

CRIME AND VIOLENCE

68062178

HEARING

BEFORE A

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETIETH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

CRIME AND VIOLENCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND
THE BREAK-DOWN OF LAW AND ORDER IN CERTAIN AREAS
OF THE CITY

AUGUST 1, 1968

Printed for the use of the Committee on the District of Columbia



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1968

SEP 30 1968
GOVERNMENT DEPOSITORY
PROPERTY OF BUILDERS THE STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF SOUTH JERSEY LIBRARY
CAMDEN, N. J. 08102

GOV. DOC.

Y4

D63/1
95-228

:C86/5

06-32716

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOHN L. McMILLAN, South Carolina, *Chairman*

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Illinois
JOHN DOWDY, Texas
BASIL L. WHITENER, North Carolina
B. F. SISK, California
CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Michigan
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia
DON FUQUA, Florida
DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota
BROCK ADAMS, Washington
ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., Indiana
E. S. JOHNNY WALKER, New Mexico
PETER N. KYROS, Maine

ANCHER NELSEN, Minnesota
WILLIAM L. SPRINGER, Illinois
ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Wisconsin
WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland
FRANK J. HORTON, New York
JOEL T. BROYHILL, Virginia
LARRY WINN, Jr., Kansas
GILBERT GUDE, Maryland
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
SAM STEIGER, Arizona

JAMES T. CLARK, *Clerk*

CLAYTON S. GASQUE, *Staff Director*

HAYDEN S. GARBER, *Counsel*

SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE

JOHN DOWDY, Texas, *Chairman*

THOMAS G. ABERNETHY, Mississippi
B. F. SISK, California
G. ELLIOTT HAGAN, Georgia
DON FUQUA, Florida

WILLIAM H. HARSHA, Ohio
JOEL T. BROYHILL, Virginia
CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland
JOHN M. ZWACH, Minnesota
SAM STEIGER, Arizona

(II)

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS

Columbia Typographical Union, Local 101 Charles F. Hines, President, accompanied by David Brinkman, Bronius Liogys, James G. Shirlen, Sr.; and Donald C. Taylor, Vice President.....	Page 16
D. C. Police Wives Association, Inc., Mrs. Joan Abbott, President.....	8
D. C. Transit, Inc.: Rodney W. Richmond, accompanied by Lloyd Howard Shands, Jr., Glenard James Phillips, Jr.; and Martin E. Kane, Bus Drivers.....	35
Government Printing Office: Landes, Gordon W., Night Worker; Rochon, Lawrence, Chairman, Chairman's Chapel; Rosenlund, Donald, Proof Room Chapel; Spinks, Darwin E., Night Linotype Chairman; Urban, Joseph R., Night Employee.....	16
Machen, Honorable Hervey G., a Representative in Congress from the State of Maryland.....	1
Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, William Calomiris, President....	4

MATERIAL SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Bookoff, Mrs. Edith, copy of letter to the President of the United States dated May 6, 1968.....	49
Carnicero, Jorge, letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 27, 1968.....	56
Columbia Typographical Union No. 101, Charles F. Hines, President, telegram to President Lyndon B. Johnson dated May 21, 1968.....	18
Gotkin, Charles, letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 6, 1968.....	48
Grand Jury No. 1 (March 1968), J.M.R. Hutchison, Foreman, and 22 others, letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 13, 1968.....	50
Grimes, Virginia Lee, letter to Chairman McMillan.....	46
Hanahan, James R., Columbia, South Carolina, copy of letter to Mr. Nash Castro, U.S. Interior Department, dated May 19, 1968.....	54
Hein, Bernard S., letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 2, 1968.....	47
Herron, Thomas W., letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 30, 1968.....	56
Horwitz, Bernie M., letter dated May 15, 1968, to Chairman McMillan....	60
Kuester, Ivan and Bertha, letter to Chairman McMillan.....	46
Market Servicenter, William R. Thompson, letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 17, 1968.....	55
Maryland Wine and Liquor Store, Inc., Ruth B. Rosen, President, letter to Chairman McMillan dated April 29, 1968.....	46
Michigan Park Citizens' Association, Roy L. Swenson, President: Copy of letter to Commissioner Washington dated May 14, 1968.....	51
Copy of letter to the President dated May 14, 1968.....	52
Park and Shop, Inc., J. Griffin Rountree, Executive Director, letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 15, 1968, enclosing copy of letter to the President.....	52
Printing Industry of Washington, D.C., Inc., Doris T. Hall, Executive Director, copy of letter to Mr. Charles F. Hines, dated May 31, 1968.....	19
Skirpa, Jr., Kazys K., copy of letter to Senator Robert C. Byrd dated May 2, 1968.....	47
Washington Evening Star: Article dated June 25, 1968, by David Lawrence, entitled "Answering the Demonstrators".....	59
Article dated August 8, 1968, entitled "Owner Quits With Gun Blazing—Holdup No. 10 Closes 20-Year-Old NW. Pharmacy".....	61
Washington Post, advertisement dated June 20, 1968, McCall's Magazine, entitled "What Women Can Do To End Violence in America".....	57
Washington Printing Pressman's Union, Delmar L. Albertson, President, letter to Chairman McMillan dated May 23, 1968.....	56

IV

	Page
Wills, Kitty W., letter to the Committee, dated May 8, 1968-----	50
Wirkus, Mrs. Eugene, letter to Chairman McMillan dated June 17, 1968---	57
WMAL, Evening Star Broadcasting Co.:	
Editorial, week of June 30, 1968, entitled "Return to 'Normal' "-----	57
Editorial, week of July 21, 1968, entitled "Police-Community Relations"-----	61

CRIME AND VIOLENCE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SPECIAL INVESTIGATING SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C.

The Special Investigating Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in Room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, Honorable John Dowdy (Chairman of the Special Investigating Subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Dowdy (presiding), and Broyhill.

Also present: James T. Clark, Clerk; Hayden S. Garber, Counsel; Sara Watson, Assistant Counsel; Leonard O. Hilder, Investigator, and Donald Tubridy, Minority Clerk.

Mr. Dowdy. The Special Investigating Subcommittee has been called today to receive testimony from several representative groups in Washington with respect to crime and violence in the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia Committee has received over recent months many calls, letters and complaints from businessmen and Government employees, private employees and other citizens of Washington, with respect to the breakdown of law and order here in the District.

The Committee thought that it would be enlightening and helpful to hear the firsthand experiences of some of the local businessmen and citizens, and perhaps also receive their recommendations as to further appropriate steps which the Committee and the Congress might take to alleviate the distressingly unsafe conditions in the District.

We are pleased to have our colleague, Mr. Machen of Maryland, with us this morning. I know you were particularly interested in having this hearing. I am sorry that other matters that we have had hearings on in the Committee have prevented us from getting to it earlier.

We will be pleased to hear you.

STATEMENT OF HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MARYLAND

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for scheduling this hearing in response to my letter of May 24, asking that additional witnesses be heard on the crime situation in the District of Columbia. The witnesses who will appear, I believe will represent a real cross section of your involved citizens and business and working community and government employees.

I have met with drivers from the D.C. Transit Company and their wives. I have had numerous calls and letters from employees of the Government Printing Office and I have had numerous conversations with City businessmen. I will not take the subcommittee's time by explaining in detail what occurred at these meetings. However, I would like to emphasize some conclusions I have drawn from them.

First, they feel that the policemen's hands are tied. They feel that if the policeman is a little too aggressive in performing his function of protecting the public he will be chastized by trial boards and other administrative actions.

Secondly they are critical of the court system here where a large backlog exists, allowing arrested persons out on personal bond or bail for long periods of time before trial, many continuances, and subsequent probation which allows them once again to strike at the public.

Recently I have become increasingly disturbed by the association of high ranking D.C. officials with such extremist groups at the Black United Front. While irresponsible statements by this group calling the murder of a policeman "justifiable homicide" might be protected by the constitutional guarantee of free speech, I do not believe D.C. government officials connected with such groups can be impartial and fair in carrying on city business as long as they belong to both groups. Such officials should either resign from the government or cease promoting the aims of such organizations.

When the present D.C. Government was appointed, I was hopeful that after a short time they would begin to take prompt and affirmative action towards solving the city's problems. Some advances have been made but they have failed miserably to maintain law and order. I realize that to solve some problems we need sociological solutions. However, I also know that law and order must come first. This must be the cornerstone on which we can build a better society for all the people of the District of Columbia.

I am also disturbed that the City Government has not openly opposed proposals which have been made to let private citizens take over the Police Department. The Police Department must not be run by a plebiscite of the citizens. It must be operated by dedicated individuals whose job it is to enforce the law quickly, decisively and fairly. Police morale is now very, very low. I believe the inaction on the part of the D.C. Government will erode it even further if prompt action is not taken to quash proposals for neighborhood control of the police. I believe the police have got to regain the feeling that they will be backed up by all echelons of government in their effective enforcement of the law.

In conclusion, I want to indicate that I hope as a result of these hearings the Committee will consider whether additional legislation may be needed to combat the rising crime rate in the District. I also hope that D.C. Government is now on notice that neither we in the Congress nor the residents of the City condone the lack of law and order we see evidenced in the District. Prompt and effective law enforcement must be the first priority. Once this has been achieved then the city can move ahead to solve such other problems as stabilizing business and encouraging people to remain in the District rather than join the exodus to the suburbs. Only with prompt and effective law en-

forcement will the city once again become the pride of the Nation and no longer a national disgrace.

I know time is short, Mr. Chairman. We have furnished a list of witnesses, and I think we will furnish you the fears that are in the minds of so many of the problem that is being compounded. We know that business, restaurant business, at night is substantially down because people will not come into the District. We know that businesses are moving out because of intimidation and threats, these types of things that to me are just tearing the guts out of the city, so to speak, and I think all of us have been trying to help in promoting the Nation's Capital that we are all proud of without regard to race, color, or anything else, and it is unfortunate and tragic, in my opinion, that there has been built up in the minds of so many of the people from all walks of life and all colors, all races, this feeling of hopelessness.

When you talk to these various groups, you talk to them in private, I am an attorney and certainly I wouldn't present before this Committee things that couldn't be substantiated, but when you talk about some of the things that there is just a sense of frustration, whether they are policemen, whether they are bus drivers, whether they are business people or whether they are people who just want to come down and they are not—statistics will show more and more of your businesses are going to your shopping centers, people are coming out of the District to shop in your suburban shopping centers. So it something no one wants to get hysterical about and I don't think many of us are, but I think all echelons of government should recognize the seriousness of the problem and not say the answer has got to come in one direction of just money alone. It has got to come with a feeling of a sense of security and a sense of pride and responsibility being built back into the police department, and I am very, very apprehensive of many of the statements and I am sure you will be when you hear the testimony.

I thank you again very much with the busy schedule all of you have for scheduling this hearing to let this segment, cross section, of the community have an opportunity to present their views.

I thank you very much.

Mr. DOWDY. I appreciate your comments and I appreciate your statement.

I well know the things to which you refer. I have talked with members of the Police Board about the restrictions that were placed on them in April, when the riots were going on here. Of course, they would lose their jobs if they were publicly to state the restrictions put on them, and I know their superiors have denied it, but they were ordered not to arrest anybody. People in business here in town, one that comes to mind, when his place, the front was knocked out of it and women drove up their cars and husbands would get out and pick up arm-loads of clothes and bring them out, and policemen were standing there, and the man begged them to make them quit. One of them said "We are under orders and we can't do anything about it." That is responsible for what happened here.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I have been very careful in presenting my testimony, that the point I am trying to make is that whether they say it is true or not, and your higher District officials do deny it and I am not accusing them of it, but whether it is or is not true in the minds of the rank and file of the cross segments of your community,

I don't care whether it is your business community, the government employee, the Government Printing Office or what, there is that feeling that it is true. So one way or the other it has got to be corrected.

Mr. DOWDY. No doubt about it.

Mr. MACHEN. That is the point I make, and I think just what you mention, businessmen, we will have some of them and you will have some bus drivers telling you the same thing, here is a man, "I am sorry. I can't do anything about it." I again offer my help as a suburban Congressman concerned with the whole metropolitan area, not trying to point the finger at any one individual but hopeful that there could be better cooperation in solving these problems and not some of them ostrich-like sticking their heads in the sand or feeling the problem will go away or it has got to be done their way or else. I think that is wrong. We have to do it from a cooperative standpoint.

Mr. DOWDY. Sure, your District is a part of the area and this sort of thing spreads out. The area, you read the newspapers, has got so bad that you have almost a daily bank robbery. This shows the criminal element has decided that there is going to be no attempt to apprehend them or prosecute them if they are apprehended, it is a very serious situation.

Mr. MACHEN. I think better than turn the key over to them we should turn the key on them.

Mr. DOWDY. And keep it turned. The criminals in the District of Columbia are supported at so many levels; even one of in the newspapers here, in an editorial a few days ago, the Washington Post—

Mr. MACHEN. I read that.

Mr. DOWDY. This editorial stated a person could make a name for himself by killing a deserving Senator or Member of Congress—the editorialist didn't name who he thought deserved to be killed—but statements such as that are inflammatory. It is hard to find words to describe the irresponsibility of an editorial writer who would recommend such a thing as killing any person. A man who would write such an editorial, recommending that his readers become assassins, should be bored for the simples.

Mr. MACHEN. I thank you.

I believe the next witness, Mr. Chairman, is the President of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, Mr. Calomiris, whom I have known for many years, very prominent in business circles and I am sure you will be very interested in hearing what he has to say.

Mr. DOWDY. All right, Mr. Calomiris.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM CALOMIRIS, PRESIDENT, METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. CALOMIRIS. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate having this opportunity to make a brief statement on behalf of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade respecting the lawlessness in the District of Columbia.

Understandably the Board of Trade for many years has been concerned with the maintenance of law and order here in the Nation's Capital since that is an essential ingredient of developing and operating a community attractive to visitors and new businesses. Our Committee on Public Order was established in 1896 and has been an integral

active segment of our activities ever since. During the last several years, as Washington's crime rates have gotten ever greater, our concerns and activities have intensified annually.

The Board of Trade has devoted its resources toward curbing crime in the Nation's Capital by offering and supporting proposals which we believe would enable our police and our courts to maintain law and order. Let me express appreciation to the District of Columbia Committee which has responded affirmatively respecting most legislative matters brought before it aimed at reducing lawlessness in this city.

Very briefly, we have supported legislation to increase the salaries paid and the strength of the Metropolitan Police Department.

We have backed legislation to increase the salaries and the number of judges in the Court of General Sessions. We have asked the Chief Justice and the Chief Judge of this judicial circuit to endeavor to secure visiting Federal judges to help dispose of the backlogs which have been built up.

We support legislation to increase the number of Juvenile Court judges.

We are supporting legislation which will expand the District Attorney's office to more expeditiously handle the many cases awaiting court action.

We are endeavoring to strengthen the U.S. Marshal's office and all related court functions in order that justice may be administered more speedily.

I am sure all of us will agree that justice delayed is usually justice denied.

We vigorously supported enactment of the Omnibus Crime Bill developed and adopted by this Committee and the Congress and recently signed by the President.

We are now seeking adjustment of features of the Bail Bond Act which make it possible for dangerous criminals to roam the streets and commit additional crimes after being charged in other serious cases.

I have met with the Federal Judges of this jurisdiction and offered to assist them in every possible way to reduce the backlogs and to secure additional facilities which are clearly needed.

Mr. Chairman, I recite this list of activities the Board of Trade is engaged in merely to demonstrate to the Committee that the Board of Trade and the business community is so concerned with criminal activity that it is devoting its attention to every possible factor which could contribute to sky rocketing criminal statistics in the Nation's Capital. Never has the need for legislation and citizen support to curb lawlessness been more urgent, as indicated by the tremendous increase of all types of crimes of violence during the last eight years.

I am sure you recognize that chambers of commerce and boards of trade engaged in attracting visitors and new payrolls to their communities rarely refer to city problems but rather speak only of their attractive and superior features. When we comment publicly about problems you may be sure they are ones we consider to be extremely and extraordinarily serious.

APRIL RIOTS

Conditions here since the early April riots have significantly undermined the economy of this community. We estimate that we lost \$40 million in tourist spending in April and May and our figures are still running behind what they should be. A great many business enterprises in the District, particularly in downtown Washington, have suffered substantial reductions in their volumes. Some have already closed and others may have to do so in the very near future unless conditions improve.

The cut back of tourist spending and those of residents in the central area has and will be reflected directly in revenues collected by the District of Columbia, and I am fearful that conditions will get worse since almost daily we receive comments and letters from business people of the District similar to one received yesterday which ended by saying, "I don't know how we can continue to do business in Washington, D.C."

On May 10th, with the approval of my Board of Directors, I wired the President of the United States as follows:

The safety of people and property in this city must be assured. This requires all citizens to observe the rights of others. Business and citizens must fully recognize and observe their responsibilities to maintain law and order. National and local government must assure such conditions and protect all citizens against lawless elements.

Clearly, Washington's law enforcement processes cannot adequately fulfill this function at this time. Scheduled demonstrations will place additional demands on the police establishments. It therefore is essential that the number of law enforcement personnel on the streets be augmented now.

We urge appropriate officials to order this done immediately.

This is the end of my telegram.

Subsequently, the President recommended the addition of 1,000 policemen to the Metropolitan Police Department. On June 4th I wrote the President and transmitted "compliments and appreciation for the decision to increase the Metropolitan Washington Police Department by 1,000 additional officers." I also reiterated our concern about the maintenance of law and order here but pointed out that while his recommendation was a step forward, it would require a considerable amount of time before it could be fully implemented inasmuch as appropriations were needed and recruiting and training facilities would have to be expanded. I invited the President's attention to my telegram of May 10th, stating that we renewed our suggestion and earnestly requested that steps be taken to assign 1,000 military police to the Metropolitan Police Department immediately so that a high degree of law and order could be reestablished at the earliest possible time.

Please understand, Mr. Chairman, that we in the Board of Trade believe that most of our responsible officials and the Metropolitan Police Department are sincerely dedicated; to reducing criminal activity and again making our homes, our businesses and our streets safe for all of us. We compliment them for their service in the face of the serious law enforcement handicaps they must deal with.

Hopefully, some of these handicaps are being lessened or eliminated. It also now appears that the Metropolitan Police Department will be enlarged. But, meanwhile it is of paramount importance that steps be taken now to reduce crime by augmenting the number of law enforcement officers on the streets as we have asked the President to do. We

earnestly hope that this Committee and the Congress will seek to accomplish this very essential objective.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DOWDY. Thank you for your fine statement.

