

This bill is a threat to the powers of the states and represents an unwarranted incursion upon the states' authority and responsibility for the enforcement of the law and suppression of public mischief. However, I must commend it for the provision that would impose a fine of \$10,000 and a prison sentence of five years upon anyone who travels in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of inciting a riot. I introduced similar legislation in both the 88th and 89th Congresses, but failed to get it even before a subcommittee. At that time racial disturbances were confined to Danville, Va. As soon as they spread to New York and Chicago and Detroit and other large cities, the House of Representatives was stirred to pass an anti-riot bill, H.R. 421, by an overwhelming majority.

The focus of any legislation looking toward the stoppage of riots is good, so far as its intentions are concerned. However, I will tell you the best way to stop riots:

The law should be enforced in such a manner that no city should have to cope with mobs gathered on the streets in violation of state and local laws and court injunctions. Those who disturb the peace and break our laws, irrespective of their race, creed, or color, must be dealt with firmly and resolutely and in such fashion as to make them and all others like them know that lawlessness will not be tolerated in any locality in the United States of America. Instead of intimidating, harassing and impeding our police officers, the government at all levels, local, state and national, should let these policemen know that they are expected to use whatever force is necessary to complete an arrest and to subjugate a criminal. At the same time, if help from the state or national government is needed, the local authorities should be assured that it will be promptly forthcoming.

This nation was founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty. Defiance of the law is the surest way to tyranny. Few laws are generally loved by all citizens, but they are to be respected and not resisted. A man may disagree with the law, but no man may disobey it. We must have a government of laws, not of men.

We must forthwith put an end to the practice of minority group leaders who go about telling the dissatisfied element that they should obey the laws they favor and violate the ones they do not like. These men are a danger to our society. We have too great a country to stand idly by and allow lawless and irresponsible men to encourage lawless and riotous conduct.

The rights of law-abiding citizens should take precedence over the rights of criminals. When a crime is committed, the question in law should be whether or not the accused is guilty and what punishment is merited and not a determination as to whether or not the criminal had a lawyer before he confessed. There are no indications that our law-abiding citizens need further protection from the police, while there is every indication that they need considerably more protection from the lawless.

The claim is made that our troubles can be traced to the ghettos. I can see little relationship, if any, between impoverished circumstances and criminal behavior. There is overwhelming evidence that poverty does not cause crime and that elimination of poverty will not prevent crime. America has had less poverty in 1967 and 1968 than in any previous years in our history. If the argument of these politicians and sociologists is correct, we would have had a genuine revolution all over the country in the depression years of the 1930's and our present prosperous days would be marked with unprecedented peace and tranquillity.

The most effective method the Federal Government could employ to assist in the suppression of crime would be to support the states and localities in their efforts to enforce the law and to desist from the past practices of hindering and impeding them. Law enforcement is a local responsibility. Without exception, I feel that states are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis. This can be accomplished if they are protected from the vicious outside influences which snub our laws and ignore our community mores, resulting in the chaos which has occurred in some of our larger cities and just a few days ago in Memphis. Our safety and our liberty depend on the excellence of local and state law enforcement. The anti-riot provision of this bill in no way impedes or usurps local law enforcement, but rather would give force and support to it. I hope such legislation will be voted into law.

As for the other provisions of H.R. 2516, I recognize Title X as worthy of consideration, although the matter taken up therein is one that should be handled by the states and not by the Federal Government.

Rather than concentrate on housing, the Congress would be acting much more in the interest of our constituents if it took steps to protect them from the looters