

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 7

MARCH 28, 1968, TO APRIL 9, 1968

(PAGES 8057 TO 9406)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that the evidence now indicates that some of those participating in the looting, stealing, and destruction of property here in Washington and in cities throughout the Nation are employed by the Federal Government. Some of those participating in the arson and the rioting here are being supported by the taxpayers of the United States.

Anyone employed by the Federal Government who participates in violence is a reflection on the high ideals and dedicated service of the overwhelming majority in Federal service.

Any violation of the law by any person should be dealt with promptly. Law and order are essential to the preservation of democracy. It is inconceivable that anyone employed by the Federal Government should be for violence and opposed to law and order as represented by that Government for whom he works.

Mr. Speaker, I might remind my colleagues that we hear much about the fifth amendment to the Constitution and about those who plead the fifth, but the most important part of that amendment is the guarantee of property rights. If we are not safe in our own homes and in our businesses and if our property cannot be protected, we are in a state of anarchy.

Once rioting starts the only effective force, so far, we have found to effectively deal with violence and rioting is our police, National Guard, and Federal troops. Federal employees should be the very first to cooperate with these forces representing law and order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived when we should begin to consider preventive measures. Today I am introducing a bill which would deal severely with those employed by the Federal Government who participate in arson, robbing, looting, and attacks on law enforcement officers.

An employee of the Federal Government is a representative of our Government and a representative of the U.S. flag. We must protect the high standards and splendid image of those in the Federal service. We cannot permit a few persons to tarnish the superb reputation of our excellent Federal employees.

The bill follows:

H.R. 16512

A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to impose prohibitions on the employment by the Federal Government or District of Columbia Government of persons convicted of engaging in riots and certain other activities involving violence and civil disorder, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after section 7311 the following new section:

"§ 7311A. Riots, violence, and civil disorder
"An individual may not accept or hold a position in the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia if convicted in a court of competent jurisdiction of murder, homicide, felonious assault, rioting, inciting to riot, looting, robbery, or arson during a period of emergency declared by competent authority due to civil disorder. An individual so convicted shall not be eligible for appointment

to, or reinstatement in, any civilian position in the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia for the period of 3 years immediately following the date of his conviction."

(b) The heading of subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, to read as follows:

"SUBCHAPTER II—LOYALTY, SECURITY, STRIKING, AND ACTIVITIES INVOLVING RIOTS, VIOLENCE, AND CIVIL DISORDER"

(c) The table of contents of chapter 73 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking out—

"SUBCHAPTER II—LOYALTY, SECURITY, AND STRIKING

"7311. Loyalty and striking.

"7312. Employment and clearance; individuals removed for national security." and inserting in lieu thereof—

"SUBCHAPTER II—LOYALTY, SECURITY, STRIKING, AND ACTIVITIES INVOLVING RIOTS, VIOLENCE, AND CIVIL DISORDER

"7311. Loyalty and striking.

"7311A. Riots, violence, and civil disorder.

"7312. Employment and clearance; individuals removed for national security."

SHOULD DOVES IN FEDERAL WORK QUIT?

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the "surrender in Vietnam" petition circulating among Federal employees. The signers of this petition represent only a very small group; however, their action has received much attention in the national press.

David P. Mayer is a dedicated Federal career man. He served in World War II with the Army Air Corps. Following military service, he was with the Civil Service Commission for 3 years. Mr. Mayer began his career with the Veterans' Administration at Wood, Wis., in 1946. He has been a faithful VA employee for some 22 years, and is now a supervisory personnel management specialist with the VA central office here in Washington.

Mr. Mayer's letter to John Cramer renews my faith in the vast majority of our dedicated Federal employees. It is obvious from his remarks that he respects the office of the Presidency of the United States.

Since many of my colleagues may not have seen the article which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Monday, March 25, I would like to bring it to the attention of every Member of the Congress:

SHOULD DOVES IN FEDERAL WORK QUIT?

(By John Cramer)

Here is one man's idea of the case against those Federal employees who have organized that new protest movement against the Vietnam war.

It comes from a Veterans Administration official (voicing his own views, not those of VA) who writes:

"DEAR MR. CRAMER: This needs to be said about Federal employees who protest against the Vietnam war thru an organized effort:

"First, let it be known that every citizen has a right, as an individual, to express his opinions on matters of national policy and legislation.