Of course we know Washington is not the only area in the United States where the police have been put under handicaps in enforcing the law, ordered not to arrest, and things of that kind. I know police don't like to be under orders like that, but to keep their jobs they have to obey the orders of their superiors. That is wrong and they should be permitted to enforce the law and I hope the hearings of this Committee will, not only this investigating subcommittee but the full Committee had already, and apparently some of the things we have brought out have had some effect, if not as much as desired.

If there is any legislation that is needed, of course, this Committee will want to bring it forth. It appears to me right now it is not legislation that is needed, it is either a change in direction of the people who are running this government or else firing them and getting somebody who will try to enforce the law.

It just seems to me that Washington officials have been inviting trouble by the things that they permit to go on.

For instance, this Resurrection City, when they set it up as an enclave and said the police couldn't go in there. This was actually a separate country that they could run their own laws in there and do whatever they want, and I have had experiences related to me where somebody from this place would rob, either assault or rob, and the police couldn't do anything with them because they would jump over the fence and the policemen would be ordered not to follow the fellow into the enclave to make an arrest. It is unbelievable that any government would permit such a thing to happen. And those are the sort of things that have got to be stopped if we are going to have any law enforcement in Washington at all.

I realize this situation, and this hotel down here, the Willard, which was forced to close by the riots and demonstrations, and other businesses forced to close. I hope, as a result of our hearing if it develops a need for additional legislation, we will recommend it; but it seems to me that is all on the books that is necessary now, if the executive agencies would enforce those laws.

Mr. Machen, we are glad to have you sit with us.

Mr. MACHEN. I have nothing to add, Mr. Chairman. I think the position made very clear by Mr. Calémiris, the Board of Trade comes out and when they promote the city, and again I come back, I compliment you and the Committee in trying to focus attention on this where there can be better cooperation on all levels of government to restore the respect, the feeling of confidence in the hands of our law enforcement agencies and the people feel they are doing the job. It is just pointed out here from this witness and the other witnesses.

Mr. DOWDY. Thank you.

Mr. CALÉMIRIS. Thank you.

Mr. DOWDY. I promised Mrs. Joan Abbott, the president of the District of Columbia Police Wives Association, we would hear her at 10:30 and it is that time. She has some youngsters at home she wants to get back to.

We are glad to have you, Mrs. Abbott.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOAN ABBOTT, PRESIDENT, D.C. POLICE WIVES ASSOCIATION

Mrs. ABBOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a privilege to be here this morning because the members of the D.C. Police Wives Association know that all the members of the House D.C. Committee share our alarm and concern over the rising flood of crime in Washington. Four policemen have been killed in Washington in line of duty in the past 7 months. A number of the members of the D.C. Police Wives Association are constituents of Congressman Hervey G. Machen of Maryland's Fifth Congressional District and all of the members appreciate the concern he has shown while in Congress in support of the Metropolitan Police Department and the individual police officers.

Chairman John Dowdy of this subcommittee, together with Congressman Durward Hall and Congressman Donald E. Lukens, included in the Congressional Record, when the Poff-Casey amendment was being debated, the letters the D.C. Police Wives Association wrote to President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey and City Council Chairman John W. Hechinger in support of the Casey Amendment. We are proud of our contribution to the adoption on July 24, 1968, of the Poff-Casey amendment by the House of Representatives by an overwhelming vote of 412 to 11. We are going to work very hard to get the Senate to accept the Poff-Casey bipartisan amendment, and we think it will be adopted.

Speaker after speaker made it clear during the House debate that it wasn't the severity of the punishment, but only the certainty of punishment which deterred criminals, and the Poff-Casey amendment deals directly with this basic issue.

It is high time that the Congress wrote the mandatory provisions of the Poff-Casey amendment into law. President Johnson in his March 13, 1968, message to Congress called on the Congress to enact a D.C. Gun Control Act which would include a mandatory provision to "add 10 years imprisonment to the regular penalty when a firearm is used in a robbery or an attempted robbery." In adopting the Poff-Casey amendment, the House of Representatives has magnificently responded to President Johnson's call for mandatory sentences to prevent a recurrence in the District of Columbia of what President Johnson condemned as last year's "2,500 major crimes committed in the Nation's Capital at gunpoint—murders, assaults and robberies."

On July 19, 1968, during the House Debate on Gun Legislation, Congressman Fisher of Texas pointed out that "records reveal that some 80 percent of major crimes are committed by those with prior criminal records, many of them favored with light sentences and manifestly unjustified probationary treatment." This is the problem in Washington. For instance, on June 26, 1968, Congressman Paul Rogers of Florida denounced 17 sentences handed down in a two-week period by District Courts here in cases where guns were used. Six of these cases were suspended, 4 were given light sentences under the Youth Corrections Act even though the criminals involved were 18, 19, 20 and 21 years of age. In a case of first degree murder the criminal was given a 1 year sentence. Judges who hand down such ridiculous sentences should be removed from office. The Bail Reform Act must be revised

and drastically amended to keep the repeaters from committing new crimes. These are essential steps to make our streets and our homes safe for law-abiding citizens. In some states, judges hand down stiffer sentences for killing game out of season than some D.C. judges give criminals in cases where guns are used. It is time to stop making excuses for criminals and to recognize crime for what it is, a plague of destruction that knows no barrier of race, color, or creed or financial status. From 1960 to 1966, 335 policemen in our Nation were killed, 322 died by guns in the hands of criminals. 242 Metropolitan Policemen have been assaulted this year in the District as compared to 193 combined assaults on Metropolitan and Park Police last year. Nation-wide last year, guns were used in more than 125,000 assaults, rapes and robberies.

The House wisely rejected the licensing and registration amendments which would have penalized law-abiding citizens. The amendment offered by Congressman McClory, for instance, called, in one section, for "imprisonment not to exceed two years, or a fine not to exceed \$2000, or both." Another section called for "imprisonment not to exceed 5 years or a fine not to exceed \$10,000 or both." These were aimed at the law-abiding citizens.

The D.C. City Council under Chairman John W. Hechinger, who sold guns in the Hechinger's stores for many years has adopted gun registration and licensing provisions which were rejected by the House of Representatives. The D. C. City Council's new gun regulations provide penalties for failure to comply of \$300 or 10 days in jail, or both. Is it realistic to expect such minor offenses to deter criminals from killing another policeman, from committing another rape or another robbery or another assault? The Washington Post, which, generally favors the criminal and gives major headlines to everyone who attacks police, either verbally or by guns, and feels that it is white people and white policemen, and society in general and not the criminally-inclined individuals; who are responsible for crime, was predictably enthusiastic in its support of the farcical gun control regulations backed by Mr. Hechinger and adopted at his insistence by the D.C. City Council.

We hope this Committee will take action against the Hechinger gun control regulations now that the House of Representatives has decisively rejected the McClory amendment by a vote of 168 to 89, in view of the fact that the McClory amendment and Mr. Hechinger's gun control regulations are aimed at the law-abiding citizen rather than the criminal. As the House of Representatives pointed out, criminals ignore such weak-kneed laws. The Supreme Court in the case of *Haynes* against the United States has encouraged criminals to ignore the Hechinger-McClory approach by ordering that the defendant be released. The famous, or infamous opinion, depending on how you look at it, and whether you are a criminal or a law-abiding citizen, was written by Justice Harlan and it declared "we hold that a proper claim of the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination provides a full defense to prosecutions either for failure to register a firearm under section 5841 or for possession of a unregistered firearm under section 5851."

A sound constitutional basis does not exist for the D.C. Gun Control Regulations which Mr. Hechinger insisted on pushing through the

D.C. City Council with the backing of the Washington Post which, in its editorial pages, is as hazy, uninformed, and heedless about basic constitutional provisions as Mr. Hechinger is. This Committee should take a long hard look at the D.C. Gun Control Regulations, with the Constitution in mind and particularly with Justice Harlan's opinion in the case of Haynes against the United States in mind.

Some of the things which policemen have to put up with when they go before courts in connection with cases in which they have made arrests are unbelievable. It is no bed of roses to be a policeman. The discouragements are great. The lack of support by the City Council under Mr. Hechinger and the Reverend Walter E. Fauntroy and Mrs. Polly Shackleton is growing day by day. We agree with Congressman B. F. Sisk that members of the D.C. City Council, "have not given effective, firm support and backing, I feel the members of the Police Department are entitled to." In our discussions with members of the Policeman's Association we believe that this is the overwhelming view of the members of the police department. We support Congressman Sisk in calling for a thorough questioning of the members of the City Council by the House District Committee. The former District Commissioners gave much more support to the police than the present D.C. Council. We think the D.C. City Council should be abolished and that the adoption by the Congress of the present plan for the District Government was a sad mistake which the police are paying for with their lives. The situation is getting worse day by day. John Harrington of Philadelphia, National President of the 137,000 member fraternal order of police, has called for a national two day police walkout. Police leaders across the country and in the District of Columbia have become embittered by what they consider lack of support in dealing with crime and racial violence.

Mr. Harrington's comment, that "when police are being shot like fish in a barrel, it's time we do something," certainly applies in the District of Columbia, Bruce Terris, chairman of the Democratic Central Committee has called for the dismissal of Police Chief John B. Layton. The Reverend Channing E. Phillips, D.C. Democratic National Committeeman wrote the resolution adopted by the Black United Front which declared that killing a white policeman was "justifiable homicide." We hereby request this Committee as well as the Democratic National Convention to bring Bruce Terris and the Reverend Channing E. Phillips before them, by subpoena if necessary to investigate completely the question of whether killing a white policeman is "justifiable homicide." We think the members of the Metropolitan Police Department are entitled to an answer to this question. The D.C. Police Wives Association will exert every effort to bring these matters before the Credential and Platform committees at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, because we believe the American people are entitled to know where the Democratic party stands on the question as to whether it is "justifiable homicide" to kill white policemen. We have not been able to get an answer to this question from the D.C. City Council, although we tried several times. When we objected to our husbands being killed, and when we said, we would urge our husbands to go fishing if the D.C. City Council did not condemn the view that it was "justifiable homicide" to kill white policemen, which had been adopted by the Black United Front and

supported by the D.C. Democratic Central Committee, Mr. Hechinger denounced us as being as "incendiary" as the Black United Front.

The Sunday Star in its letters column of July 28, 1968, performed a great public service in printing three letters on the Black United Front and the control of the police, which it is demanding. One of the letters pointed out that the policy of the control of the police was first unveiled on October 22, 1967, by the Communist Party, U.S.A., in a position paper which declared:

We believe that under all circumstances black people not only have the right but the responsibility to defend their persons, their homes and their community. And in line with this position we support the view that black people police their own community . . . There can be no question of the right of black people in the United States to use violence to achieve change.

The letter in the Star went on to say:

It is not surprising to find this line being echoed by the BUF, which has Stokeley Carmichael as one of its leading members, or by Arthur Waskow, who only last year attracted attention for his role in the ill-fated National Conference for New Politics convention in Chicago. That meeting was so dominated by the Communists and Black Power Extremists that its more naive and innocent participants were nauseated.

The D. C. Democratic Central Committee is zeroing in on Chief of Police, John B. Layton, and has called for his dismissal, as the first step in carrying out the policy announced by the Communist Party last October. We are very grateful indeed that the Senate of the United States, in adopting on Tuesday of this week, July 30, 1968, the \$548.2 million District Budget for the current fiscal year, gave its support to the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee which raised questions about the constitutionality of a citizen "take-over" of the police department. The Senate report noted that the Constitution gives Congress "exclusive jurisdiction over the district" and that the Congress has conferred its powers over the police on the Mayor. The Senate report said these powers cannot legally be delegated to "private groups or individuals." It added that it "would view with much concern any action on the part of any governmental officer or an employee encouraging or assisting any such group or person" to obtain control.

The Subcommittee will certainly want to give all the support it can to this view which has been so ably expressed in so timely a fashion by the Senate of the United States.

We wish to commend all those individuals and groups who have rallied to the support of Police Chief John B. Layton. Among these are D. C. Republican National Committeeman Carl L. Shipley who attacked as "reverse racism and demagoguery" the demand that Chief Layton be dismissed which was voiced by Bruce Terris, "is a violation of the Federal Civil Rights Laws." Shipley pointed out that the demand for Chief Layton's dismissal disregards questions of merit and competence.

Shipley added "it is regrettable that the Democratic chairman would exploit racial tensions and appeal to any of our citizens on the basis of race at a time when our business community is suffering serious losses as a result of the April riots and the Resurrection City episode in June."

We agree with Mr. Shipley and we feel confident that the fine citizens of the District of Columbia, who elected the members of the D. C. Democratic Central Committee on May 7, this year, did not vote

for then, and do not favor now, the calculated, cruel and heartless attacks on the police and on Chief Layton which have their origin in the policy formulated and announced by the Communist party in its position paper of October 22, 1967. I would like to include as part of my remarks a column by Drew Pearson published in the Washington Post, July 31, 1968, entitled "FBI Prepares Report on Black Militants" because of the light it sheds on the black militant movement in the United States today.

We thank you for your consideration you have shown us this morning and we want you to know that we deeply appreciate the sympathetic understanding and support which the members of this committee and of the Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike have always given the Metropolitan Police Department of this great city.

I would like to include, as part of my remarks, with your approval, Mr. Chairman, an article from today's Washington Post (August 1), reporting that President Johnson regards Police Chief John B. Layton, "very highly" and sees "no justification for the removal of Chief Layton."

I would also like to include the tough statement by former Vice President Nixon to the Republican Platform Committee in Miami on crime. Mr. Nixon said "it is too late for more commissions to study violence; it is time for government to stop it. We cannot accept a wave of crime as the wave of the future."

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Dowdy. The articles you mentioned will be made a part of the record.

(The articles referred to follow:)

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1968]

FBI PREPARES REPORT ON BLACK MILITANTS

(The Washington Merry-Go-Round, by Drew Pearson)

The FBI has prepared a report on the underground black nationalist movement in the United States that may explain the sudden outbreak of violence in Cleveland. Under a Negro mayor, Carl Stokes, the city has been making great progress toward racial understanding. A handful of black nationalists began shooting police there last week who were merely towing away a parked car.

The report may also explain some of the moves by black militants in Washington.

Finally, it gives a key to the tremendous upsurge in the popularity of George Wallace, who represents a latent American fascism whose answer to Negro violence is white violence.

What the FBI has found in Washington is that black militants have worked out a plan to take over the Nation's Capital. The militants argue that Negroes are now in the majority and that given home rule they can take over the city.

At present, Washington is governed by a Negro mayor, Walter Washington, an able executive, who is supported by a city council, with five Negro and four white members. Mayor Washington is considered much too moderate by the black militants. They have worked out the following strategy, neighborhood by neighborhood.

First, they will try to persuade the moderates to become militant, and if they fail, then bury them with frustration and harassment. When the moderates hold meetings, the strategy is to break up the meetings or to be so unreasonable that the moderates will have to dissociate themselves from the meetings.

This was the explanation of the recent meeting to discuss neighborhood control of police, in an African Methodist Episcopal church where the black militants demanded that all whites leave. The whites present had been strong supporters of Negro progress. When they left, some moderate Negroes walked out with them.

Stokely Carmichael sat quietly in a back row of the meeting. He had been one of the architects of the new strategy. Another was Chuck Stone, former assistant to Rep. Adam Clayton Powell. Both militant and moderate Negroes are burnt up over the double standard of ethical conduct in Congress, whereby Powell, a Negro, was expelled while no action is taken against white Congressmen who misbehave.

This has caused far more resentment in the black world that Congressional leaders realize and appears to moderates to be a legitimate case against Congress.

Carmichael has been laying low following his subversive statements in foreign countries. He has been careful not to say anything publicly which would cause his arrest.

His operations, however, have been very carefully followed by the Justice Department, including some of his talks with the late Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who finally persuaded Carmichael to stay out of the Poor People's march.

The Rev. Ralph David Abernathy seems more susceptible to Carmichael's persuasion than was Dr. King. Shortly before the start of the Poor People's march, Mr. Abernathy told the New York Times: "I love Stokely. He's a wonderful guy. I may disagree with individuals like him on strategy, but not on goals. All I know is that we will remain nonviolent."

Carmichael's real goal, however, is the overthrow of the United States government. He spelled this out last Aug. 18 in Hanoi at an Afro-American rally attended largely by North Vietnamese.

"We are not reformists," he said. "We do not seek to reform. We do not wish to be part of the U.S. government, of its system. We are revolutionaries. We seek to change the imperialist system of the United States. We will be satisfied with nothing less.

"We are comrades," he told the North Vietnamese, "because we seek to redeem humanity, because we seek to stop the greatest destroyer of humanity—the United States. When we succeed, and we will succeed, our blood, our lives would have been a little price to pay."

Probably Carmichael did not know that his words were picked up by powerful U.S. monitors. What he does know, however, is that his words in Hanoi cannot be used to prosecute him in the United States because the Justice Department can get no witnesses from Communist countries.

Back in the United States, Stokely is being very careful not to repeat these remarks.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
POLICE WIVES ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Clinton, Md., July 9, 1968.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, House District Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to bring to your attention our stand on the Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy and the Black United Front.

Enclosed please find our statement regarding this issue and our telegram which we sent to President Johnson.

It is our fervent hope that your committee will not ignore this pressing issue.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) JOAN ABBOTT,
President, District of Columbia Police Wives' Association, Inc.

D.C. POLICE WIVES' STATEMENT JULY 5, 1968, CONCERNING THE BLACK UNITED FRONT RESOLUTION

The Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy has chosen to align himself with the Black United Front, a group which openly condones and urges abolition and death to law enforcement and our husbands. We can not see how this city Councilman can remain in his post of government and continue to be part of an organization that so flagrantly repudiates the laws he himself is sworn to uphold. We call upon Rev. Fauntroy to dissolve his association with the Black United Front or resign his post on the D.C. Council and cower with those who would have anarchy. With the onset of lawlessness, there too is the decline of a safe and orderly society.

TELEGRAMS SENT TO PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON JULY 9, 1968, ASKING
REMOVAL OF THE REV. WALTER E. FAUNTROY FROM THE D.C. CITY COUNCIL

The Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy has chosen to continue his association with the Black United Front which outrageously condoned the public murder and shooting of two disarmed policemen attempting to perform their duty. He can not remain in his post of government under which our husbands work yet continue to be part of the Black United Front. He can not serve two masters or travel two roads simultaneously, but has stated his intention of doing so. We are therefore compelled to ask for his expedient removal from the City Council.

This statement was released July 15, 1968, by Police Wives United criticizing local news media for their irresponsible and biased reporting in any matter regarding the Metropolitan Police.

