

lation regardless of the title. Since they have tied in firearms legislation and Indian legislation under the title of civil rights, we should examine it carefully.

We have the legislation coming over here very shortly from the Senate dealing with taxation. I do not think that the same people who are saying to this committee that we ought to buy this bill because of the title and pass it without amendment would take this same course of action about the tax bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I have always felt that we have two bodies. As I have indicated, I do not want this bill jeopardized. If I felt this bill would be jeopardized by sending it to conference, or back to the Judiciary Committee, I would take strong steps to reappraise my position. I do not think that is a hazard here.

I think we can allow for orderly procedure. It appears that the Rules Committee has an abundance of power, and, if it appears that conference and Judiciary Committee are weak, we can always place another resolution before the House to reconsider this. This would not be the first time the Rules Committee has taken a piece of legislation from a committee—

Mr. LATTA. I would like to stop you at that point and say that you are pointing out something that I think has not been pointed out in the press, which is writing that if we do not pass this bill as it is now, we are going to kill civil rights legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. The Rules Committee has that power and the matter could then be placed before the House or handled in some other fashion.

I am not panicky on that score. I feel for the people of the country that we should have a civil rights bill and I am satisfied that the membership in fairness will move toward that call.

Mr. LATTA. That is all.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. While I appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Michigan over the language in this section 231, is it not true that this is the language which has been generally used in criminal statutes and one which has been given judicial interpretation, being that this is a criminal statute, so that there is no real danger, as the gentleman has pointed out, of this language being too broad to involve an innocent person.

Mr. DINGELL. I would say; one, I have been a lawyer now for about 20 years and I have seen very few criminal statutes that take the language in the form that this one takes. Two, I do not ever recall seeing a Federal statute that is triggered by some subsequent happening. This is unique in that regard.

I said that criminal statutes are usually narrowly construed. This is true. I pointed out something else and that is, while the courts are acting in a more calm and deliberate fashion, it would probably not find people guilty under this. It is still a great device for prosecuting and I would point out, in connection with the riots that we have had in Detroit, that it is a classic case. We had many thousands of citizens who were arrested and detained. We had many thousands, but a much smaller number of those were brought in on some kind of criminal proceeding. But, we had very few who were finally prosecuted to conviction. When you are passing a law that is going to be used in those times of emotional strain, you should have a law that is going