

As proposed, its far-reaching provisions would ban discrimination on racial and other grounds in the sale or rental of 75 percent of U.S. housing. It will involve builders, developers, brokers, apartment house owners, makers of real estate loans in all categories, and many owners of individual homes.

Instead of banning discrimination, its language is, in itself, discriminatory, in that it strips away constitutional rights of a very substantial majority of the people in the management and disposition of their own property. It is another instance where the Federal Government would take additional jurisdiction over the lives of the people. A case where one more of the slipping list of rights guaranteed to the individual by the Constitution will be taken away.

The firearms provision of the civil disorders at this time will represent a hastily conceived and ill-prepared approach to the problem of overall firearms legislation. The police and enforcement problems involved in strengthening Federal controls and in the use of firearms are far too complex for the summary and ambiguous treatment given in this bill. It is this ambiguous language which gives rise to serious concern about the use to which it could be put if it were to become law.

I must consider it a bureaucrat's dream. It can be interpreted in almost any way an enterprising administrator might deem desirable for his purposes. It could be used for persecution of the innocent just as well as it could be for prosecution of the guilty.

I think all of us concur with the basic purpose of the amendment, but it is feared that some of the language pertaining to firearms could open a Pandora's box of unintended and serious consequence.

We have before us a criminal situation predicated on vague, broad, and elastic terms. This language poses a threat of prosecution for legitimate activities, unfortunately and unintentionally brought within its scope.

This could be a mockery of law resulting from a statutory monstrosity. There are many objections to the proposed language.

In the discussion in the Senate it was indicated the language covers situations in which kind of disorder is anticipated and includes any dealer who has not assumed due care in selling firearms to persons who incite riots or use firearms in disorders.

Obviously this covers the waterfront. Under this, I wonder if we are to assume that both the man who purchases a weapon to defend his own household against destruction, looting, rape, or other violence, and the dealer who sells him the gun could be hauled into court and punished if violence erupted in the neighborhood.

Please consider the language and impracticability of phrases such as "or having reason to know or intend," or "any way or degree."

I don't think the House should concur in or support vague and extremely loose wording which could make a completely innocent person criminally liable with heavy penalties, and that is what could happen under this bill.

There is even a provision against teaching and demonstrating which would make any person who teaches marksmanship or safety in hunting liable to prosecution. This could be true in a city like Orlando, Fla., where good work has been done in an organized way to teach housewives marksmanship for their own protection, and the result