

state or foreign commerce for the purpose of pursuing the legitimate objectives of organized labor through orderly and lawful means.”

A riot as the bill defines it is a public disturbance involving, one, an act or acts of violence by one or more persons, part of an assemblage or three or more persons, which act or acts shall constitute a clear and present danger of or shall result in damage or injury to the property of any other person or to the person of any other individual, or, two, a threat or threats of the commission of an act or acts of violence by one or more persons, part of assemblage of three or more persons having individually or collectively the ability of immediate execution of such threat, or threats, where the performance of the threatened act or acts of violence would constitute a clear and present danger or would result in damage or injury to the property of any other person or to the person of any other individual.

This protective provision for labor organizations in connection with labor disputes is written into this provision with reference to riots.

Now when you get to title X, and you tell with civil disorders which are disturbances of a lesser degree than a riot, you don't find this provision. While I don't advocate civil disorders or any conduct that disturbs the public peace in connection with labor disputes or otherwise, I do think that it is rather significant that title X of the bill would be so restrictive upon people and might subject them to criminal penalty in some rather remarkable ways.

What is a civil disorder, according to this bill? It means any public disturbance involving acts of violence by assemblages of three or more persons which causes an immediate danger of and results in the damage or injury to the property or person of any other individual. Three men walk out of a bar. One of them calls the other a name, a fighting name, and a fist fight ensues and personal injury results to one of these persons.

As I view this definition, that is a civil disorder. Suppose that in connection with a labor dispute this same event occurred among three of the people who were involved in it or maybe two who were involved in the labor dispute and one who was not involved but was friendly to management.

If someone could show under title X that either one of these men the week before had gone downtown to one of these karate training outfits and told them that a labor dispute was coming up next week and he didn't know what may happen but he wasn't very well able to take care of himself, and he needed a little bit of karate training. I say that under this provision the man who ran that training school, who knew that this individual was about to become embroiled in a labor dispute and taught him—and line 14 of page 46—“a technique capable of causing injury or death to persons” could be imprisoned. The same thing could happen if someone had taught another person to use a firearm and had reason to believe that this man was about to go into a labor dispute, because certainly the language on lines 18 through 21 where they use the words delay or obstruct, delay or adversely affect commerce, or the movement of any article or commodity in the commerce, or the conduct of the performance of any federally protected function could very well be extended to include knowledge that a strike was going to impede the flow of commerce.