

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the witness and I want to direct these questions to the attention of the members of the committee also.

I have been sitting here all day and according to all of the testimony which I have heard, all of these cases are similar in that there is always the same plaintiff and the same defendant.

Mr. BLOCH. Always what?

Mr. FORRESTER. The same plaintiff and the same defendant, and when these cases reach the court and as you well said you didn't know how that point is going to be raised, whether the Attorney General is going to have to specify a pattern or whether simply evidence is going to be heard, we do know there is going to have to be some evidence introduced in a judicial finding.

Now, as I understand it, if the court holds there has been any pattern of discrimination, that holding, in effect, becomes *res judicata*. Then they can come in in a wholesale manner and everyone who claims that he has been discriminated against, he is in court and is not required to prove at all that he has been discriminated against.

Mr. BLOCH. That is right.

Mr. FORRESTER. Now I want to ask the gentleman this.

Since they are the same parties and it is the same State, the same defendant and that point is raised in the court and the evidence does not develop that there is a pattern of discrimination, then I am asking you, wouldn't that also be a *res judicata* and wouldn't that be a conclusive finding that anyone else who had been up and tried to register and was denied registration, wouldn't that be *res judicata* to him and he could not come into the court and raise that point?

Mr. BLOCH. I think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you acquainted with, and you just pointed with justified pride to the ballot safeguards according protection to all of the people of Georgia as to the right to vote, but I now draw your attention to an excerpt from the Atlanta Constitution of the 20th of February 1958, which reads as follows:

The House handed Governor Griffin another stinging defeat Wednesday by approving overwhelmingly a bill backed by Lieutenant Governor Vandiver's forces seeking to tighten voter qualifications.

Mr. BLOCH. Seeking what?

The CHAIRMAN. Seeking the tightening of voter qualifications.

The measure passed by the House is aimed primarily at curbing Negro voting.

Representative Frank Twitty of Mitchell, a Vandiver leader in the house, took the floor to oppose Hawkins' poll tax proposals to plug the passage of the bill.

He said the bill would give local registrars the "weapon" they need to combat "insidious organizations" such as the NAACP by keeping off the registration rolls those "who ought not to be there."

"Let's give the local registrars the weapon they need to preserve the southern way of life as we know it in Georgia," Twitty said.

Representative William M. Campbell of Walker County said, "We haven't got the Negro problem in our county that some of you have, and we control them and we don't have to come to the legislature and ask for help to do it."

The editorial comment by the Atlanta Constitution was to the following effect, and I am only going to read one paragraph from the editorial:

Nowhere in its approximately 9,000 words does the act mention Negroes, but it has been plain all along that the intent is to discourage Negro registration.