For further information you may call: Mrs. Evelyn Brennan, 572-4799. Mrs. Patricia Buckley, 262-1595. Mrs. Rosemary Gaine, 577-5918.

In regard to the resolution passed last week by the Black United Front, Let us set some of the records straight of the inconsistencies of their resolution and also errors in newspaper accounts.

Pvt. Stephen A. Williams had on the evening of Monday, July 1, 1968, made a police department offense report of a robbery which had taken place in which the complaining witness, who was a Negro, had reported that he had been hit over the head with a pistol and \$30 of his money taken. At this time, this complainant gave the information to Pvt. Williams that the subject who had robbed him was known to this complainant as Johnny. Around 24 hours later Pvt. Williams, in the company of Pvt. Matteson, were called to the 1300 block of Columbia Road by this Negro complainant who pointed out to them John White as the man who had robbed and pistol whipped him the previous night. The rest is known to history that when Pvt. Williams attempted to arrest subject White for the alleged robbery (which is a felony), they were jumped. Pvt. Williams was murdered and Pvt. Matteson critically wounded. Isn't it hypocritical that this so called Negro leadership, including the Democratic National Committeeman from Washington, D.C., an inconsistency with the demands of the past that Negroes weren't getting a fair shake from white policemen. Here was a Negro man who had been robbed—struck with a gun—calling for assistance from HIS police department—and when this assistance arrived to aid him—and took the proper action—they met with death and injury.

These same leaders who cried that police treat Negroes as second class citizens—now turn around and call this murder justified.

They use their basis for justification that police have been killing Negroes in the ghettos unjustifiably. Yet they come forth with no example of where a policeman has ever killed a Negro unjustifiably in this city.

They try to use as an example the case of the injured, Officer Matteson, who a year ago shot and killed a Negro while defending himself. However, they gloss over this case very quickly because in examination of the facts of that case show that Matteson used every means possible to apprehend the subject before using his revolver as a last resort to defend himself against possible death or serious injury. The key witness in that case was the deceased Negro's brother, who testified that his brother went at Matteson with a knife—stating he was going to kill Matteson—and that Matteson had even begged the subject to drop the knife—and that Matteson fired only to protect himself.

We are sure that most Negroes were appalled by the cruel, rude and selfish resolution passed by this Black United Front.

This type leadership, who would have been the first to criticize Pvts. Williams and Matteson for NOT taking action, now state that the death and injury are justified. It seems apparent that no matter what action a white policeman takes, that this Black United Front would find grounds to criticize. The Reverend Fauntroy states he doesn't agree with the resolution, but that he is going to remain a member of the organization, so that he may influence its membership. If this is an example of his influence, either he is over-estimating himself or the fact is that he has no influence at all!

Much has been made that white policemen in Chicago and Detroit have been members of the Klu Klux Klan. However, it should be noted that when this affiliation became known, these men were asked to resign or were suspended. This black Klu Klux Klan that has now been formed will no more help the Negro than the white Klu Klux Klan helped the white race.

POLICE WIVES UNITED.

Mr. Dowdy. I might say this, last year this Committee reported the anti-crime bill (P.L. 90-226, approved Dec. 27, 1967) which was passed by the House, and subsequently it became law. In that bill, we, this Committee and the House, approved a provision which fixed and made mandatory, additional sentence for crimes committed with a gun. For several years, the Senate wouldn't go along with it and it was opposed by the Justice Department. That is the only reason the mandatory feature was not put in the law as you mentioned earlier, which we have now put into the gun bill (P.L. 90-351, approved June 19, 1968) the Poff-Casey amendment. But I did want you to know that this committee has held that view all the time, that I have had it all the time, and when the opportunity has presented itself, I have always urged the fixing of a minimum sentence by law. We several times reported bills fixing the minimum sentences, which passed the House, but always over the opposition of the Justice Department.

You mentioned the City Council's gun law, the gun ordinance. I have this opinion about these proposals for gun registration, of course it will not stop crime. But the people of the United States, not only the District of Columbia, are disturbed about the crime and riots and looting going on in the country and are very open about their opposition to that sort of thing; I think these gun laws are proposed as a smoke screen to get the people's minds off crime and so on and to get them to talking about guns and forget about the real problem. You know if you can get people off something that is bothering them and get them on to something that is really immaterial it will be good politics to divert their thoughts by promoting this anti-gun measure and try to persuade people that passing a gun law will stop crime. I don't think it will go, because the idea is ridiculous. The American people are not that gullible.

Mr. Machen?

Mr. MACHEN. I would just like to compliment Mrs. Abbott on a very thoughtful, fair statement, and I am satisfied that it is the voice of the police because it takes the wife to do the talking before a Committee.

Mrs. ABBOTT. I am sure it is true.

Mr. MACHEN. And the difficult position that you all have in backing up your husbands in their chosen field of endeavor makes it rather rough, but I think that the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the District of Columbia are behind just what you have stated, a fair and impartial and effective enforcement of the law against any perpetrator of a crime. I think we get that message loud and clear, and if we do things will start changing.

Mrs. ABBOTT. I sure hope so.

Mr. MACHEN. I think we hear too much about this community relationship and perhaps I might add, to me I think one of the most effective programs we have had in the District for many years has been the Police Boys Club and I think they still continue to carry on very effectively with community relations with Boy's Clubs activities, do they not, Mrs. Abbott?

Mrs. ABBOTT. Yes, they do, but then there is a problem there, too, Congressman. Most of the men are working six days a week because of the crime problem. In addition to that they are attending American University classes maybe two, three nights a week; they are at-

tending court, they are going in earlier now an hour once a week for a key class, they don't have time to spend with their own children and their own families, but they, you know, several of them, do that can fit it in but it is hard.

Mr. MACHEN. Let me ask, how long has your husband been with the Police Department?

Mrs. ABBOTT. 11 years this June.

Mr. MACHEN. I am not trying to put you on the spot but in your conversations, in your associations, with the members of your group, is there a feeling among the wives for one reason or the other the impression I get from many of the business communities and the bus drivers and the others, as we say, that the hands of the police are fettered in carrying out their duties?

Mrs. ABBOTT. In certain cases. I mean it is hard to pin-point.

Mr. MACHEN. You think that has increased recently in recent years more than in the past or has it been the practice and policy in the past?

Mrs. ABBOTT. It has been increasing. But during the riots I had asked my husband about, if he was held back in any way and he said "heck, no." His captain said "get out there and get them, lock them up if they are breaking the law."

But the men aren't backed up when they go to court. That is where a lot of the problem is. They go in there with the cases but they are not backed up in the courts.

Mr. MACHEN. Spare the rod and spoil the child.

Mrs. ABBOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MACHEN. I appreciate it very much.

Mr. DOWDY. I think somebody said if a policeman makes an arrest the attacker will be released before the person attacked can get to the hospital, and the policeman will be in court Monday morning facing charges brought against him for making the arrest.

Mrs. ABBOTT. That is more of the truth.

Mr. DOWDY. Thank you for a fine statement.

Next we have from the Government Printing Office the Chairman of the Chapel Chairmen and others. All of you who are here from the Government Printing Office, come around and have these chairs. Who is to be the spokesman?

STATEMENT OF CHARLES F. HINES, PRESIDENT, COLUMBIA TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION, ACCOMPANIED BY BRONIUS LIIGYS; DAVID BRINKMAN; JAMES G. SHIRLEN, SR.; DONALD C. TAYLOR, VICE PRESIDENT; LAWRENCE ROCHON, CHAIRMAN, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE CHAIRMAN'S CHAPEL; GORDON W. LANDES, NIGHT WORKER; JOSEPH R. URBAN, NIGHT EMPLOYEE; DARWIN E. SPINKS, NIGHT LINO CHAIRMAN; DONALD ROSENLUND, CHAIRMAN, PROOF ROOM CHAPEL

Mr. HINES. Charles F. Hines. I am President of Columbia Typographical Union.

Mr. DOWDY. All right.

If you will in some way identify the others here.

Mr. HINES. Yes.

I will identify the gentleman immediately on my right as the vice president, Donald Taylor. He works at the U.S. Government Printing Office, and is vice president of our union which represents 4,500 members from the District of Columbia, 1,800 of whom are employees of the United States Government Printing Office proper.

And to my left is Larry Rochon, who is Chairman of the Chairman's Chapel, United States Government Printing Office which represents 25 chapels of approximately 1,800 men of the Typographical Union employed in the Government Printing Office.

I will have Mr. Rochon identify the others. Because of these 4,500 members, I don't recognize all their faces.

Mr. ROCHON. The gentleman to my left is Gordon Landes, the gentlemen to his left are Joe Urban, Darwin Spinks, Don Rosenlund, James Shirlen, David Brinkman, and Bonius Liogys.

Mr. HINES. I will lead off, representing the Columbia Typographical Union, which as I said represents 4,500 members of Columbia Typographical Union. It is a local and an affiliate of the International Typographical Union, AFL-CIO. We have approximately 1,800 members that are employed in the U.S. Government Printing Office and who work around the clock in the publication of government documents, the Congressional Record and the like.

This is what they are hired for and this is what they take pride in their work in doing.

We have been brought under considerable fire over the past several years in what we term our pay that we receive from the United States Government Printing Office, we now term that combat pay. It is worth your life and limb to go to work on the streets of Washington to and from the Government Printing Office.

We sincerely sympathize with the previous speaker, the lady that represents the wives of the District Policemen, and we sympathize more wholeheartedly with the life of the District Policeman in this area. Personally, I wouldn't have one of those jobs if they paid \$50,000 a year, because of the lack of cooperation they get from the courts in this area.

A policeman himself literally is wasting his time when he makes arrests, and then they are turned loose before he ever gets back to his precinct to report off duty. We think it is a disgrace to the Nation's Capital that such actions are allowed to go on.

Myself, I was born and raised in the City of Washington 44 years ago. I resided in this city until I was about 21 or 22 years of age and took great pride in being able to say that I was one of the original members of the City of Washington. People don't readily admit to the fact that they were born in the District of Columbia any more. We more or less take this as—we have to look down when we say this to people, because it is a disgrace at the way the District of Columbia Government has been allowed to go on.

We think, we thought, that the appointment of a District Council by the President and to maybe start a fresh slate would be the area in which the City of Washington could grow. We think just the opposite has happened. In fact my own personal opinion, and many members of our Union, when we saw some of the members who were appointed to that City Council, we had grave reservations about the quality of the people that were put on there. We call them bleeding hearts. Most of these people are good, substantial citizens of the City of Washington

and this area, but their attitudes on crimes and the law enforcement agencies in the City of Washington differ from the average working man.

The average working man looks on a policeman as something with honor. He thinks that he should be looked upon as a leader and a protector of his rights. Instead of that they look upon him as a sad state of affairs because his hands are tied every time he makes an arrest.

I won't linger on that subject any longer although I could talk on it for hours. I think, like I say, it is a disgrace.

The crime problem that we are interested in, particularly, is within the printing industries of Washington. There are three major branches, the newspaper industry, the booking job or commercial industry, and the United States Government Printing Office.

Some of the gentlemen that I have here with me today are victims of the assaults, armed robberies, and acts of physical violence, vandalism and so forth, and we could crowd this court room or this hearing room with many of these people but I will tell you, it is a hard thing to get most of them to show up because they say "what's the use. All we are going to do is going to do a long big round of talks and nothing is going to be done" and this is the general attitude of the public in the City of Washington, particularly with our members working in the Government Printing Office, and he says "au, what the hell," and it is a true statement of fact.

We have sent and you have on record, Congressman Broyhill has been very cooperative with us, Congressman Machen, Senator Brewster, Senator Byrd from West Virginia, we have appeared before them several weeks ago, and we have a telegram that we sent to the President of the United States on May 21, 1968, Senator Carl Hayden, Senate Committee on Appropriations and also the Printing Committee of the Congress of the U.S. Representative John McMillan, the Attorney General of the U.S., Ramsey Clark, Mayor Walter Washington, Representative Burleson, Representative Broyhill, and the Public Printer, James L. Harrison, and I will read that and then give it to you for the record.

I have another letter I would like to read into the record, which is more up to date, and I don't think Congressman Broyhill has one, he may have one. This was addressed to me by the Executive Director of the Printing Industry of Washington, Miss Doris Hall.

(The telegram and letter as read by Mr. Hines are as follows:)

[Telegram]

MAY 21, 1968.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, *President.*

Senator ALAN BIBLE, *Chairman, Committee of the District of Columbia,*

Senator CARL HAYDEN, *Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.*

Representative JOHN J. McMILLAN, *District of Columbia Committee,*

RAMSEY CLARK, *Attorney General of the United States.*

MAYOR WALTER WASHINGTON, *District Building, Washington, D.C.*

Representatives OMAR BURLESON and JOEL T. BROYHILL.

JAMES L. HARRISON, *Public Printer.*

Your immediate attention is requested on the subject of police protection for approximately 7,800 employees of the U.S. Government Printing Office, of which 1,800 are member of the Union that I represent. There is not a day or night that goes by that one of our loyal Government Printing Office employees isn't mugged, yoked, beaten, stabbed or robbed or damage done to personal property all due to

the lack of proper, legal protection. As taxpaying citizens of the United States and voting residents representing each and every State and the District of Columbia, we demand *immediate* protection from this sort of violence. As government employes, as taxpayers, as voting members of the United States, these people are entitled to protection and we demand what they are legally entitled to. The Public Printer of the United States, through his good office, has repeatedly requested more police protection. The situation is getting worse and we are getting tired of excuses. The members of my Union are loyal employes, but they are now fed up to the chin with talk, promises and bleeding hearts. If the police cannot handle this problem, then the Armed Forces of the United States should be brought in to patrol at least a 12 block area surrounding the Printing Office. As you are well aware, the GPO is a 24 hour operation and I am very apprehensive as to whether the printing of the U.S. Government will be done on time each and every day if present conditions are allowed to continue another day. I repeat, we need *immediate attention* to the protection of our lives and property.

CHARLES F. HINES,
President, Columbia Typographical Union No. 101.

PRINTING INDUSTRY OF WASHINGTON, D.C., INC.,
May 31, 1968.

MR. CHARLES F. HINES,
President, Columbia Typographical Union No. 101,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: We thought that you and your Union members would be interested to know that the Association has sent the following letter to Mayor Washington, Police Chief Layton, the members of the Senate and House District Committees and the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade:

"The printing industry is Washington's largest manufacturing industry. We employ over 7,500 employees, with an annual payroll topping 55 million dollars. We are proud of the industry's contribution to the economic well being of the Washington area.

"Our members are increasingly concerned with the lawlessness and vandalism to which they and their employees are subjected. There have been numerous payroll robberies and an alarming escalation in the theft of office equipment and of broken windows. Our employers and their employees have been brutally beaten and robbed.

"A great many of our members employ night shift and lobster shift employees and it is becoming increasingly difficult to persuade employees, especially women, to work these night-time hours.

"We would urge that immediate steps be taken to provide adequate police protection for the property of the business concerns in this area and to assure the safety of the employees. The current lawlessness will only accelerate the removal of our member plants out of the District of Columbia."

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

DORIS T. HALL, *Executive Director.*

MR. HINES. We have within a year lost considerable business in the District of Columbia in the commercial printing plants, newspaper lineage has gone down and the Government Printing Office employees are losing not just business but personal possessions and sometimes eyes, through acts of physical violence.

We have facing us today the move of many, many small printing businesses in the City of Washington that are moving to the suburbs because of the lawlessness going on in the District of Columbia.

One firm, for example, has a print shop up around 18th and Kalorama Road. They call this area a ghetto. I was born and raised in Washington. This was one of the finest neighborhoods in the city. This shop has a woman that works, one woman that I know of personally, who works the night-time hours. They have a special arrangement with

the Police Department to pick her up at a quarter of an hour when she quits, and pick her up in a police car and escort her to the bus stop because she is afraid to walk one and a half to two blocks to the bus stop because of fear of life or rape or assault or what have you. I think that is a disgrace.

Mr. Dowdy. If I might interrupt, we have had the same problem here on Capitol Hill with our secretaries, providing escorts from their offices to their parked cars.

Mr. HINES. Yes, sir, I know you do and it is a real shame.

We have, in the booking job industry our payrolls have, decreased considerably to the members that I represent and it is because the customer, the printing buyer, will not come down into the City of Washington itself, where the majority of those shops are located, for fear of being robbed himself in broad daylight. Many of our acts of violence around these places take place at night, but there are also a great number that take place in the day time.

The policeman, trying to block this, he does his best, but there are just not enough of them.

We back the aid of Congress in trying to get more jobs for the police but we think when they speak about enacting laws to help the police, I think we have enough laws on the books of the United States now, if they would just apply them and have the courts back them up, and I think it is a crime that some of the Federal judges that we have in the judiciary system of this country, are allowed to sit on the benches when, in my opinion, many are incompetent or just indifferent to what is going on around them, and I think that the time has come that the President and the Senate and Congress of the United States start looking into this problem and see what we can do about removing a few of these gentlemen if they don't start doing the job.

We have around the Government Printing Office which we are principally here for today, many, many condemned buildings. These buildings are, in our opinion, just sitting there being used as a haven for the criminal and the thug who just wants to prey on the decent working man coming and going into the Government Printing Office.

The Public Printer has done, I think, everything that he can do, but we believe that the Redevelopment Land Agency ought to acquire immediately all of the surrounding land to the Government Printing Office, tear the buildings down and to make parking lots available to the employees of the Government Printing Office until we can have built a public parking area for the employees of the Post Office which is right up the street, which is just as much in trouble as we are at the Government Printing Office and for the employees of the Government Printing Office.

We appreciate and can wholeheartedly back Representative Broyhill and many of the other fine representatives that we have, Representative Machen, at whose request we are here today, he asked us; to appear and for which we are very thankful and we congratulate them on their efforts to have Congress appropriate enough money to build places for our people to park so that they don't have to worry about going back and forth to work.

Through the efforts and many other fine Congressmen in the House and the Senate, we have been given the right to use approximately 550 to 600 parking spaces at night in the House and Senate Office

Buildings, and we have been provided shuttle service between there and the Government Printing Office for our night-time employees. This is a good step in the right direction. It will help until we can get built buildings that you can park your car.

We hear, it is distressing, they want to move the Government Printing Office to the outskirts. We wholeheartedly would back such a move but to do this is to run away from the problem that faces the District of Columbia. If you can't lick them, in other words, join them. We don't believe in that. We believe that you should lick the problem in the District on crime and then you won't have to spend many millions of dollars in building a new Government Printing Office in order to get away from the problem. Let's cure the problem instead of running away from it.