"Second, let it be understood that the possession of rights carries with it obligations and responsibilities to exercise these rights wisely and judiciously.

"Thus, Federal employees who thru organized effort, whether it be by group demonstration, petition or other action, breach the obligation and responsibility inherent in their rights.

"Organized efforts opposing public policies have sanction when the actions are by groups outside the Federal employment, but when within the Federal employment, the practitioners violate a trust—the trust of the jurisdiction they were hired to serve.

"Federal employees have a responsibility to perform duties which provide public services and products. In the discharge of such duties they have an obligation to support and defend the public policies and objectives of their chief executive, the President of the United States.

"In this context, the principal engagement of Federal employees is to assist the chief executive in accomplishing the intent and purpose of his administration. This is a basic principle in employe and employer relationship, whether it be Government or industry.

"Therefore, accepting this principle, Federal employees who oppose the policies and objectives of their chief executive have a right to resign, and this they should do when they cannot support the responsible head they were hired to serve.

"Let it also be recognized that all Federal agencies, regardless of their operations and missions, are implicated in the Vietnam War, directly or indirectly as part of total government.

"The obligation to support the chief executive extends to all who are in his employ. It, of course, does not extend to the elected officials.

"The Federal employees who through organized action demonstrate opposition to their chief executive, give comfort and incentive to the enemy, and more so than organized efforts outside of Federal employment.

"On the other hand, there is no dispute about the right of Federal employees to engage in organized action on matters directly related to their welfare, status and rights as employees.

"An old axiom summarizes these thoughts: When you work for a man, help him to achieve his objective—when you can't do so, quit!"

DAVID P. MAYER.

NEED FOR PASSAGE OF SENATE VERSION OF CIVIL RIGHTS BILL

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the world mourns the death of the Reverend Martin Luther King. In the words of Abraham Lincoln:

How weak and fruitless must be any word of mine which shall attempt to beguile us from the grief of a loss so overwhelming.

History will not forget, nor can America's conscience overlook that Martin Luther King lived and died to further America's great ideals. The world will consecrate his memory for his insight, his determination, and his courage in pene-

trating the fog of ignorance and of bigotry to see the promised land of freedom, equality, and justice in America.

Dr. King was a man of peace. His was a philosophy of nonviolence, and while it is true that violence frequently followed him, he would have been horrified by the rioting and the looting that erupted after he was killed. His would have been the first voice raised against such senseless actions for he knew such violence would hurt rather than help the cause to which he was devoted. In his speech during the march on Washington in 1963, he said:

But there is something I must say to my people who stand on the warm threshold which leads them to the palace of justice. In the process of gaining our rightful place we must not be guilty of wrongful deeds. Let us not seek to satisfy our thirst for freedom by drinking from the cup of bitterness and hatred. We must forever conduct our struggle on the high plane of dignity and discipline. We must not allow our creative protest to degenerate into physical violence. Again and again we must rise to the majestic heights of meeting physical force with soul force.

The marvelous new militancy which has engulfed the Negro community must not lead us to a distrust of all white people, for many of our white brothers, as evidenced by their presence here today, have come to realize that their destiny is tied up with our destiny. They have come to realize that their freedom is inextricably bound to our freedom. We cannot walk alone.

We cannot walk alone. Yet, it is already apparent from the speeches that have taken place this morning that hard lines are being drawn. Some Members have pointed to the looting and the burning to declare that they will not be intimidated or blackmailed by such actions and that they will vote against the civil rights bill which will be considered this week. All of us oppose the criminal lawlessness that scarred our country during the past few days. It is vicious and destructive. It is the rule of anarchy, rather than the rule of law and order and it cannot be condoned. Nevertheless, it must be apparent that the type of approach advocated by such opponents of the bill plays into the hands of the rebels, the cynics, the rioters, and the looters, for they have been pounding their communities that change will not be made through the lawful processes of government. If the attitude of such Members is to prevail, what shall we tell the law-abiding citizens who have waited so long and so patiently for the changes which they have been led to expect would be made by the Congress—changes which will give them a share in the equal justice which is their American birth-right.

Mr. Speaker, we are long past the time for action. This Wednesday the House is scheduled to consider the civil rights bill of 1968. We will have to decide whether to approve the Senate bill or send it to conference. I will vote for the Senate bill.

