

disorder. Nothing is wrong with that. If these various groups assemble and there are people in that assembly who intend to commit the civil disorder or will use what is taught there for the purpose of a civil disorder, there is nothing wrong with that even though the result is the same. It is a silly, preposterous bill. Now, why are you going to create the existence of a crime when there is no connection between this individual who is prosecuted and an ultimate act that occurs that hurts society? That is what happens. There is a gap between the one teaching and any ultimate act. There need not be any resulting act whatsoever and there is no way that you can constitutionally hold a person responsible for a crime when no act occurs that hurts society or anybody else. You don't like what they are talking about. You don't like the group they are a member of, so you say the things that they say, even though it results in no harm to anybody, is a Class IV felony. Preposterous, silly and simple minded. A civil disorder, based on the definition in this silly bill, can be involving only one person. Now, when you talk about civil disorder, you can define it any way that you want to, but there ought to be some magnitude in the conduct involved that goes beyond what one individual does. And there is an offense called disturbing the peace which can be committed by one individual. Defining civil disorder so that one person can commit it by one act, which may not harm anybody or any property, is the same as saying one person is guilty of a riot. But again when the Legislature is on this particular hobby horse, it doesn't matter how irrational, unreasonable or silly the definitions are. I said earlier that another problem arises with the definition of firearm. Any item which can readily be converted for use to expel a projectile with an explosive charge is a firearm. It doesn't become a firearm after being converted, when it can be converted it is a firearm right then. A Roman candle does expel a projectile with an explosive charge so it is a firearm. So I guess if a guy is guilty of having committed a felony and he has a Roman candle, he is a felon in possession of a firearm. If a lady has a metal pipe and she has been convicted of a felony, she is a felon in possession of a firearm and those are things that are in the bill. Now, when they talk about an act of violence in their definition of civil disorder, they make it clear by the words that follow that word that in their mind an act of violence can be committed which does not harm person, which does not harm property and they will probably be willing to detail what