We do feel that some of the officials, as I have touched on a few minutes ago on the City Council that has been appointed by the President, one official, I won't mention his name, he knows who he is, cast a very serious slanderous aspersion on myself and the vice president of this union and our union. He said we are irresponsible officers of an irresponsible union, and what he meant by that was——

Mr. BROYHILL. Who made that statement?

Mr. HINES. We had one of the officials of the District of Columbia making his statement.

Mr. DOWDY. Put his name in the record if you don't mind.

Mr. HINES. His name is Mr. Murphy because we had audacity to go over his head and the Mayor and City Council to send the telegram which we sent and to raise as much hell as we did about the Government Printing Office and our protection, and I assure you we will not have much of Mr. Murphy in the future until he apologizes. It is a crying shame, I think, if we cannot disagree in a gentlemanly manner to the extent of his saying that we are irresponsible. I think we are very responsible.

I was born and raised in this area and I do not condone such remarks from any official. I think that Mayor Washington is to be congratulated for his stand on some of the areas, and I think that the sooner he rids himself of some of the officials that surround him the better off he will be.

I would like to keep from talking too long and boring you any further with some of this stuff that may be repetitious. We do again appreciate the cooperation that we have gotten on this problem. I think what you should do is to hear from other members who represent the same union and one of our fellow members here who represents the Pressmen's Union who was a victim of a robbery attempt. One of the gentlemen who was kidnapped at gunpoint, I don't think is here today, is he? He was greatly alarmed that his name was used in the Congressional Record. He was afraid of reprisals, that if he appeared again that it may be begging another act against him and he said once is enough. He is not coming to stick his head in the noose again.

So with that I would like to turn it over to my colleagues, the vice president, Don Taylor to my right and Larry Rochon of the Chairman's Chapel, and they can fill you in with a little more information.

Thank you.

Mr. DOWDY. Let me say this: We have a quorum call and we have several transit people, employees of D.C. Transit, Inc., who are here

to testify. I will return after I answer the quorum call, as will other members of the Committee. We have a little time, 10 minutes or such to go on, so, whichever one wants, may speak now.

Mr. HINES. Right, we will let Larry Rochon have it.

Mr. ROCHON. I have here, Mr. Chairman, this is a sampling of just a few incidents since May 20, since everybody got riled up about these three gentlemen here being held up at pistol point, that was the straw that broke the camel's back. Nobody could take any more. I have already given to your counterpart in the Senate, Senator Byrd, in the District Committee, approximately 150 incidents. I have here, I have not counted them, I have just been stockpiling them.

Mr. DOWDY. Over what period of time?

Mr. ROCHON. This is since May 20, 1968. And I know personally that I don't have them all because of the fact that a lot of people say "why turn them in? I have turned them in before and nothing has happened." So they won't turn them in.

Even since June 10th when our members, some of our members, have been fortunate enough to be able to park up here on the Senate and House lots evidently the criminal element has found out about it because as of last Friday night, July 26, 1968, on the Senate lot located over here by Union Station, a 1968 Ford Galaxie broken lock and forced open rear deck, removed new tire and wheel. This man signed his name to it and I happen to know this man very well because of his 1965 Ford Galaxie when it was 48 hours old they also did the same thing when he was parked in the vicinity of the Government Printing Office.

On the same night in the same Senate parking lot, 1968 Pontiac Tempest, station wagon, broken into, a new tire stolen from the rear well, and worst of all his golf clubs were stolen and his parking permit was also stolen, so we don't know now who would be driving in there with this parking permit issued.

I have with me four or five gentlemen who have actually gone through this. I myself have been very fortunate, I haven't been jumped yet, but a lot of nights you go in there and you say "is it my turn tonight or whose turn is it tonight?"

I have here on my left Gordon Landes, deaf mute. They are even in a worse situation than we are because they can't hear anybody coming up behind them.

Mr. Landes is fortunate enough to be able to speak a little and also to hear a little but we have a lot of these people down here and they have a worse problem than we have.

I don't want to take up any more of your time, but would rather have these gentlemen who have lived through it relate it.

Mr. DOWDY. All right.

Mr. SHIRLEN. Mr. Chairman, having been the victim of a hold up at gunpoint, and after living in the District of Columbia for 28 years, I feel that the time is upon us when it is dangerous to walk on the streets and that this is a deplorable situation that certainly if the laws of the land are enforced will be remedied, and I suggest that that happen, and that the judges and the judicial system of this country be granted authority, if they no longer have it; or encouraged to put it into effect to the fullest extent, and that we who work in the Government Printing Office be given places to park that are safe, with escorts, if necessary

in and out of the building, and lighted areas, with guards posted until the District of Columbia is restored to a normal situation.

Mr. MACHEN. Can I briefly ask one question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes.

Mr. MACHEN. Of you men here today how many of you have been victims of assault or a crime?

Mr. HINES. Five total.

Mr. MACHEN. Of those how many have there been apprehensions of the criminal involved in any of these cases?

Mr. HINES. To my knowledge, none. As are in many cases of the over 100 up until May, and as we say we have many numerous more that our people do not even bother reporting any more because they say they can't catch what is going on why add to the list. It just gives them more to work on and less time to get them.

Mr. BRINKMAN. My name is David Brinkman. I would just like to say I would like to see more parking provided for the GPO where you could walk at least across the street or something without getting robbed or assaulted or else if you come out of work at night you don't even expect to find your car there, it could be stolen or broken into. It is just a shame that you can't even walk across the street without running into some kind of trouble. I think there is enough, well not enough police but I feel that if they had more backing in the courts the situation wouldn't be as bad as it is.

Mr. DOWDY. I think you are quite right. If the police won't be backed up in the courts by the city officials you could have 15,000 and it still wouldn't improve the situation.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, you say we will meet with these people after the quorum call?

Mr. MACHEN. I want to make certain that representatives of the bus company understand, we have a quorum call which will take us about five minutes or so, but we will come back.

Mr. DOWDY. We will be back as soon as we can.

(Short recess.)

Mr. DOWDY. We will now proceed. I believe we were just fixing to hear this gentleman nearest to me.

Mr. HINES. Mr. Liogys.

Mr. LIOGYS. My name is Bronius Liogys. I was born in Europe, Lithuania. I went to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Germany, was in Korea, Japan, but I never was approached at a gunpoint like in the District of Columbia. And I think actually in Korea I had a better chance since I had an M-1 in my hand to defend myself. So I think I should have more protection.

Thank you.

Mr. DOWDY. Thank you.

Mr. LANDES. My fellow workman just asked me to come in and testify what has happened. My name is Gordon Landes and I am employed in the Government Printing Office on the night shift.

I did not want to come here very much, but I think I should because there are approximately about 200 deaf people working at the Government Printing Office which I communicate with my hands.

I would like to say this much: I was attacked about three blocks from the Office. I was walking down the street and this open convertible was driving in on the side of the sidewalk about 15, 20 miles

an hour. There were six people in the car. One of them jumped out with a pipe in his hands, it just happened so fast, and I believe to my knowledge, he was too high to give me a hard blow on the head, if it was I would have been dead today. His stomach was on top my head when I hit the ground. I got up very quick. Fortunately I know how to defend myself, I hit him pretty hard to knock him out.

The next guy came up and he hit me on the side of my arm. I was in a state of shock, I don't recall what I did, both of them were on the ground I saw fear in their eyes, when the car backed up the other guys jumped up from the car, from the side of the car and had an object in their hands. I panicked and I ran all the way to the Office. But I would like to say this much, I am only thinking about deaf people. It is not safe for them to walk in the District. They communicate with their hands. Anybody can see them communicate with their hands, they come up from behind them and attack them.

There are approximately 5,000 deaf people in the metropolitan area, Maryland and Virginia. I don't know what I should say actually because I think the District should be moved up now looking to get into a better bargaining position for employees where they work in the Government Printing Office and all other branches, not only there but people walking on the streets these days.

I can speak all afternoon and say what I want to say, but I just want to give specific information that should be known.

Mr. BROYHILL. That was a very effective presentation.

Mr. HINES. What he didn't say, being a deaf mute it is hard for him to hear, he can speak as you can see, what he didn't tell you is he is a karate expert and a black belt degree and he left two of those gentlemen who attacked him laying in the street, but you can see a man who has that ability to protect himself with five people after him it doesn't offer too much, and if he had stayed where he was they probably would have killed him or he would have killed them. There are about 200 deaf mute employees working in the Government Printing Office, majority at night.

Mr. LANDES. I think it is maybe 200 of them. I don't even know half of them. I have been introduced every night since I have been there for one year since yesterday.

Mr. URBAN. My name is Joseph R. Urban. On May 31, at 11:00 on my way to the night shift at the Printing Office I happened to look back after I had parked my car and I saw two characters seemed to be in a haste and I thought just like the expression, will it be my turn tonight, and then I thought this looks as if it is going to be my turn.

So I thought I would walk on and cross diagonally at this intersection and to an open corner where I thought they wouldn't bother me and I would wait for some other people to walk to the Printing Office which would be about three blocks.

As I was, as I had crossed about three-quarters of the intersection I heard running footsteps, more fortunate than this young man next to me, so I pretended I didn't know what they were running and I waited until they were close behind me and I turned suddenly and one of them confronted me and I hit him and knocked him down, and the other one got me from behind and I was flat on my back, I kicked, and swung, they kicked me in the side of the face. They got my wallet, all my keys, and they didn't get my watch, they broke my glasses and I

had to have all my locks at home changed, my family were in a dreadful fear that they would notice or know my address, knew all about me from the cards that were in my wallet.

And then 7 weeks later, the same night of the week, Friday, on this new shuttle system where we park our cars here, I happened to be parked at this one, I was on this bus at 1st and G Street, I happened to look out of the window and five or six young fellows, one of them looked 13 years old, and I saw him going through these motions as if he was throwing something and I thought, "Oh, no," then I found this object which was a beer bottle hit me in the face. The glass shattered and the man who worked with me in a bindery, his eye was injured by glass and he couldn't raise his eye for fear of damaging the eye more, and the nurse at GPO took the slivers out of my face and I continued to work.

But as the night went on my left eye started to bother me and a slight irritation, and when I got home I ate and I went to the Suburban Hospital and asked for them to look at my eye, my eye doctor doesn't—his office, he doesn't have offices on Saturday so this man, this doctor looked at my eye and he said there had been a piece of glass there because the eyeball of my eye was scratched, so I had to wear a bandage for two days and now I am afraid to walk across the street.

When I come down to the District I roll up my windows, when I approach the red light I watch there is no one in front of me or someone in back of me, so if one puts a gun behind me I can get away fast. When I park my car, I happen to have a private, I got to a private parking lot four days a week because it is an inconvenience to me in the morning parking over here because I have got to go through town and I want to get home to get my daughter to summer school so I use this private lot, and there have been incidents there, but there is a little more personal safety there, but still you have to watch.

When you pull in there you have got, we all look to see if there is someone behind us and someone in front of us, so the worse they can do is steal your tire or take your wheels off or break a window and go through the inside of your car.

Excuse me, that is all I have got to say on it.

Mr. DOWDY. Thank you.

Mr. MACHEN. There never has been any apprehension of any of these people who molested you all?

Mr. URBAN. Pardon?

Mr. MACHEN. There never has been any arrest or apprehension?

Mr. URBAN. No, there wasn't. The detective came to my home the next evening, he had a briefcase and I think he had three albums but I couldn't identify any of the pictures. But I did see the one man who when I stopped short and faced him I could identify him immediately but I don't think his picture was in any of those albums.

Mr. MACHEN. You think your officials are being hysterical when they complain about the crime rate in the District?

Mr. URBAN. My immediate officials were very much concerned and I would say my officials were immediately concerned and I think other people in the Government Printing Office are concerned where I work and I think this arrangement where the people park over here are the best arrangements now. But like Mr. Hines said before it looks as if we are backing away. We should get at the source of this trouble.

Mr. HINES. In answer to your question, Congressman, I don't think the officials in the U.S. Senate or Congress are being hysterical in any form or manner when they have, when the statement they have made about more police protection and even to the extent of bringing in armed forces of the United States.

I think it is a necessary evil more or less, and when I say evil it is something we ought to be ashamed of rather than have to do it, but as long as the hire of people—people that are hired by the Congressman and Senators of this country sit on their duffs and say “well, if I do this I am going to lose votes and lose votes,” the hell with the votes, the country is going to hell. We have got to start worrying about the people in it before we start worrying about people's political futures, and I think it has, what it has come down today, is politics above all and the hell with the people. It is a hell of a statement to make, but it is true.

Mr. MACHEN. Don't misunderstand me that is the reason for having you all here, that is perhaps a written record that some of them have refused to acknowledge.

Mr. HINES. Let me say this one thing and then I will let you go back to the others and I don't like to hog the show. But I think right today you have a situation where we have two very outstanding political parties, Republicans and the Democrats, and this has been the tradition and history of this country and I am very proud of it.

Today you have a third party entered into it, and I have my reservation of who I am going to vote for and who I am not going to vote for and that is not anybody's business but my own, but I think when people come out and say that the Democrats or Republicans ought to choose up sides and cast their votes to go to keep another party from becoming a Presidential candidate or a Presidential appointee or nominee of this country, then I think it is a disgrace to this country.

The only reason why that gentleman is getting the votes that he is going to get, and he is going to get quite a few from what I hear, is because the other people, the members of the two parties who are going to run, don't have the guts to stand pat and say “and let's stop all the horse manure here and get down and put an end to the lawlessness in this country,” and believe me that is the only reason why Governor Wallace is going to get a lot of the votes he is going to get. They are sick and tired of all the politics being played on this thing.

Mr. DOWDY. I think you are right about that, and I wish you would tell the young man over here, the Karate expert, if he gets jumped again to mark one of them up so he can be identified and be easy to find.

Mr. HINES. Fine.

Mr. Spinks?

Mr. MACHEN. I would just like to comment about politics. I do not feel that this is a partisan political issue. I think this is an issue that the members of both parties on both sides of the aisle are deeply concerned about and what we are concerned about is not personalities or the partisan politics.

Mr. HINES. Right.

Mr. MACHEN. But we are concerned not only with the answer here but with some of the root causes, too, but we think law enforcement ought to be the number one priority.

Mr. HINES. That is right.

I told Representative Broyhill in a meeting in his office that I voted both sides of the street. I voted Democrat and I voted Republican and I vote for the man I think is doing the best job, and I am not saying it and I didn't say it when Representative Broyhill was there because he was there, but I have voted for him every time he has run.

MR. BROYHILL. I want to comment on that statement in a moment. Have all the other people who have something to say spoken? I have a couple of comments on that, and I think you made a very fine point.

MR. SPINKS. I would like to say—I am Chairman of the Night Lino Chapel and Chairman of the Union, we have about 218 men in this section and it is responsible for, the main purpose is printing the Congressional Record, and we have been writing letters and making phone calls to the police, the Congressmen, the Senators, and to anyone who would listen to us, and we have been talking and talking, and we have been getting a lot of this done, and a lot of promises, but in the meantime, the meantime now, our men are getting beat up. It is not safe to come to work any night.

Even in one of our memoranda recently from our officials they wanted us to walk in large groups. Well, there was a good example right over here. Three of our men were walking together, and big men, too, and they got waylaid and help up. Another one here was beaten, and this man here was beaten and robbed, and this is just kind of a guessing game every night of who is going to be next, whose car is going to be missing when you get off from work. Your wheels, your car stolen or anything, every night something, someone is affected in some way, and we have to work under this pressure and try to get the Congressional Record out.

All of these men right here now worked 10 hours last night and haven't been to bed yet and they have got to get back to work pretty soon, too.

MR. MACHEN. We have been making them work overtime?

MR. ROCHON. That is the understatement of the year.

MR. SPINKS. I have been through two wars already, and I am not afraid to fight, but we do need a little ammunition or something to fight back with and we don't have that here.

In a speech by our President just a while back, he encouraged all Americans to take up their places of responsibility beginning with the home and the community, and then our places of employment, in every area and every walk of life.

Now, my people have nominated me to serve them as Chairman. They are turning to me and now I am turning to you, I have got to turn to somebody, we have got to have some answers somewhere. They expect us to do something, and we are literally sitting on a powder keg at the GPO, and something is going to pop soon unless we have some drastic action taken, and now.

What are our places of responsibility anyhow? I think we have some real good citizens. What do you want us to do, what can we do?

One thing I would like to bring out right now, now you folks have been nice enough to help to arrange for parking lots all over the city and shuttle us back and forth on busses. But we are parking in 10 different places now, and we have the same problems, they are scattered all out where the police couldn't protect us if they wanted to. While

they are trying to get legislation passed, I wish that they would give us a parking lot close by, clean out those old buildings or something, and get some lights out while they are trying to get some legislation through, and get lights and some kind of police protection.

Man, I am telling you it is not safe to walk a block with two or three men any time of night.

Just here a while back some of our folks were invited over to see how this end of the Congressional Record worked, and to see the functions and all over here in the Congress. Well, I would like to extend the same courtesy to you folks to come over there and see how that end works and walk to work with us and help these men to set on these linotype machines and produce the work for the Congressional Record every night. That is all I have to say, thank you.

Mr. DOWDY. The next gentleman.

Mr. ROSENBLUND. I represent the night proof room at the Government Printing Office. I guess as well as Darwin Spinks or any of the other gentlemen here we have had as many beatings and we have men today, we have a man today after a beating two years ago he still suffers from a wrist that is bent and will never be the same, and he has lost teeth, money, and he has been inconvenienced and his sick leave and annual leave have gone down the drain, nobody is going to give him that back.

Mr. Hines touched on a subject about the building that we have in the neighborhood that don't house anybody and it is certainly going to cost the Redevelopment Land Agency more money two years or three years from now than it will today to tear the buildings down. Labor isn't going down, it is going up. We don't know why they are standing there, all they do is house criminals or whatever you want to call them, thugs.

I had occasion a couple of weeks ago when a police officer took me down there to show a car that was stripped. He didn't even want to take me down there. He felt his life was in danger and he had a pistol on his hip. Now, this is the neighborhood that we have to walk through.

We had occasion, what touched a lot of this off was back in May a woman by the name of Mrs. Bish—Mr. Bish was up in a proof room, as a matter of fact his name is in the style manual, she came down to put in retirement papers for her husband, and this is 10:00 o'clock in the morning, on North Capitol Street was beaten up and robbed. Today she still suffers. She has a broken shoulder, she will never lift her arm above her head the rest of her life.

