

Mr. CELLER. I hope not.

Mr. CORMAN. If I may respond, with the chairman's permission, on that point. I suppose the philosophy of the bill is that when he goes directly to court there has been nothing up to that point to alter the situation, whereas if he takes the route of conciliation that some substantial effort has been made to resolve the dispute, and in fairness to both him and the defendant, if he is unwilling to accept the efforts of the conciliators that then he ought to proceed from that point forward. That is his own expense.

Further, I would imagine that the court would give careful consideration in attempting to decide whether or not to appoint a lawyer.

As to the efficacy of conciliation and whether he ought not to have gone to conciliation first, because it is entirely discretionary with the judge and I would think the judge would look carefully at the efficacy of conciliation of the particular area involved before appointing an attorney.

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Would it be too much to suggest that maybe it would be good and correct to write into the law that conciliation must be employed as a procedure before you come in and expect the court to appoint an attorney? You are relying on judicial discretion. I would like to hope that the judge would do exactly what you suggested but I wonder why we couldn't have written a section to provide specifically that this is the procedure.

Mr. CORMAN. Conciliation of course takes a reasonable amount of time. It may well be that practices in some parts of the country would be such that conciliation would—

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Doesn't the statute limit the time? I thought it was 30 days.

Mr. CORMAN. Yes, sir; there is some limitation. It seems to me in view of the complexity of the problem plus the rather divergent attitudes across the country that the three methods of relief are justified.

I would expect that although in most instances that the conciliation would be the realistic relief and the one most useful for both the respective purchaser and the seller. I think the other two methods of relief are completely justified in view of the experience with civil rights legislation generally, and with the complexity of this particular piece.

Mr. JOHN B. ANDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Delaney, do you have any questions?

Mr. DELANEY. I have one or two.

In the interest of timesaving, Mr. Celler, the original of this bill came before this committee about a year ago when this committee granted a rule. It passed the House, I believe it was in August, and then went to the Senate. Sometime in November, I believe, they started taking it up and it was passed about the middle of last month, or during the month of March.

What is before us is:

That, immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill (H.R. 2516) to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, on the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to.

There are certain differences between the House version of the bill and the bill as passed by the Senate. I think it is fair to say that