

Mr. QUIE. You said on page 6 of your statement that you consider those who would mock our laws, shatter our peace, burn our homes, kill our people to be enemies of our country. Now, it is true that in all cases anyone who would burn homes or kill people would be enemies of our country. But do you believe in all cases that the local poverty workers out to abide by any local law? Is that what you are saying, that they should never in any cases refuse to accept local laws?

Mr. SHRIVER. I am hesitating just to try to figure out what kind of a law that you would be considering. I think it is true——

Mr. QUIE. Civil rights people are quite upset about the number of local laws.

Mr. SHRIVER. Where a local law is in opposition or opposed to the laws of the United States, I would not say that, no.

Mr. QUIE. Let us take as our example, the local housing ordinances at times where it is not a matter of straight discrimination. The civil rights people would take action not only in strictly civil rights requests of discrimination but also if the effect tended to be discriminatory.

My question would be then, Would you require that any Community Action agency which is funded would not be able to take action, say political action, to protest against local laws to try to get the local city council to change their laws and to get the legislatures to change their laws?

Mr. SHRIVER. No, I never intended to imply that. Maybe the expression "mock our laws" is not a strong enough expression. Our position has been the poor, in fact everybody, has a right to express their opinion about the laws in one way or the other and that the poor should not be estopped from expressing their opinion about a law which they find harmful to them any more than anybody else. I did not mean to imply that they did not have the right of protest. That is in the Constitution and we certainly are not trying to take away the constitutional rights of American citizens.

What I was trying to get at in this paragraph here was that as it says there "mock our laws." Maybe that is not the right word. What I was trying to say was hold the law up to ridicule as such, the law itself.

The other thing is quite obvious, as you said. So with respect to the law we could not possibly put ourselves in the position of taking away a civil right like the right to protest which is in the Constitution or to have assembly, as they call it, in the Constitution and the other provisions of the Bill of Rights.

Needless to say we support those.

Mr. GARDNER. Would the gentleman yield one second? I would like to explore this.

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GARDNER. Let's use a hypothetical case. If a city wanted to build a hospital in a certain location and they were going to have a bond issue, do you think it would be the responsibility of your poverty workers if they were opposed to this, if they felt in some way it affected the people living in the poverty area, to go out and actively march in protest in front of city hall, in front of a board meeting and disrupt what was going on?