All of these things aren't necessary. But it all goes back to law enforcement. We don't have enough policemen. We have been told, off the cuff we have been told, that that precinct over there is short 100 men. Why are they short 100 men? Don't we pay enough taxes to hire enough people to put in these precincts? If the men won't take these jobs there must be a reason. What is the reason? We all know what the reason is, nobody is backing up the policeman. Everybody is backing up the criminal. It seems the thing to do today is be the criminal.

I am more concerned with right now what I have as a situation developing in my chapel. The Government Printing Office about a month or two ago found it necessary to issue a memorandum stating the law in the District of Columbia about carrying weapons, and

believe me that Government Printing Office is becoming an armed camp, and it is all I would like to see some innocent person protecting their life kill somebody who deserves dying, and what are they going to get, they are going to get plenty of misery because they are going to be charged with murder, their families are going to suffer, friends are going to suffer, and why? Just to protect themselves.

We have this, and other things can develop. We have men who come in there with weapons, we try to talk them out of it, they say "Well, supply us with protection." We can't supply them with protection. We can't protect ourselves.

You have men, we work in teams and partners, we work under tension, we are working 10, 12 hours a day, we are working 6 and 7 days a week. We don't spend as much time with our wives as we do with our partners, and I don't think there is a man in this room can spend as many hours with his wife without an argument once in a while, and we do have arguments, and that is all we need to do is somebody pull out a pistol and shoot his best friend because that pistol happens to be handy.

And why is it handy? Because he needs it for protection.

Now, we have had, like I say, we have had other things, we have men who have purchased new automobiles and others that won't purchase new automobiles; which doesn't help the economy. They won't purchase new automobiles. Why? Because they are just going to be stolen.

We have a case where a man went out and bought a new Chevrolet Corvette, put all kinds of locks on it, put them on the hood, put them on the rims, put them on the wheels and what did they do? They laid them out on the seat and took the motor. We don't have any protection, that is what we need.

This parking lot situation, we find it hard to criticize the management of the Government Printing Office, we know how hard it is for them to meet the terms that we expect them to meet. They have a lot here, and they have a lot there and like Mr. Spinks said it is almost impossible to protect the people coming and going from these lots. It is almost impossible to explain to our people why those buildings have to remain standing when they don't house anyone. They are not going to house anyone. Why aren't they parking lots?

Why doesn't an agency that employs 7,500 people have a parking lot? Industry outside that is comparable to the Government Printing Office have to have parking lots. Most of your communities would not even let them operate unless they supply their people with parking lots because the counties and cities and so forth, they can't take care of these things. The companies have to do it. Why can't the GPO do it? Why can't other agencies do it? This is the answer that we have to give our men and we don't have them. I don't know if we are going to get them here today or any other time, but this is something we should be working for because we are just getting people hit over the head every day, cars robbed every night.

We had a man bought a new car a couple of months ago, was stolen two weeks ago, they had to order new parts that were taken off, he got the car back, he hasn't even got the parts that were ordered and it is stolen again. So that is all I have to say, gentlemen.

Mr. DOWDY. I will say this: This committee is attempting to provide parking lots, I don't know whether we will get the cooperation everywhere that is necessary, and also as far as the police we are trying to get them under some sort of organization where they won't have the restrictions placed on them to keep them from protecting people. We are doing what we can along that line.

Mr. HINES. Yes, sir, one other thing before we adjourn or we will recess ourselves from your presence, on this Black United Front thing, I would like to make one statement on that. I think I voice the concern and what is in the minds of most of the working people in this community, I know in our union, I think it is a disgrace that we have members of the City Council backing up such an organization as this: I am the first one to say don't cut out the right of free speech of anybody because we make our living off of free speech and the publicizing of it, publication of it. But I think it is a crime that members of the City Council have made it justifiable in the image of this Black United Front to kill a cop or kill anybody that stands in their way, and I think these people on the City Council if they don't have the good sense to resign after making such a statement, I think that action should be taken that they should be removed from the City Council, if necessary.

Mr. DOWDY. It was my understanding that probably this member of the City Council you are speaking of is backed up by the rest of them or at least the majority of the rest of the Council anyway.

Mr. HINES. Yes, it is really a shame that that thing has to go on.

Mr. MACHEN. I might just ask for the record—you all mentioned the buildings abandoned, are they government owned, do you know, or not?

Mr. HINES. I really couldn't tell you.

Mr. MACHEN. If we had someone from my office or the staff go down there and pinpoint these buildings where we could get the addresses and so forth then perhaps we could ascertain and what could be done.

Mr. HINES. I think the vice president of our union, Mr. Taylor, can probably tell you. He is probably more informed on that than most of us.

Mr. TAYLOR. The RLA does have title to these buildings. These have been condemned and 70 percent are unoccupied and the ones that are living there are living there on a 30-day notice.

Mr. DOWDY. If they were decent buildings the RLA would already have torn them down.

Mr. TAYLOR. This entire area from North Capitol to 1st Street Northwest and from H Street to I Street, if they could tear that down and put a parking lot in there it would answer a lot of the problems. There is nothing but a bunch of slums and most of the places have been condemned; at least 90 percent of this is owned by RLA but all of it facing on H Street adjacent to GPO has been acquired by RLA.

Mr. ROCHON. I think you will find also the triangle across the street from the Main Post Office borders on G Street and North Capitol and Massachusetts Avenue, most of that, I think is in the same position, and G Street, according to the Police Department, is the worst street in the area, the Government Printing Office, and, boy, they really have something over there, pool halls.

Mr. DOWDY. The most dangerous street you mean?

Mr. ROCHON. In that particular area. As moved down from K Street to Eye Street to Defrees Street and now G Street holds that distinction.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend Mr. Hines, and all of the members of his organization, for appearing here this morning and for the testimony that he gave to this Committee. I think it is one of the most effective, informative presentations that I have heard during the 16 years I have been a member of the Congress.

You stated a moment ago, Mr. Hines, that Commissioner Murphy, or whatever his title is, had criticized your union, and I should like to commend you and all of the several chapters which I believe comprise your organization—

Mr. HINES. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROYHILL (continuing). For the tremendous and most effective job that you have done for your members throughout the year.

I have had several contacts with you on many employee problems, such as grievances about assignments or promotions, or problems in obtaining a job, and I would say that if all unions could do as effective a job as you have done for your members, the rating of the unions in the eyes of the American people would rise at least 50 to 75 percent. So I commend you for the job you have done for your people, and particularly during the recent months during the crises when your members were faced with loss of life and limb when it would have been easy to have a wildcat strike. Because of your knowledge, you knew they could not legally call one, and through your leadership your members had the loyalty and determination, along with your encouragement to stay on duty and see this thing through. I think this deserves the heartfelt thanks and appreciation of the members of Congress, who are dependent upon you for getting the information, which they must have in order to operate, printed each day.

So I want the record to show that one member of this Committee, and I am sure the other members agree with me, feels that you deserve the commendation of the Congress for your effective leadership and the wonderful job you have done for the members of your organization.

Now, as the Chairman pointed out, this committee has reported out a parking bill, which we believe will take care of a major part of the parking problem. We all recognize that this is not the only such problem, but it is one of them. Actually, the bill that the committee has reported, places emphasis on the problem at the Government Printing Office and declared that its resolution is to have the very highest priority. That was put in the bill as a result of the actions of you and your union in calling to our attention that this is an emergency problem which must be acted upon immediately.

There is no reason why this matter cannot be acted on immediately, Mr. Chairman, because the land is already in the hands of the government and the bill provides for immediate construction of these parking facilities on government or District-owned land. So this can be done immediately and relief can be provided in the near future.

Of course, it was also through your actions that we were able to obtain some cooperation from the Congress for a temporary relief.

Also, as the Chairman pointed out, this Committee has under consideration a bill that would take the Metropolitan Police Department out from under the jurisdiction of the City Government. Now, I don't think any responsible legislation completely provides what may be the

best approach to this problem, but we certainly recognize that the Police Department is not receiving the backing and the support which it needs to enforce the law effectively in the District of Columbia.

So I am quite confident that this Committee will take some action in that direction, to assure the members of the Police Department more backing from the people to whom they are to be responsible.

I think it is a disgrace, and as a member of Congress, I am ashamed, that it was necessary to have a group of people such as yours, loyal employees of our government, come before a Committee of the Congress in order to ask for protection of your lives and limbs in order to render an essential service to your Congress.

I think this is a political situation. As Mr. Machen pointed out, this is not a partisan matter, but it is political nonetheless and I agree with you that the American people are going to be called upon to express their feelings this fall. We all know that there are many politicians and people in high places who are pussyfooting on this issue. They are claiming that we need to spend more money in the ghettos, and to pacify and pamper these lawbreakers or law violators.

The odds are about 20 or 30 to 1, Mr. Chairman, that if you commit an act of violence in the District of Columbia you will go off scot-free; so anyone who doesn't want to have respect for his neighbors in a free society has a pretty good chance of getting by with inflicting himself upon the freedom and welfare of other people.

So I think the American people should require their elected officials to stand up and be counted on this subject this fall, regardless of whether he is a Republican or Democrat, because it is naive not to recognize that there are those in high places who are appealing to various organized minority pressure groups for their votes, and who are fearful of saying firmly, "By golly, you ought to be punished and punished severely whenever you violate the laws of this land."

I agree with you that we don't need more laws on the books. We just need some guts and some backbone in the enforcement of the laws we now have.

I thank the Chairman for calling these hearings. There is a lot of work to be done here in the District of Columbia, and this group has certainly brought before us a lot of valuable information.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Attorney General. I am not going to take the time of the Committee to read it, but I am going to discuss it on the Floor of the House today. At least I intend to do so, and to put it in the record.

I had written to the Attorney General about a month or perhaps two months ago. There were several reports of threats and intimidation against many merchants here in the District of Columbia, and demands that various sections of the District were going to have to be all black communities, with all the merchants required to be Negroes, and the white merchants being forced to get out of the community.

Merchants also were threatened if they did not put certain placards and posters in their windows declaring a holiday for the birthday of Malcolm X, and several other events they felt should be of national importance. I received a reply from the Attorney General, and there is just one sentence here that might be of interest to this committee. I would like to insert the whole letter in the record:

"Section 241 of Title 18 of the United States Code prohibits conspiracies which threaten or intimidate persons in the exercise of rights guaranteed them by the Constitution or laws of the United States. The courts have uniformly held that the right to operate a business is not in and of itself a right secured by the Constitution, and there are no federal statutory provisions securing the right to operate or maintain a business."

And yet we have people coming to Washington and threatening to disrupt the operation of our government if we do not provide them with subsidies, welfare, and handouts at the expense of the taxpayers, as if that were a right provided them by the Constitution.

Business people in our Nation's Capital cannot appeal to the Attorney General of the United States for protection so that they can stay in business, even, if they have the courage to continue to operate, here in the District of Columbia.

I say that these are things that the American people are concerned about, and that there is something that all of us politicians do not have to be subtle or naive about. I think the American people should know about your problem, and that candidates for all public offices should be required to stand up and be counted, and to tell the American people what they intend to do to bring about better enforcement of law and order in the Nation's Capital, and everywhere else in this country.

I commend you again and thank you for coming here and letting us have your suggestions and advice.

(The documents referred to follow :)

UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, April 30, 1968.

HON. RAMSEY CLARK,
Attorney General of the United States, Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I should like to formally request that you initiate an investigation to determine if there exists in the District of Columbia a conspiracy by so-called Black Power groups to deprive a minority group, in this case a white minority, of its Constitutional and civil rights.

The enclosed newspaper clippings describe in some detail anti-white, and especially anti-semitic actions by representatives of Black Power groups. I am sure you will agree that if Negro merchants were harassed, looted, their enterprises burned by fire bombs, and open incitements and threats made against them solely on the basis of the color of their skin, the Department of Justice could and would find adequate legal grounds, civil rights or otherwise, to protect them. I feel that the white minority in the District of Columbia are entitled to the same protection from your Department, and I therefore urge that you initiate the necessary steps to afford them protection.

Your early attention to this critical situation will be appreciated.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

JOEL T. BROYHILL,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, July 22, 1968.

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROYHILL: This is in reply to your letter to the Attorney General of April 30, 1968, and the enclosed newspaper clippings concerning the alleged harassment of white businessmen in the District of Columbia by Negroes.

We have reviewed carefully your correspondence and the enclosed clippings and have concluded that there is no statute administered by this Department covering the specific type of activity described in the clippings.

Section 241 of Title 18 of the United States Code prohibits conspiracies which threaten or intimidate persons in the exercise of rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution or laws of the United States. The courts have uniformly held that the right to operate a business is not in and of itself a right secured by the Constitution, and there are no federal statutory provisions securing the right to operate or maintain a business. Therefore section 241 would appear to be inapplicable to interferences with an individual's conduct of his business relations even though that interference were premised on or motivated by racial considerations.

Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. section 245(b) (3), which punishes threats or incidents of violence against businessmen "during or incident to a riot or civil disorders" also is inapplicable. That section is applicable only to acts which occur during or incident to a riot, and there is no indication that the acts that are the subject of the newspaper clippings can be so characterized.

Other provisions of Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 provide penalties for intimidation on account of race or color of individuals in the exercise of certain enumerated rights such as attending school utilizing public accommodations and serving on juries. But this section would provide no penalty for intimidation of a businessman unless he were engaged in one of these enumerated activities and in addition it were clear that his participation in that particular activity was the reason for the harassment.

The matter that you have brought to our attention therefore does not appear to violate any laws administered by this Department. However I want to assure you that our policy with respect to enforcement of the civil rights laws is to investigate incidents we have cause to believe may involve violations of those laws regardless of whether such incidents involve harassment of whites by Negroes or Negroes by whites.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. POLLAK,
Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division.

[News release from the Department of Justice, July 29, 1968]

The Department of Justice filed suit today charging Roper Hospital in Charleston, South Carolina with discriminating against Negroes in violation of two sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Attorney General Ramsey Clark said the civil suit, brought in United States District Court in Charleston, alleged violations of the public accommodations and employment sections of the 1964 Act.

The Department sought a court order barring the private hospital from discriminating racially in admitting patients, hiring staff members or permitting use of any facility.

Roper Hospital has discontinued various federal financial assistance since enactment of the 1964 Act, which includes a section forbidding discrimination in federally-assisted programs.

But the Department said the hospital is covered by the public accommodations section because it contains a cafeteria and a snack bar.

The section, which lists eating facilities as being covered, also covers any establishment that houses a covered facility and purports to serve its patrons.

The suit said the hospital does not admit Negroes and furnishes them limited out-patient service on a racially-segregated basis.

It was also asserted that the hospital, which employs 523 persons, hires few if any Negroes as professional or clerical workers and provides racially-segregated facilities for its employees.

Negroes are employed exclusively or almost exclusively as orderlies, practical nurses, nurses' aides, service workers and unskilled laborers, the suit said.

Mr. HINES. We appreciate it, and we thank Congressman Machen for asking us here. We went maybe a little far afield, Congressman Dowdy, but I think it is better to get things off your chest than to let them build up inside of you, and to let you people, who have the responsibility of enacting legislation, know how we feel.

Mr. MACHEN. I am very indebted to the Committee Chairman and the Chairman of this Subcommittee for making it possible for the

business people, the government employees, and we have some other people here who I feel will have just startling testimony that I felt should be a part of the record. I do deeply appreciate, Mr. Chairman, your making it possible for the little man also to be heard.

Mr. Dowdy. What Mr. Broyhill says about condoning some of the criminal acts by many officials, it is also true that for the past several years we have had officials in our government aiding and abetting, encouraging, recommending these acts, demonstrations and civil disobedience. It is just unbelievable that supposedly responsible Federal officials would not only condone, but praise and recommend, violation of law.

Mr. HINES. Yes, it is.

We thank you, sir, and we appreciate your cooperation and your kind patience.

Mr. Dowdy. We appreciate your being here.

Mr. HINES. Thank you.

Mr. Dowdy. The D. C. Transit Company drivers are here.

I am sorry you all have had to wait so long. We promised you will be heard, and you will if you will all come around and sit in these chairs.

Now, then, who will be the spokesman?

What is your name?

STATEMENT OF RODNEY W. RICHMOND, ACCOMPANIED BY LLOYD HOWARD SHANDS, JR.; GLENARD JAMES PHILLIPS, JR.; AND MARTIN E. KANE, BUS DRIVERS, D.C. TRANSIT, INC.

Mr. RICHMOND. My name is Richmond.

Mr. Dowdy. Rodney Richmond?

Mr. RICHMOND. Right.

Mr. Dowdy. All right. You may proceed.

Mr. RICHMOND. First of all, Mr. Chairman, we do a service for the people of the United States or Washington, D. C., that has to be done, and we do not see why we should have to do a service that has to be done with a whole lot of harassment, robbing, people spitting on you, breaking your windows.

You are driving down the street with 50 or 60 people on the bus, and somebody throws a brick through the window or a beer bottle or a Coke bottle, and you lose control of that vehicle, and who knows where you are. You might end up down in the basement, and so forth and so forth, and you have people whose lives are in your hands, and the whole blame is on you.

Three years ago if you did not work a certain line in a certain section of the city, you did not have to worry about being robbed. Now it has gotten to the point where you can be robbed any place in the city at any time of the year, and any time of the day.

Now, they have come out with this new idea of scrip. They have been working it from 8:00 p.m. to 4:00 a.m.

Mr. Dowdy. That is at night?

Mr. RICHMOND. At night, yes. We have not had any robberies during that time. There is no money out there. There is no reason to rob anybody out there. So we have not had any robberies.

Now we are going to do it on a 24-hour basis starting Sunday. This is good for us, the bus drivers, 3,000 of us. But what about the 800,000 people who work and live here in Washington, who ride the bus some time or other, it is going to cause a whole lot of inconvenience to these people when they give a dollar to the bus driver, he cannot give them anything in change but scrip. If a person happens to live over in Glover Park or McLean Gardens, he has to come down Sunday or Saturday way up to the other side of town to get his change, which is about 80 cents, 73 cents really.

Now, he will probably say, "Forget it." So all that money stays in D.C. Transit, making this man a little bigger, and making the man who is just working for a living, just trying to make ends meet, he is going to lose that money because he has to go to the other side of town to get that money, and it is going to be a whole lot of inconvenience to him, and I say this without wondering as to the effect that some of these, some of us, are going to be hurt when we tell these people we do not have any change to give them, we do not have any change at all, after we give them this scrip, explaining there is no doubt in my mind that some of us are going to be hurt.

Now, it has gotten to the point that you can be driving a bus, say, up F Street, for instance, in the afternoon, when the rush hour is going on, and you can be going along, and you can come to a bus stop and you can see the pickpockets standing there waiting to get on the bus because it is crowded.

