

Mr. DUNCAN. Not part of this bill?

Mr. BRESS. Not part of this bill. We have as far as damage to Government buildings.

Mr. DUNCAN. It does not include everything that this bill does; other legislation does?

Mr. BRESS. Other legislation does not relate to the disorderly type of offense committed in a Federal building in San Francisco, for example, but the U.S. Criminal Code, title 18, does provide for damage to Government buildings, no matter where they are located.

Mr. DUNCAN. This is going further and giving more protection to buildings on Capitol Hill and the District than it does for Federal building in some other city.

Mr. BRESS. This does not give any more protection insofar as the penalty is concerned for property damage, but insofar as it relates to individual conduct of the disorderly type, crimes of personal violence against a person, this does go beyond what we provide federally for other areas.

Mr. CRAMER. I suggest that could well be the subject matter of additional legislation which would not come to this committee, but probably would go to the Committee on the Judiciary. This is before this committee because it relates to the Capitol itself principally. This is the legislative fountainhead of America. Its business cannot be disrupted by anybody if the people are to continue to be served by their representatives. This is the legislative headquarters of America. It is a different situation from the administrative buildings. They too obviously need protection, but this is my thought, this is an emergency type legislation that action must be taken upon.

We have been served notice by what happened in the other body, the Senate, not too long ago. I was on the House floor when the Nazi came in a year and a half ago and threw a Nazi flag on the floor. I was sitting right there. It could have been a Molotov cocktail.

I think it is a specific, special necessity for this type of legislation relating to the Capitol, and that is what this bill does.

Mr. HARSHA. I can understand the necessity for this legislation and the position of the Justice Department in supporting it, but I cannot understand why the Justice Department is supporting this type of legislation in regard to the Federal buildings, the Capitol, when it apparently is not supporting similar legislation in the antiriot bill. That covers many things this bill is supposed to do, does it not, also in the District?

Mr. CRAMER. That subject is close to my heart. I would be glad to hear your reaction as to why the Justice Department is not supporting the antiriot bill which passed the House by a vote of 5 to 1.

Mr. BRESS. I think the only answer I can give on that, sir, is that I have not personally been in discussion with the Department of Justice in determining its official position on any of the various antiriot bills.

I know with respect to the pending riot bill in the District of Columbia, it is my recollection that the Attorney General did support that legislation and I believe that—I do not know whether it has passed out of the House yet or not.

Mr. HARSHA. We are going to provide in that bill a certain mantle of protection for public officials and public property which we, if we do not pass the antiriot bill, are denying to private citizens. I think we are going to be subject to some criticism.