGREGOR. I thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And I say that with all sincerity, I assure the gentleman.

Does the gentleman think it is quite fair to take a thing as controversial as this gun bill and not give the House an opportunity to consider it, or even the gentleman's own committee which has jurisdiction over that subject to bring out a bill?

Mr. MACGREGOR. May I respond in this fashion, Mr. Chairman?

I have been a Member of the House of Representatives for a little more than 7 years. I have been on the subcommittee in the House considering gun control legislation for more than 3 years. That subcommittee, as the chairman knows, wrestled with the question of gun control legislation during much of 1967. Toward the end of the year we endeavored to reach a resolution in the subcommittee. The subcommittee is constituted of seven Democrats and six Republicans and this was a Democratic bill and we divided seven to six.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has not seen fit to consider in the full committee either the Democratic bill which gained seven votes or the Republican substitute which gained six votes. I don't think it is likely to expect that we are going to see further progress on either of the two existing approaches to firearms control legislation. Whether it is relevant or not, Mr. Chairman, the provisions in H.R. 2516 which the Senate added relating to firearms control are much less comprehensive in scope than either of the two bills that I referred to that have been pending before our subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, what the gentleman is saying in substance is that although your committee has had this and the subcommittee had it for better than a year—what did the gentleman say?

Mr. MACGREGOR. We considered it during most of 1967, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For most of 1967, and your committee couldn't come up with any agreement on it. And yet does the gentleman now advocate that this full House should take it without an opportunity to even offer an amendment?

Mr. MACGREGOR. I advocate the full House be given the opportunity to take it or reject it as a part of a very complex bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Very well, sir. I don't want to argue with the gentleman. But would the gentleman say when the bill was introduced in his committee that the chairman of that committee should have called it up and said, here it is, you vote it up or you vote it down? Would that have been a good procedure?

Mr. MACGREGOR. Not in my judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. No, sir. Then I find it a little difficult to arrive at how the gentleman feels, that the whole House should take it up without any consideration.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Well, Mr. Chairman, it is true we do have some freshmen. Members who were not present in 1966. I have in my file the full text of the House debate in 1966 on the then pending House civil rights bill. I think we spent some 3 long days in the House, perhaps longer than that, debating the open housing title in the 1966 civil rights bill. And it does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that with the exception of those freshmen who were not here in 1966 and thus not given an opportunity to fully participate and to consider, participate in and