I am not a policeman, none of these men who work with me are policemen, but they can pick out a pickpocket just as readily as I can, and just as soon as a person gets on a bus, you are not a policeman, you cannot stop this guy. All you can do is holler, like I do, all these times, "Ladies, watch your pocketbooks. Pickpockets are on the bus."

We see them, actually see them, but we cannot stop them. It has actually gotten that bad.

We have had guys robbed—today or tomorrow the guy will come back on the bus and give him his wallet back, come face to face with the guy who did the robbing, and give his wallet back, for the simple reason he knows nothing is going to happen to him. It is tax-free money—why not rob?

Mr. MACHEN. Tell us some details. Did you make a movie of one of those?

Mr. RICHMOND. Yes, I made a movie, Congressman Machen. In fact, you called my bluff. I told you I could make a movie of what goes on every day around the buses. I took this movie, and the movie came out real good. The Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority saw the movie, and they said that this is good. They said, "We are going to have to have this," and they took the movie, they took the film, and they sent it to New York and that is where it is now.

I planned on bringing this film down here and actually showing it to you. Actually, it is what goes on or the people climbing in the back windows of buses or scaring people off the buses, operators being chased off buses. I mean this can happen any day, any time of year. I can take my camera and go out and take you pictures of things that you would not believe.

I am not a good speaker, but I believe in showing you exactly what is going on, and that is what I planned to do today, but the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority has the film now.

Now, insofar as like the policemen work six days a week, we work six days a week, also. We are about 140 men short. That is 140 buses. They carry 51 people. Nobody wants the job.

The guys who once worked at it or retired are quitting with 13 and 14 years seniority. They cannot afford to stay on the job for fear of their lives or losing a limb or going blind, and so forth.

Now, it has got to the point where some of the fellows are actually carrying guns. I do not carry a gun. I would not want to shoot nobody, yet still I do not know—I do not want nobody to shoot me.

What I did do one time, I would always carry myself a R-C cola bottle. If anybody was attacking me I was going to try to wear that coke bottle out on him. And what I could tell the law was that I found this coke bottle rolling around on the floor, and they could not get me for concealed weapon. Why should I have to go around like this? It is not necessary.

Half the drivers at one time at night were carrying guns, scared to death. We had one man who was jumped on out in Northeast, beaten on the ground, and beaten, he begged the people to leave him alone. He pulled his gun out and shot one of them to keep them from killing him.

They fired him because he saved his life. They had to take him to the hospital, and before he was fired he had to stay in the hospital I do not know for how long, and when he came back they dismissed him because he had this gun, but he saved his life.

Mr. DOWDY. They ought to have given him a medal.

Mr. RICHMOND. I say more power to a man like this.

But what we are trying to say simply, anything that goes on in the District of Columbia we are part of it. I do not care what it is, civil disturbance, civil disobedience, riots, anything, we have to be a part of it because it is our job.

If you need extra policemen to go out in these areas, we are the ones who have the buses to take these people there. We take them there. Anything that happens, happy times, sad times, sorrow, we are there. This is out type job and we do it.

But we do not see why we should have to work and take so much harassment and so much beating and even danger to our lives as well as people who ride the bus also.

So we are just simply asking that something be done. We do not have a solution, but the main thing that we are actually asking for is prosecution.

We have men who have been robbed. They get on the bus every day, like I say, these guys, maybe I work a line today and I work a different line tomorrow, all right. I might see the guy who robbed me. Well, I cannot do anything. I mean, if I catch the guy and hold him, and I am going, supposed to go to court, the next day, somebody from my company will tell me he will make me believe that I will be in grave danger if I go down and prosecute him. This may sound very untrue.

Mr. DOWDY. Your employer won't permit you to prosecute?

Mr. RICHMOND. I am not saying he won't permit you, but I will say he will inflict fear in your heart that he will do something if you go down and prosecute the man who has robbed you.

I caught a man one time coming out of the garage with our trap box—we carry money in our boxes—I ran down the street and caught this man, brought him back to the garage and called the police. They came to find out he had two trap boxes. He had hid one outside and was coming back for another one. All right.

The police came, they took him down. I went home. I got off that night, my car was torn up. This guy had been released before I got off duty, and I was turning in then. It was just the simple fact that they make us believe that they will fire us, which they can't, they will make the guys believe they will fire them if they go down and go down to the courts and appear and be a witness and say, "Yes, this is the guy who robbed me."

Mr. DOWDY. It seems to me that is inviting more trouble. Prosecutions and punishment will deter criminals. Remove that fear, and the problem becomes worse.

Mr. RICHMOND. I say, Mr. Chairman, it is not inviting, it is breeding crime.

Mr. DOWDY. Well, that is true.

I was a prosecutor for eight years before I came to Congress, and every once in a while there would be some complaining witness who would be afraid to testify or would not want to prosecute because of the fear of the consequences; I was always able to persuade them of the error of their ways, that the only way you can stop crime is to have prosecutions and give criminals adequate punishment for what they have done, punish them the amount that they deserve.

I just cannot conceive, it is really unbelievable or almost unbelievable, that an employer or company would refuse to prosecute, and certainly they should encourage an employee to testify against anyone who was depredating on the company's business or property.

Mr. RICHMOND. This is unheard of. I think what the company is afraid of, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that so many times people here tend to jump on D.C. Transit about anything that they do, and they are afraid to have a write-up in the paper, "D.C. Transit gives a 16-year-old boy or 18-year-old kid or 19-year-old kid," which they really are, big as I am, 19-year-old kid, "three years for assaulting a driver." They have to have this written up in the paper.

Mr. DOWDY. It is a ridiculous situation, calling an 18, 19, 20-year-old thug a child because they are not children.

Mr. RICHMOND. Yes.

Mr. DOWDY. All the papers are guilty of that, and it is pretty bad.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I might add that these are the key spokesmen. They are representing a representative group of 40 or 50 of them I met with right here in this room, and one of the reasons why I requested you all to permit, to have additional hearings, is what this gentleman has just stated and the impression I got from all the bus drivers, that the company has a policy of frowning on their participation in attempting to arrest these people or attempting to have anything done to them, if they cause trouble on the buses.

If they do it they have to go to court, they do it on their own time. I mean it is not on company time, even though it is company property that is involved, and it was just startling to me this permissive attitude on the other side of the fence, so to speak.

Mr. RICHMOND. Just to give you an idea, this is one of the things that goes on at D.C. Transit.

Last year, all of 1967—1967 now—we had a million and a half worth of buses and glass or seats and glass destroyed, a million and a half dollars, and robberies, too.

Now, this year it is going to be much higher than that. In the event that some safety director from the District was to come down and go over the buses of D.C. Transit, and enforce the law like they really are supposed to be enforced insofar as like a cab or a public transportation vehicle cannot operate with a broken glass or cracked glass, you would stop half the transportation in the Washington, D.C., area, because nearly every one of our buses has some type of cracked window, and he just cannot replace them fast enough.

Mr. BROYHILL. You say a million and a half dollars?

Mr. RICHMOND. A million and a half. That was last year, 1967.

Mr. BROYHILL. A million and a half!

Mr. RICHMOND. A million and a half dollars in seats and glass. This is just last year. This year it is going to be much higher than this because of the civil disturbance.

Mr. BROYHILL. Actually, Mr. Chairman, the mere fact that we have a provision in the law for the waiver of the motor vehicle fuel tax and other taxes for D.C. Transit if the revenue or the income is not at a certain level, means this has to be paid for by the taxpayers.

Mr. RICHMOND. I do not know anything about that, but I am just saying a million and a half.

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes.

Mr. RICHMOND. It is quite a bit of money, and this year I imagine it will go to \$2 million, and you take these fellows, this guy has been robbed five times.

Mr. BROYHILL. Do you gentlemen represent the union itself, or are you just individuals?

Mr. RICHMOND. No, we are just individuals of the union. What Mr. Machen is speaking of, he invited us down prior to this meeting and we were talking to him, and we were telling him some of the things that were going on, and he really could not believe some of the things we were saying. I told him that I would bring this film, and he called my bluff and he said, "You do it."

Mr. MACHEN. I did not say I did not believe it. I wanted to make certain it would go in the official records.

Mr. RICHMOND. He said for me to bring in the evidence.

Mr. BROYHILL. Truth is stranger than fiction.

Mr. RICHMOND. It is, it really is.

Mr. BROYHILL. Did I understand correctly that you were criticizing the scrip system, when you were talking about the inconvenience of it?

Mr. RICHMOND. It is not an inconvenience to me or the drivers, it is not an inconvenience at all to us. In fact, we welcome it, we grab our transfers and the scrip in the morning and we are off.

The first week or so is going to be kind of rough on us because a lot of people do not understand.

Mr. BROYHILL. Do you support it?

Mr. RICHMOND. Oh, yes, right now, because it keeps us from being robbed. We had one robbery Monday. This happened during the day. A guy was walking down the street and some guys walked up behind

him and said, "Keep walking," and they walked up an apartment eight floors and robbed him.

Mr. BROYHILL. I thought the drivers had insisted upon it, and that the company had resisted up until recently.

Mr. RICHMOND. Yes, they had resisted it.

Mr. BROYHILL. Of course, you are experienced in this. You mentioned the case of a person who would go far to get his change.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The only problem with the scrip is like I find out, I work in one of the worst ghetto areas, I think, in Washington, D.C., and that is Benning Road from H Street on out of town.

Now, here is a man on Friday night, he just got paid. This guy has got a \$5 bill, and he is half high, he climbs up on the bus and he asks to change it, he asks change or tokens. I say, "I am sorry, I cannot make change." He says, "I am not getting off the bus and I want to ride it." I am not a policeman and I cannot put him off. After 8:00 o'clock you explain that we issue scrip, and you explain how scrip works. This guy is not buying. This guy is not giving up \$5.

Mr. BROYHILL. You are kind of damned if you do and damned if you don't! If you don't have the change you are going to get sluggish, and if you do have it you are going to be robbed.

You have to use the trial and error method as to what might be a more streamlined or more effective way of doing this. But the idea of requiring passengers to have the exact change, might work once people got used to it. I would think you could make it effective except for those instances where a thug gets on and want to get the free ride.

Mr. PHILLIPS. You see, that is all I haul.

Mr. BROYHILL. But it requires, you know—

Mr. DOWDY. He says he does not have any other kind of riders.

Mr. BROYHILL. You have to have the change for the telephone or for cigarette slot machines.

Mr. RICHMOND. It will work out once it got started.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The only trouble is the type of people I haul you cannot talk to them.

Mr. MACHEN. Let me ask Mr. Phillips, even before you had the scrip system you had this thing of people saying, "We are going to ride, period."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Right.

Mr. MACHEN. When that did occur would you try to stop them, tell the police about that or if not, why not? I want to pinpoint it because this is part of what he said.

Mr. RICHMOND. Here is one thing, it comes back to the company again. The company wants no trouble. They want no trouble whatsoever.

Now, you are to have nobody locked up under any circumstances. This is the first law. You are to have no one locked up under any circumstances, child, woman, old man, nobody is to be locked up.

We have fellows, like when, who was here just before us—

Mr. DOWDY. The Government Printing Office.

Mr. RICHMOND. The Government Printing Office, when these fellows take these women and escort them to the buses, they leave them, and then we are in charge or they think we are in charge, those women who are hovering around us like we are the law.

There is nothing we can do, there is not a thing. I know a man personally, I can show it to you by time of year, a woman was being beaten, somebody was trying to take her pocketbook, and she was trying to hold on to it, and this guy has got a razor cut from here to here just because he got off the bus to see what was going on. It started on the bus; in fact, it was happening right there on the steps of the bus, and he got up out of his seat, and no sooner was he out of his seat when he got a razor cut from here to here, and he will carry this scar for the rest of his life. He knows who that is, who cut him. He knows who did it, but he cannot testify at all because he is afraid that he is going to lose his job.

Mr. DOWDY. Is he a bus driver?

Mr. RICHMOND. Yes, he is a bus driver, yes. But these women——

Mr. BROYHILL. You mean if he testified he would lose his job?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The company does not want any publicity.

Mr. RICHMOND. He would not lose his job, but the company says he will lose his job. They inflict the fear he will lose his job. They cannot fire you for that, but they maybe fire you for some little misdemeanor later on, like being late for work. There are other ways of getting you.

Just like in the Army, you go one way or the other. So these are some of the things we are confronted with.

Once these policemen escort these women to the buses, these women stick around us and think we are policemen. They figure somebody is going to attack them. They feel the "bus driver is going to help me," and we have been given strict orders to stay out of that.

Mr. BROYHILL. Do you have policemen riding on the buses at night?

Mr. RICHMOND. Well, a policeman is like a sore thumb. Nothing happens while a policeman is there, and it is just like some of these end-of-the-lines, policemen are sitting there or detectives sitting there and in their so-called unmarked cars. A kid can pick it out, a kid knows it is a detective sitting there. He is not going to rob nobody while the detective is sitting there.

So the next night nobody is there, and you get robbed.

We have one man who is a new man he worked 11 days and got robbed seven days out of 11. This does not make sense.

He is actually he is doing a public service to the people of Washington, D.C. Still, now he went back on to——

Mr. MACHEN. Let me ask you this in connection with that one man.

When you report in on that does the company report it to the police or not?

Mr. RICHMOND. Oh, yes. This is another thing. Once you are robbed, a gun stuck in your nose, you are afraid of death, you are trembling and you are afraid to go back to work. A guy is scared, a gun is stuck under his nose, and if you have \$90 in your pocket, if you have anything over \$11, you have to pay this back. You have \$80 company money in your pocket; if a guy comes in with a gun and takes it from you it is a robbery, right? But still you have to pay it back to the company. You never heard nothing like that.

Mr. BROYHILL. You have to replace the money?

Mr. RICHMOND. You have to replace every penny over \$11 if you do not have it locked up in your box.

Mr. BROYHILL. I see.

Mr. RICHMOND. Yet but that is still a robbery.

Mr. BROYHILL. How much change do you carry, company money?

Mr. RICHMOND. Well, it varies. Some runs carry \$40, some \$20, some carry—

Mr. BROYHILL. And you have it locked in the box?

Mr. RICHMOND. Not all of it, some you have to work with. Like you have a barrel of quarters, sometimes nickels, and the others are supposed to be locked up, and as you sell tokens or as you give change, you put the dollar bills in your pocket, and the moment you get over \$11 you take this money and put it in the locked box. It is just a little bit of a locked box there.

Mr. BROYHILL. When is it that you will have the scrip?

Mr. RICHMOND. Sunday, the 4th of August.

Mr. BROYHILL. All around the clock?

Mr. RICHMOND. Right.

Mr. BROYHILL. You won't carry any change?

Mr. RICHMOND. We won't carry any change, won't carry anything.

Mr. SHANDS. I would like to say something more about this scrip.

The run I am working now, I worked last year and the year before last, as a matter of fact, the year before that, this is the fourth time that I have chosen it, the people that were paying then are paying now. It is the guys who were not paying then who are not paying now.

Mr. DOWDY. You are talking about people who get on the bus and refuse to pay you?

Mr. SHANDS. Yes. They are not going to pay anyway so I do not think there is any question of working with the thug who has made up his mind not to pay.

Mr. DOWDY. What are your instructions from the company when somebody gets on and won't pay?

Mr. SHANDS. You are supposed to collect the fare if you can, just what force is necessary, there is not any force, you just ask.

Mr. RICHMOND. They tell you collect the fare if possible.

Mr. SHANDS. But other than that you go on, but it is a terrible thing to have 20 people who won't pay.

Mr. MACHEN. If that is true, if you put the scrip system in for the law-abiding citizens, all the others have to say is, "I am not going to give you money for scrip," and they won't pay, and they get a free ride.

Mr. SHANDS. If you have 20 people who pay and you get this one guy who did not pay, that makes it rough.

Mr. DOWDY. What is your name?

Mr. KANE. My name is Martin Kane.

Mr. DOWDY. You go ahead and make your statement.

Mr. KANE. In regard to the discussion that has been going on in regard to the scrip system, this program has been inaugurated for about two weeks or three weeks and has been proven successful in regard to retarding robberies.

The program was carried out under the direction of the WMATC, and will begin 24 hours this coming Sunday.

Along with this scrip system in order to provide protection for the drivers, the Amalgamated Union has also requested the D. C. Transit System to construct safety shields around the operators to retard assaults. This is being at the present time thrashed over between the

company, the union and the WMATC. We are in hopes that this will be another addition in regard to the safety of the bus drivers.

This scrip system has created a problem, I understand, with cab drivers. The cab drivers' union has called our union offices shortly after we inaugurated the scrip system, with the complaint that we were driving the thugs to robbing cab drivers.

Our problem in coming here is actually the fact that the type of people who are on the street and who are assaulting not only bus drivers but members of the typographical union and the general public of Washington are here in number, they have been here and they have progressed with such a rapid pace over the last few years, with no deterrent to stop them, it seems to me that it is only going to be a matter of time before the members of the Metropolitan Police Department are going to be forced to resign their positions, as well as any other responsible person, and I know from the records on a slide-scale basis, that the rate at which the robberies in our business have increased over the last eight years, would make any successful businessman envy them.

This dollars and cents gain, I do not think there is any industry in the country that has made the progress that the robbers, so to speak, as a private industrialist can show for gain.

Mr. DOWDY. I have stated that any mother who is raising her son to be a criminal is derelict in her duty to him if she does not bring him to Washington, D.C., to practice his profession. Here, he will be protected by the courts from punishment.

Mr. KANE. It seems to me that one of our problems is the fact that we all know we are not getting the backing of the law enforcement agencies. We have policemen; we do not know why they cannot do their job. We look up to them, we envy them.

I personally believe we have the finest and most intelligent group of policemen in the country right here in Washington. I have had the opportunity to work with the police department on different occasions during the riots and the civil disturbances, and they know within the nth degree as to what they can accomplish, what they can do, and what they cannot do.

When I first came here to Washington I came here with the idea that, at that time, I was living in a rural area which was being hit by the recession in the late '50's, and I thought that as a responsible individual and as the father of a large family that I would move to a more lucrative location where I could support my family without going on welfare, without asking anybody's help, to find a job and to do my best.

Coming to Washington where I understood there never had been any suffering or depression, the economy was great, I did not intend to settle as a bus driver, but after starting out in that career I found it to be quite lucrative and I prospered. But with the threats of losing a limb or losing my life and leaving a widow and children to suffer, as the present time I am in regard to weighing the situation, I am on the fence as to whether I have done the right thing here. I am quite a few years older than I was when I came here, and I would not have the opportunities that I would have had on the farm, and with the responsibility of children growing up, educating them, is just another thing, and you cannot pick up and move.