It will be contended by some that prudence dictates sending the bill to conference so that the House may lend its influence to shaping the bill. I say prudence calls for approving the Senate bill now. We must keep faith with the members of the community who have

confidence in government and orderly procedure as being the best expression to reflect needed change. Passage of the bill will sustain that trust. Moreover, it will give the lie to the cynics, to the extremists, to the rioters and the advocates of violence, burning, and destruction. Finally, it will give tangible expression to our support for the ideals of the noble man to whose memory we pay tribute.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. has given the last full measure of his devotion to the people and to the country he loved. He is now a part of history and of eternity, never to be forgotten.

CONGRESS SHOULD LEAD ON A PROGRAM TO LIQUIDATE POVERTY

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, this has been the saddest week in American race relations since the Civil War.

Dr. Martin Luther King represented the unfolding of a new period in American history which we must understand and learn to accept if we are to survive and continue our leadership role in world affairs.

It is regrettable that the fiendish assassination of Dr. King unleashed a reign of terror and violence which we should in no way identify with the life and saintly doctrines of this disciple of the Gandhian philosophy of nonviolence.

Events of the past week have raised many questions. One in particular was often asked as buildings were burned and looting continued as an aftermath of Dr. King's assassination.

Do they not know they hurt their own cause?

Who are they?

They are not the whole of the Negro people but they represent a sizable number of citizens grown weary of patience and promises.

They are part of those this House voted against last week when it rejected the Senate amendments which would have provided more school aid, \$25 million for Headstart programs, and \$75 million for summer projects.

They are the young people of today and yesterday who were deprived of equal educational opportunities in segregated and inferior schools.

They are the children of garbage collectors and other low-income breadwinners unable to provide necessities of life for their families.

They are the school "pushouts" and job rejectees, the kids who live in crowded slums, and who fail to understand our fancy talk of inflation, the gold crisis, and a balanced budget, for life to them is a constant crisis of economic phenomena and fiscal deficit which they know only as poverty, unemployment, and deadend jobs.

They are the ones the appropriation committees found fancy jargon and su-

perfluous excuses to deny their needs while the taxing committees wept tears for those whose income is so substantial and complex they pay law firms to make out their returns.

That, then, is who they are. But what is their cause?

Precisely, therein, that they have a cause which differs from other Americans, lies most of the answer.

Their cause is deeply rooted in three and a half centuries of slavery and exclusion, the destruction of family ties and cultural heritage, a deceptive emancipation and reconstruction in which political and civil rights were virtually destroyed, the "separate but equal" doctrine which created separatism but never equal opportunities, and now a legal equality without enforcement and implementation. Their cause is America's failure to provide equal opportunities and justice to all its citizens.

Solutions to such age-old problems are never simple and cheap. But neither are they so complex and beyond our financial capacity as some would have us believe.

Upon this Congress, and State and local governments, rest the responsibility for that action which alone can convert the wrongs for which Dr. King and hundreds of others have labored in vain. It is the Congress, and not the President, which has failed to act, which has slashed appropriations for vital educational, manpower, housing, and antipoverty programs. It is the Congress, and specifically, this House, for example, which has bottled up in the Rules Committee the Senate-passed civil rights bill which grudgingly grants only a part of the rights already secured for almost all other Americans except the Negro—a bill which could not get passed originally except for an "antiriot" amendment and now can not get passed because those who sponsored this amendment will not vote for the bill.

Basically, the so-called Negro problem is not one which can be separated from the main concerns of the American society. The fate of the Negro is bound with that of every other American to whom economic security and national security are essential.

Just as the search for world peace has been interrupted by the racial disorders of the past few days, so the economic stability of our country is weakened when the garbage collectors in Memphis must strike for decent wages—and when 22 million Americans are cheated out of achieving their potential as good customers, productive employees, and professional technicians.

Economy or Vietnam is not the reason opponents of the administration fight against social legislation. These critics of Great Society programs would oppose domestic spending and liberal legislation under any condition. Thus, these same economy-minded, so-called protectors of the Public Treasury oppose civil rights and fair housing legislation which calls for relatively no spending, merely enforcement of basic constitutional rights.

But it is a mistake to believe freedom can be bought cheaply. A. Philip Randolph, respected Negro leader, has spelled out a "specific and factual course