

Do you agree with me on that?

Mr. BLOCH. Yes, I notice I have not had the opportunity to read this printed report of the hearing. I had not seen one of them.

I did have the mimeographed copy and I noticed your questions of Judge Walsh along that line. But I was struck with the fact that in the time that I had had to read it that there was considerable discussion as to the effect on certain parties defendant, but I didn't see much discussion, if any, as to what the meaning of the phrase "receive application from any person claiming such a deprivation." What was the meaning of that phrase, "any person?"

Mr. WILLEIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. Just for one question.

Mr. WILLEIS. Judge Walsh made that perfectly clear. I didn't know there was any apprehension or misunderstanding about it; the real purpose of the bill is an honest effort by the Department of Justice to provide a right to vote and to provide a means to enforce the right to vote of persons not in the original action at all.

That is the whole idea of the bill; the third party, not the parties to the original action, as the parties to the action are protected by injunction.

The whole idea of this bill is to give opportunity to people not in the original action, but in the whole area, the whole county supposedly effected by the pattern of discrimination, to come in and say, "I want the right of a certificate to vote" and be accorded by the conclusive presumption that I have been discriminated against.

Mr. MEADER. I don't yield further because I think the gentleman has assumed.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait a minute, Mr. Meader. I want to correct the gentleman. There is nothing conclusive about the presumption. It is a rebuttable presumption, not conclusive.

Mr. MEADER. I took exception to Mr. Willis' statement that the people deprived of the right to vote were parties to the action.

I thought we had that stage behind us because the party to the action is the Attorney General, whether he is required to name individuals or not, they are not parties to the action.

Mr. BLOCH. Well, Mr. Meader, I think you called it 131-C and I called it 1971-C—what power does it give to the Attorney General? Would you mind reading that to me again? I thought I had a copy of the statute.

Mr. MEADER. I just got through reading it a few minutes ago, but the action is on behalf of the United States by the Attorney General and it doesn't require him to name individuals.

Mr. BLOCH. What does it say?

Mr. MEADER. It says:

Whenever any person has engaged or there is reasonable grounds to believe that any person is about to engage in any act or practice which would deprive any other person of any right or privilege secured by subsection (a) or (b).

Mr. BLOCH. What comes next?

Mr. MEADER (continuing):

The Attorney General may institute for the United States or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proper proceeding for preventive relief.

Mr. BLOCH. Preventing what?