I think that what I am looking for is effective laws where criminals are taken into the courts, taken off the streets, so that I can walk safely up First Street or Independence Avenue or any other street in the District of Columbia, and so could my children, without having to send an armed guard, if they were interested in visiting the Congressional Library, which is open until 10 o'clock at night. You would now not allow your 18- or 19-year-old downtown to visit the Monument, and I do not know, if the crime progress continues, how long it will take before these criminals have taken over the seats in the Congress.

It may not happen soon, but progress is progress, and we are not retarding them in any degree than I can see.

MR. MACHEN. Let me caution you that members of the Congress are not elected from the District yet; they come from all over the United States.

MR. KANE. I do not think our problem is in the District only. But, of course, this is the one that is in our back yard.

MR. DOWDY. It is not a localized problem. It is probably more apparent here, but this is the problem all over the nation.

MR. KANE. It is a problem for the lawmakers. I think we have to struggle with it in regard to looking out for our individual safety, but I think it is the lawmakers' job who were elected by their districts, to take a bite out of this problem so that it backs down a little bit, at least let us have progress in reverse to some extent.

Where to start, does not seem to be the average layman's problem as to put his finger on what can be done, but we do look up to the people who are elected.

MR. DOWDY. This actually is a problem for law enforcement officers. The lawmakers might have to do something about them, now, that is something else. We have passed all the laws, I think, we can. Some of the laws passed by Congress may have made the situation worse, but the problem is law enforcement.

MR. RICHMOND. Could I ask a question now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOWDY. Yes.

MR. RICHMOND. It seems to me everybody is asking for the same thing. Everybody wants something to be done. I think everybody is asking for the criminal to be stopped.

MR. DOWDY. Oh, yes.

MR. RICHMOND. It seems to me that everybody is asking, like I say, everybody is asking, the same question. Everybody is going to the Congress. These are the only people we have to go to. What is stopping them really, what is stopping you from doing anything?

MR. MACHEN. It is not just Congress. It is just like what you all are doing. It is not only going to take many of us who are cognizant of it, but it is going to take the aroused citizenry also, to insist that this small minority of your lawbreakers could be locked up and something could be done.

MR. RICHMOND. It seems to me, Mr. Machen, that the wrong people get the publicity. You take these people like Rap Brown and Stokely Carmichael and so forth, any little thing they say is publicized all over television, and it makes people believe, it makes white people believe, that Negroes are behind these people, and this is ridiculous.

MR. DOWDY. It does not make me believe it.

Mr. MACHEN. None of us do. We know there is a very responsible citizenry regardless of race who are just as concerned. This is not color we are asking law enforcement. This is all concerned citizenry.

Mr. RICHMOND. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. SHANDS. I think our major problem is there is not enough action taken down at the courts, because the company won't even prosecute.

In 1964 I was sitting at the bus stop working some math problems. A group of kids came up, snatched my transfers and shot me.

I went down to No. 11 and looked at some photos, and I thought I had the guy, but the company had sent a representative from the claims department over and he told me, "Don't pinpoint the guy," you know. "Just don't choose him." So they had the pistol and everything. No action. I never heard anything from it.

A guy can rob you. I will tell you, once three boys took a man's cash carrier, beat him up on the head, so some guys caught the boys, turned them over to No. 5. So the next day they were out and they beat him again. You see that kind of stuff does not make sense. That is where our main problem is, right there.

Mr. DOWDY. That sort of thing just encourages them to do more.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, the particular night that Mr. Talley, the operator from the Bladensburg Division, was shot, I picked his bus up at 21st and K Street. It was wrapped around that pole, and what I saw or what was left of the man, his brains smeared across the windshield; this is all he has to show for the time he has been with D. C. Transit.

These are some of the hazards of the occupation, and that is it, and actually there wouldn't have been a thing done until the guys at night just literally refused to drive the buses without money. If the company would only back some of the operators who are willing to stick their necks out on the line, who would like to help protect the people on their vehicles, as I would if allowed to. I think I am about as much a man as the next guy, and it irritates me and it bugs me to see a little punk harass people on my bus. I know I could do something about it and stop it, but I cannot for the simple reason that the company that I work for limits me to my actions.

The best I can do is ask him would he please cut it out, especially when I can put him off my bus, but he knows if I put him off my bus, and he files a report on me, then I am called on the carpet for it, because I am not allowed to take this type of direct action.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I know that we have to leave—

Mr. DOWDY. Is Mr. Nebel here?

Have you all about finished?

I will come back if you have not.

Have you all finished?

Mr. RICHMOND. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOWDY. Well, we appreciate your testimony. It has been enlightening, particularly on the orders that you operate under. It seems like you are under about the same type of repressive order that the city police are in trying to enforce the law.

Thank you very much.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. RICHMOND. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Dowdy. We will include in the record at this point numerous letters from the local citizens to Chairman McMillan and others, on the crime situation.

(The documents referred to follow:)

MARYLAND WINE & LIQUOR STORE, INC.
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1968.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: We are respected business people in the retail liquor trade for the past thirty-five years in northeast Washington. On April 5, 1968, our business was broken into and looted as violence broke out on the streets of Washington. This has forced us out of business for two months or more and has caused severe financial hardship not only to us, but to the seven people we employ.

Fortunately, we have insurance that will cover a portion of our losses, but we are deeply concerned and disturbed—while repairing the damage to our interior and business equipment—that in the event of a similar outbreak as the one on April 5, we will not be able to go back into business.

We respectfully demand proper police protection so that we need not work in constant fear that there could be more looting and arson or bodily harm. We do not feel that asking for assurance of protection and prompt financial assistance from the Small Business Administration is unreasonable.

We do not yet know whether our insurance henceforth will be of an exorbitant price, or whether it will be renewed at all. If this is the case and rioting should occur, it will be impossible for us to re-open our doors. It is not easy for men who have been in a particular field of business most of their working lives to have to consider another means of livelihood.

We deplore a society that has brought men, women, *and children*, by the hundreds, to burn, loot, and otherwise wantonly destroy in a spirit of gaily. We are heartsick that our own neighbors and customers were involved in tearing down our business while our police force, National Guard, and troops looked on.

We trust that our letter will be taken under serious consideration and that we may be favored with a reply. We want to be able to conduct our business, in peace, in the District of Columbia, our birthplace.

Sincerely,

RUTH BURDETT ROSEN, *President.*

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McMILLAN: Why was our Capital allowed to be burnt and looted recently?

Who issued and is responsible for the orders that withdrew the local police and failed to provide adequate protection for our citizens and property?

What is your committee doing to stop this and similar events that will be attempted again, soon?

Is this to be the new policy of our administration, promote anarchy?

We are concerned over this growing threat of no law and order, are you?

Sincerely,

IVAN KUESTER, BERTHA KUESTER.

3023 14th St., N.W., Apt. 815,
Washington, D.C. 20009, 1 May 1968.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, District Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Is it out of order to remember that Government officials who let Washington burn are under oath to "provide for the common defense"?

Should we forget that Robert F. Kennedy held a massive rally at 14th Street and Park Road the night *before* Dr. King was shot, and that the area was so hopped up all that night that a lot of us had no sleep, expecting a riot to break out then?

It is good form to suggest that appeasement has never been notably successful in appeasing terrorists, that 14th Street in Washington is apparently another Sudetenland to those entrusted with public safety?

Are we heartless brutes to remind those in authority who failed us and left us to burn, that we are not all "voteless Washingtonians," that our numbers

still include absentee voters, that our hurt is deep and bitter, and that we will remember?

Since those of us who do try to be decent and law abiding are obviously left to our own devices—we are sick to our very bones of being docile and quiet victims. There is a movement gaining momentum to organize a "Committee for a Safe Washington" and—we mean business.

Yours sincerely,

VIRGINIA LEE GRIMES.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 2, 1968.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a businessman of this city, I am very apprehensive of the possibility of more rioting, burning, and looting during the summer.

It has come to my attention that if such a situation should arise again that the businessmen can expect the same insufficient type of protection that we had during the last riot. To me this is inconceivable. There must be better protection by having the police and military personnel called out on the streets immediately to contain any trouble.

As a law-abiding, tax paying citizen, that is the least I should expect.

Respectfully yours,

BERNARD S. HEIN.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 2, 1968.

Senator ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SENATOR: I am a naturalized U.S. citizen and a senior aeronautical engineer employed by the Department of Defense here in our Nation's Capitol. I also have the misfortune of owning rental properties in the District of Columbia. Thanks to our "government's" current attitude towards crime and lawlessness in general, I am compelled to consider arming myself when visiting my properties. Some I might add are a stones throw from your executive offices. My tenants have even more to fear than I. Today I hardly own a single apartment unit which is not broken into at least once a year. Many of my tenants have been robbed, yoked, assaulted, and one has even been murdered.

These people and I are joined in disgust and ever growing amazement on how our "government" continues not only to tolerate crime and other forms of lawlessness but in effect endorses it at the expense of lawabiding citizens and perhaps even the dignity of this country as a civilized nation. The only explanations we are ever given through our news media seem to involve one of two nebulous arguments. The first relates to no less than our glorious constitution, i.e. "rights" of the criminal. This argument has, we believe, been carried to such an extreme by presently well meaning but usually naive liberal idealists and legal theoreticians, that we the ordinary law-abiding citizens, who have little need for many of these "rights" since we do not commit crimes, are compelled to assume that this great document as it is now interpreted by our courts, must have been conceived by our forefathers expressly for the benefit of future criminal generations. While innocent white and black alike are killed, maimed, yoked, robbed, and lately looted and burned, our great constitution has done little in their behalf.

Alas, official acceptance of our new national sport, i.e. rioting, in particular, as manifested here in our Nation's Capitol, proves this contention. After all, a personage no less than our Director of Public Safety, Mr. Patrick Murphy, had officially instructed his law enforcement officers not to interfere with our looters and arsonists; and God help the police officers who would dare to even consider using force of arms to interfere with our looting or burning sport fans. Mr. Murphy has even solemnly threatened to resign his position as Director of Public Safety in the event that higher authority should consider compelling him to direct the use of force against looters and arsonists. I pray to God that Mr. Murphy will carry through his threat.

I cannot help but reminisce and compare familiar scenes during my childhood in Nazi Germany. There, likewise a presumed great and civilized nation used similar democratic restraint towards its criminal element while looting and burning Jewish merchants. Just as here and now, I assure you, in no time flat

it became a national sport with players soon convinced that they were not only above the law, but indeed within their moral right. For after all, did not the Jew for at least 350 years economically exploit the poor downtrodden Aryan, and was not the Jew responsible for the insidiously planned and conceived genocide of millions of budding young Aryans through instigating and purposely losing World War I?

The second explanation seems to relate to the fantastic contention of some super-liberal civil rights advocates that our colored citizens would resent the imposition of strict law enforcement on their criminal element and would consider acts of law enforcement as a denial of their civil rights. In other words the contention implies that the majority of colored citizens would rather be killed, maimed, yoked, robbed, looted and burned by their own criminal element than have them promptly arrested, tried and punished, and if need be shot, just as white criminals. Insofar as the popular cries of police brutality are concerned, their intensity seems to be in direct proportion to the number of crimes committed by our criminals when being rearrested while out on bond via personal recognition. Little else need be said except that one of the most foolproof methods to avoid possible exposure to "police brutality" is to desist in the commission of crimes. I can recommend this approach from personal experience. I might also add that I have yet to hear of any policeman involved in any physical struggle with a citizen over the issuance of parking meter violation citations for example.

Finally, I would like to dispel some current wishful thinking, namely that the riots were not organized and will just go away. Through my real estate operations I know many colored people including a number of riot participants, former criminals, . . . etc. I, at least, was aware of the fact that riots were being organized for some time this Summer. I had mainly presumed that our Director of Public Safety, Mr. Murphy, using his new modern techniques of law enforcement intelligence acquisition, would have even more precise information and take appropriate steps. Needless to say I was wrong. A few hours after Dr. Martin Luther King's tragedy, an emergency meeting was called by our riot organizers; a vote taken quite democratically, and the riot instigated. Mr. Murphy in subsequent public interviews attempted to convince us that his reason for not directing police officers to contain the initiating rioters was based on his deep feeling of safety for his men who were outnumbered. Since, however, the initiating group of rioters consisted of no more than some dozens of hoodlums for quite a few hours in the 14th Street vicinity, it is difficult to comprehend why Mr. Murphy's police force of several thousand men was outnumbered. Insofar as getting to the scene, the few times that I have been involved in minor traffic accidents within the District of Columbia, a telephone call has invariably brought police in minutes. Finally, the subsequent magical appearance of electronically rigged automobiles driven by riot leaders equipped with loudspeaker systems, walkie-talkies, etc. on 7th Street, N.W. coordinating and directing groups of looters and arsonists is hardly convincing of our popular concept of a spontaneous outpour of deep grief for Dr. Martin Luther King's tragic death. Criminals, looters, and arsonists have little sentimentality; their objectives are quite practical.

I respectfully request that you lend the strength of your office towards achieving effective law enforcement in the District of Columbia.

Respectfully,

KAZYS K. SKIRPA, Jr.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 6, 1968.

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE McMILLAN: "Write to the District Committee if you want action", I was told by the police. I am therefore writing to you to plead for your recognition of the problem that exists for me and my neighbors.

I am the owner of Foodland Super Market, 343-13th Street, S.E., Washington, D.C., and I am a native Washingtonian. I have paid taxes and have been an owner of a business in Washington, as was my father before me, for over 30 years.

My store was broken into and severely looted on the night of April 5, 1968, but I reopened with the determination that all small businessmen have to continue to serve their neighborhood and to make a living as best they can.

On the nights of May 3 and 4 after closing hours, my store was again attacked by neighborhood teenagers. On each of these occasions, the police were present for some or all of the time during the break-ins. Each time the police had the opportunity to arrest and capture the very few individuals involved, but each time they refused to do so. The only explanation given to my by these Fifth Precinct officers on the scene was that this no-arrest policy was imposed by the House District Committee.

I am white and my business neighborhood is Negro and white. My neighbors of both races implored me to write you this letter to explain the dangerous situation that exists. It is not "black power" militants who threaten our neighborhood and, most especially, my sole livelihood, but teenage criminals. My neighbors and I are frightened. It is they who call the police when my store has been broken into. The police only tell me to get a gun and to write to the District Committee.

Mr. McMillan, I am a veteran and a peace-loving man. I can use a gun, but must I stay in my store all night with gun in hand and kill someone when a concentrated police surveillance and a few arrests of easily identifiable culprits would solve the problem at my store?

As a life-long Democrat and a D.C. small businessman, I beg you to use your good offices to contact the metropolitan police and, most especially, the Fifth Precinct to help give me and my neighbors the protection we must have to survive. The tax base of the District of Columbia cannot long survive if the small businessmen of this city are destroyed.

I thank you for any response or help you can give me in this life-and-death struggle for economic survival that I face.

Yours truly,

CHARLES GOTKIN.

SILVER SPRING, MD., May 7, 1968.

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: My husband is the owner, or should I say was the owner, of a small liquor store in the District of Columbia. He and I worked side by side for several years, starting from scratch since we did not have much financial backing at this time which was around 1955. For the past seven years, I have not worked in the store but have worked for the U.S. Public Health Service, after our store was held up about three times and my husband felt that he did not want to endanger both of our lives with children to raise and put through college.

Things have been going along relatively smooth for the past seven years, except for a break-in or two (for which we were not covered since insurance coverage was not available after the previous holdups) and window glass having to be repaired because of vandalism in the neighborhood. However, April 5, 1968, was our downfall—we were warned by neighborhood friends to close our store around 1:30 p.m. and leave immediately, which my husband did. About 2:30 p.m. our store was broken into, looted, in fact cleaned out, and what was not taken by the mob was broken and stepped on. Our safe, into which we had put several checks cashed that morning and accumulated cash, was dragged outside of the store with chains tied to a car. The safe was literally chopped apart with a sledge hammer and everything taken, even things that could not possibly have been of any use to the culprits.

It is now May 7th and we still are not back in business. The insurance adjustor assigned to our case needed several figures in order to ascertain our loss and these figures were not readily available due to the fact that everything including records was destroyed or trampled on.

Our biggest problem at the present time, besides knowing how we will come out in the end financially, is trying to decide whether or not to go back into the business again. As you must know by this time, several merchants who have reopened have been threatened for protection money, looted and broken into again, put afire, and even held up at gunpoint. We feel the Inner City is not a safe place to make our living in as the District of Columbia Government's police power has literally surrendered to mob rule, as far as we can ascertain. Unless police power is restored, the small business owners in the District face serious financial hardship. In spite of its Mayor and City Council, Washington, D.C., is still the

capital of the United States and should be the concern of every citizen of the United States. At the rate we are going, we don't set a very fine example for the rest of the country.

The affairs of the District of Columbia are managed and supervised by the Congress of the United States and fortunately we the residents of Maryland elect some of the Congressmen. It therefore behooves us to elect those who will fight for our rights as citizens and small business owners, and we must have some assurance now that we will be protected in the future with a strong police force, and with protection insurance, should this ever occur again. Some insurance companies have cancelled policies of those stores that have reopened.

When we read that the Negro people would want all businesses in the District to be run by their people, we wonder why we are fighting so hard for integration—do they want it?

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EDITH BOOKOFF.

HYATTSVILLE, MD., May 8, 1968,

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON D.C. AFFAIRS.

DEAR SIRs: I think the following should be brought to your attention.

My husband was working a laundry route in S.E. and he said he does not like the way the negroes on the street are looking at him. He was born and raised in Washington and has worked routes for over 20 years; so he should be able to judge. One of the other men who was working 14th St. N.W. had the same feeling.

My son (22 years old and 6'8" tall) also made a delivery in S.E. yesterday, and said he had the same feeling, and he was not going back.

At that my son who is in Northwestern High School, Prince Georges County, said the negroes there are saying "You ain't seen nothing yet."

I am concerned for their safety as well as my own, since I work in the District.

Very truly yours,

KITTY W. WILLS.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTHOUSE,
Washington, May 13, 1968.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
Chairman, House District of Columbia,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We, the members of the March Grand Jury One for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, have concluded from our experience of the past two months that there is a significant need for legislative action concerning crime in the District of Columbia. We respectfully offer the following comments and suggestions.

First, we are dismayed by the prevalence of crimes of violence in our community. In case after case presented to us, the defendant has shown little restraint in resorting to violence in the execution of his crime. According to the *Report of the President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia*, there was an arrest for crimes of violence in forty-five percent of all arrests and sixty-one percent in arrests for assault. In 1965, only fifty-four percent of those defendants convicted for aggravated assaults were imprisoned. Based on the apparent lack of penal deterrents to the use of violence, we would recommend that a minimum sentence of imprisonment be mandatory when a defendant is convicted a second time for a crime of violence.

Second, we were astonished by the number of defendants who were already on bail under the Bail Reform Act of 1966 for one or more other crimes brought before us for indictment in another crime. The Commission's report mentions, "Other felon charges were pending against more than eleven percent of all arrested offenders." We are aware of the fact that the original intention of bail was to guarantee the presence of the accused at trial, but it appears there is also an equal need for the protection of the community when it becomes apparent that the defendant flaunts the privilege of bail by committing further crimes, or even, jumping bail. In either of the aforesaid instances, a judge under the Bail Reform Act of 1966 is powerless to deny bail except in capital cases. We feel that in such situations and others where warranted by the circumstances of the crime the judge should be allowed to exercise his prerogative to deny bail.

Third, we believe that the high incidence of guns involved in the cases presented to us requires a new approach to the regulation and control of firearms. According to the Commission's report, the use of handguns in murders and robberies (including attempts) doubled and in assaults quadrupled over an eleven-year-period from 1955 to 1966. Rigid laws in the District governing the sale and carrying of handguns, and the new laws enacted in the suburban counties, are necessary and have helped slow down the increase of the flow of firearms into the District. They appear, however, to have done little to reverse the trend toward the use of firearms or to curb effectively the illegal market in guns in the District. The Commission's report states that of the sixty-two homicides committed with handguns in 1965, only twenty-six of the guns were obtained legally. We suggest that legislation be enacted which would require all firearms to be registered and that the second and third violations demand minimum sentences of increasing severity. Such legislation should aid law enforcement officials in curtailing the illegal exchange and regulating the possession of firearms.

Fourth, we are appalled at the sentences which are handed down for cases similar to ones which we have heard. We have learned that many defendants "shop around" for the easiest judge. The Commission's report relates that, "There were considerable disparities in sentences imposed by 22 District Court judges in the period 1964-1966 as well as a marked disproportionate assumption of the court's criminal caseloads by 2 judges." It goes on to say, "Not unexpectedly, judges who accept a disproportionate number of pleas place a great many offenders on probation." We would suggest a review of the judicial procedure in the handling of cases and mandatory minimum sentences for second or third convictions for repeated offenses.

Our exposure to crime has shown us the result and patterns of criminal behavior, therefore, we have limited our suggestions to this area in the hopes of inhibiting the use of violence and discouraging the repetition of offenses by the criminal. We realize that social, economic, and political steps must be initiated to surmount the real problem, the conditions in our community which cause crime. We also realize that the Bail Reform Act of 1966, the Federal Youth Correction Act, the expanded probation programs, and the work release programs are serious efforts in the judicial province to rectify the inequities of the system and shift the emphasis from castigating to rehabilitating the offender. Our present efforts as a society to protect the rights of the defendant are not only a laudable cause but an indispensable one, however, we should not in this endeavor sacrifice the safety of any individual in our community.

This letter is being sent to the Chairmen of the Judiciary and the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Respectfully,

J. M. R. Hutchinson (foreman), Robert A. Arthur, George W. Babb, Lucinda S. Cooper, John D. Davis, Louis A. De Marco, Andrew Dyer, Russell Edmonds, Benjamin A. Jackson, Melvin S. Liederman, Shirley T. Peace, Frank Phillips, Doris Scrivener, Venetta J. Smalley, Alice L. Smith, Sereta Staley, Eva D. Stewart, Marian W. Tammany, R. E. Terry, Ellen Douzikas, Julia C. Walker, Pearl West, Waldo E. Webb.

MICHIGAN PARK CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, May 14, 1968.

HON. WALTER WASHINGTON,
Mayor-Commissioner,
District Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAYOR-COMMISSIONER: The Michigan Park Citizens Association, at their meeting in May, passed a resolution expressing their sympathy and concern for the property owners, businessmen, and investors who suffered heavy losses in the holocaust of early April.

This anxiety stems from our interest in members of our Association, as well as all entrepreneurs whose property was destroyed, damaged, and looted. Currently, there is still apprehension among business and financial interests about the daily news reports of arson, robbery, and burglary. This does not offer an environment that would encourage constructive plans for the early reestablishment of these business enterprises.

A most important step in behalf of these businessmen is their adequate compensation through insurance or government grants, or both to provide capital. This is because rebuilding of these enterprises is recognized as most urgent in order to provide an income for the businessmen, employment for workers, rent for the property owners, interest and dividends for the investors, and above all reestablish the tax base for the District of Columbia. These are basic requirements if our Capital is to regain its stature as a place for visitors.

We suggest the following action to create an atmosphere that will encourage rapid restoration and further development of our Capital City :

Immediately terminate the irresponsible acts of arson.

Enforce law and order.

Apply the law of the land most vigorously to all law breakers.

Finally, ensure citizens of the District, visitors, and tourists of their complete safety and security in the Nation's Capital.

Only then can the rebuilding and further expansion of this Capital City take place.

Thanking you, we are,

Respectfully yours,

ROY L. SWENSON, *President.*

MICHIGAN PARK CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1968.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Michigan Park Citizens Association at the May meeting unanimously passed a resolution demanding that law and order be maintained and enforced in the District of Columbia.

The daily lists of arson, robbery, and assault indicate ineffectual local administration. Leadership and vigorous action by the Executive Branch of the Government is necessary to secure law enforcement in every detail. The solution of the Capital's urban and business problems require time, patience, and wisdom and cannot even begin in this atmosphere. On the other hand, control of riots, and the maintenance of law and order require only police and military manpower and could be achieved almost instantly.

The situation in the District of Columbia demands immediate action. If we cannot ensure domestic tranquility, health, and safety for all citizens including personnel of business establishments in our National Capital, then martial law by Executive order would be necessary and the obvious solution.

The following statement is taken from a recent Congressional Record:

"All people in this country must realize that this is a land of liberty, not a land of license; that this is a land where laws must be respected, not violated; that this is a land where each man is free to carve out his own destiny and choose his own future so long as he harms no one else in the process; that this is a land where a man's value is not determined by his race and his color, but by what he has contributed and is contributing toward making this a decent, law-abiding society in a free nation."

We subscribe to this philosophy and trust that prompt action will be taken to restore law and order in this great Capital.

Respectfully yours,

ROY L. SWENSON, *President.*

PARK AND SHOP, INC.,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1968.

Hon. JOHN L. McMILLAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. McMILLAN: The citizens and the business community of Washington, D.C. are seriously concerned over the increasing incidents of lawlessness and violence in this city and especially over the possible repetition of the recent rioting and looting. We feel obligated to join in the rising demand for a restoration of peace, order and progress through law.

I am enclosing a copy of our open letter to the President of the United States, the Mayor and Officials of the District of Columbia, and the Congress of the United States.

Very truly yours,

J. GRIFFIN ROUNTREE,
Executive Director.

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; THE MAYOR AND OFFICIALS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; AND THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

All citizens of the United States have a right to visit their national capital, and this right should be denied to none. All citizens have a concomitant right to do so with reasonable assurance of personal safety. This dream of every American from childhood, this privileged pilgrimage to the shrine of liberty, is now denied to the vast majority of the people by the actions of a few. The majority of the people are afraid to visit Washington, and many of its own citizens are leaving the city. The effect on business, property values, and tax income cannot escape even the casual observer, nor can our need for support by the people's representatives.

The economic advancement, or even survival, of the entire community of Washington depends largely on the existence and growth of commerce within the city. If all commerce ceased, the community would cease. The daily needs of the people, rich and poor alike, for food, clothing, shelter, transportation, services, health, recreation, and many other aspects of life are provided by the business community. In many areas of this metropolis the innocent citizens are now denied convenient access to these requirements because businesses have been destroyed or driven out by arson, looting, and ever increasing harassment, violence, and open crime.

These same businesses provide the opportunity for tens of thousands to support themselves and their families, but many are now denied the means of livelihood by the destruction or dispersal of the businesses for which they had worked. Why do the many innocent have to continue to suffer while the guilty run rampant through the streets.

The taxes of the business community provide a large part of the support of the social welfare, police, fire, and other public functions of this city. Taxes have been increasing, and are expected to increase more, but protection has been decreasing, and if the recent past is any indication, it is expected to decrease more.

As businessmen and as private citizens we want to live within the law, but we want others also to live within the law. We want the protection and justice of the law for all. We want to respect the rights of others, but we want them to respect our rights.

Men have given into the hands of society their own defense and the defense of their families in order to attain order and the general welfare through law. Not fear or intimidation, but love of civilization has been the genesis of the self-control and the reluctance to react with force against force on the part of threatened communities during recent disorders. There may well be a dangerous misunderstanding of this point on the part of a militant few. If people are pressed too far, or if their families, communities, or means of livelihood are threatened beyond endurance or beyond the ability or willingness of society to provide adequate protection, they will retake into their own hands their inalienable right to self-defense and survival.

This nation has borne the allegedly spontaneous rape of its cities with restraint and patience beyond ordinary understanding, but the eyes of the whole country are now on Washington, and with a clear understanding that the approaching events will not be spontaneous. An aura of uncertainty and personal insecurity, a growing smog of fear, hangs over this, the national capital. It is not just another city. It belongs to all Americans, and all Americans are watching. Continued order and justice under a common law depends on the outcome. If the Government is incapable of assuring the security of the capital and the personal protection of less than a million citizens, you may fully expect that the lesson will not be lost on two hundred million.

Our national policy has been to assure national security wherever possible through the existence of sufficient force to be an overwhelming deterrent to aggression rather than through the use of that force to punish aggression. Will the Government of the District of Columbia and the nation provide an overwhelming deterrent to violence? Will they provide visible police and troops sufficient to discourage the criminal few from acts which, unfortunately and unjustly, are

often blamed on the innocent majority of one segment of our whole people? Or will they allow an apparent danger to become a real disaster? Will they bear the guilt of driving each State, each city, and even each citizen to provide his own protection? Will their example teach each individual that in order to survive he must meet the threat of force with force, action with reaction, and counter-reaction with escalation until the fabric of our society and our civilization is rent asunder?

We of the business community feel that we have some guilt for not having pressed for greater protection in the past, for having allowed ourselves to be intimidated by the potential and at times real threat inherent in sticking one's neck out. But it is time to stop worrying about sticking our necks out, about not getting involved. We are involved, and we intend to defend the commercial and economic interests of this city and its people. We ask for the protection to which we have a right, for our lives and property and for the lives and property of the entire community. It will be achieved, but we prefer that it be achieved through the law.

We ask for a deterrent to destruction, not only a promise of control after it has started. A curfew is an effective emergency weapon to curb destruction, but it penalizes the innocent far more than the guilty. Use of a curfew for long periods in itself could destroy large segments of commerce. If sufficient police are patrolling this city, are seen in large enough concentrations and numbers, and are known to be authorized to enforce the law with all means necessary, serious rioting, arson, and looting will never have the chance to begin. If sufficient police are unavailable, there are in the area of Washington and at the disposal of the Commander-in-Chief more than sufficient troops to provide the necessary show of force. It would seem preferable to show force before, rather than to have to use it afterwards.

It is obvious to all that the existing number of police does not allow adequate protection, especially when their effectiveness is reduced drastically by imprudent restraints. We, therefore, ask that troops be placed on duty to supplement the police forces prior to and during the impending demonstrations, that they be made clearly visible in sufficient numbers to provide an overwhelming show of force, and that the President of the United States and Government of the District of Columbia make a public statement of policy that the police and the troops will be authorized and directed to use all force necessary to assure the peace and order of the community, and that the courts will support them.

You have taken the oaths of the highest offices of this land that you will to the best of your abilities preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. That Constitution guarantees the rights of the citizens to live in peace and free from fear. We citizens now call upon the executive, legislative, and judicial officers of the United States and of the District of Columbia to fulfill their oaths of office.

Very truly yours,

PARK AND SHOP, INC.

(This letter is sent at the unanimous request of the Executive Board of Park and Shop, Inc., which represents over 200 member merchants and professional firms and over 95% of all commercial parking facilities in the District of Columbia.)

COLUMBIA, S.C., May 19, 1968.

MR. NASH CASTRO,
U.S. Interior Department,
National Capital Park Region,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASTRO: Several friends and myself are planning a trip to Washington during the first two weeks in August (4th thru 17th). We have decided that it would not only be nice, but much more economical to camp on the same park grounds that you and the Interior Department have made available to the organizers of the "Poor Peoples Demonstration."

Our party will include approximately twenty to twenty five people, including women and children. Being able to camp on these public grounds will make it possible for us to give the children a good while to see the Nation's Capital and its many historical places of interest and to observe some of the most recent changes made by not such historical events.

Of course we are in a position and would expect to comply with the same requirements that you are asking from the "Poor People", actually we are poor too, that's why camping in the middle of Washington appeals to us.

We feel sure that you and the Interior Department and any other Officials in Washington will approve this request and will give us the same treatment and protection that is being extended to the "Poor Peoples Demonstration." From news items we feel sure that our planned camping trip there will not conflict with theirs, as their time will expire in middle June.

We are looking forward to this trip and especially the opportunity to camp so close to such historical places as the Lincoln Memorial, etc. As you know, it takes time and money to prepare for such a trip, so please give us your approval as soon as possible. We are taxpaying Citizens, White, with no police records. We are coming for sightseeing educational and camping purposes only, we do not want anything from the Federal Government or Congress except equal treatment and the same privileges extended other citizens and groups. If we visit Congress, it will be only to make a social call and congratulate our representatives on the good work they are doing.

Yours very truly,

JAMES R. HANAHAN.

MARKET SERVICECENTER,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1968.

Hon. JOHN McMILLAN,
House District Committee,
Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have been listening to people on radio and television recently in regards to the conditions existing in Washington, D.C. Mayor Washington claims the business men are unduly alarmed and spreading false rumors about people who are not coming into Washington at night. But, I've got news for you—they are not coming in the day time either.

Recently I have been staying at my beach home and commuting daily. This morning I came in New York Avenue and particularly noted the lack of automobiles at the Motels. Maybe, Mr. Washington or Mr. Murphy have an answer for the lack of Motel and Hotel Registrations. With the continued robberies in the Motels and the fact the City is without police protection probably has nothing to do with the fact that tourists are staying away by the thousands.

I was born and raised in this city but there has never been another period in my life when I have witnessed such complete disregard for the Police Morale in the Metropolitan Police Department is at its lowest in the history of this City. The Police are harassed by both the officials and the Citizens with complete disregard for the privates safety. How can a police private take an oath to carry out the rules of law and order and still work under Mr. Murphy and Mr. Washington? Are they not breaking faith with God when they are forced by orders from Mr. Murphy to break these oaths?

Anyone who monitored the Police frequency during that fateful period of April Fifth would be ashamed of the police officials, namely, Mr. Wilson the Assistant Chief of Police and Mr. Murphy. Their decisions have made every policeman I know ashamed of his part of the Metropolitan Police Department.

On April fifth at about ten o'clock in the morning a group of about two hundred youths were walking down Florida Avenue headed West. Seeing this rowdy crowd I called Police headquarters and informed them. They told me they were aware of the condition. As this crowd passed my place of business they called to my men and told them they were going to tear hell out of fourteenth street northwest and on their return would be back H street northeast. I again called the police and relayed this information. The result—nothing. You know the rest. Losses that can never be regained.

Now, getting back to my problem. The Riot.

Apparently Congressmen Charles Mathias and Gilbert Gude are under the impression that Mr. Murphy is doing a good job.

I'm a registered Republican in Montgomery County and would like to extend an invitation to these gentlemen to walk thru this market and talk to the business men, many who are voters in Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties. I feel that meeting these men and discussing conditions may broaden their views.

I've repeatedly read the wonderful things this committee is doing for the colored race and feel that some day these things may happen to me too. I'm white.

My business was broken into, windows smashed, stock stolen, fixtures smashed and my wall safe broken. This all could be tolerated if any relief was in sight but the only thing a person has to look forward to in Washington, D.C. under the present circumstances and direction of Mr. Washington and Mr. Murphy and Mr. Wilson is the next riot.

I am fully aware as I write this letter that it will be my "Swan Song." I know I will be harassed until I finally am forced completely out of business, but my losses are so great it no longer matters.

In the month of April 1967 I pumped 64,118 gallons of gasoline. In the month of April 1968 I pumped 43,517 gallons, or a loss of 20,601 this year. This represents a loss to the Federal Government of about \$1648.08. A loss of revenue to the District of Columbia of \$618.03. A loss to the Humble Oil Co. of \$309.01. Also, this represents a loss to me of gasoline only of \$824.04 plus profits on related products. These figures represent the losses of just my one gas station and as of May 15, 1968 these conditions have not changed.

Last night I pumped 214 gallons between the hours of six and nine P.M. for a gross profit of \$9.63. Two men worked three hours at \$1.40 per hour which cost \$8.40. Rent on this amount of gas was \$3.21. Not counting insurance, light or other expenses, in this short period I lost \$1.98.

As you can plainly see, unless someone comes to my aid I cannot continue operating at a loss. The Federal Government, Big Business and myself all seem to be on the brink of disaster and I know of many who are in a like circumstance.

While I am wondering what I did to help myself in 1933 would you please attempt to salvage 1968.

Yours truly,

WILLIAM R. THOMPSON.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 23, 1968.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN L. McMILLAN: Your immediate attention is requested on the subject of police protection for the employees of the United States Government Printing Office of which 500 are members of the Union that I represent. The members of my Union are loyal employees but cannot any longer tolerate the existing conditions of muggings beatings stabbings being robbed or having damage caused to their personal properties all because of the lack of proper and legal protection. We ask for your immediate attention to this serious problem and ask that steps be taken for the protection of our lives and property.

Sincerely yours,

DELMAR L. ALBERTSON,

President, Washington Printing Pressmen's Union.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 27, 1968.

HON. JOHN McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on D.C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: As a citizen of this country, and a supporter of peace and order in this city of Washington D.C., I have the honor of addressing myself to you, requesting that the strongest action possible be taken at all the Administration's levels, to provide us citizens with an adequate Police force, thus bringing forward a material reduction in crime, and protection to our person and property, as well as judicial procedures which provide punishments that are adequate deterrents, and procedures which prevent the release of known or dangerous offenders to commit added crimes while awaiting trial.

It is just about time the proper action be enforced to take care of the most pressing problems that we are facing today. It is most unbelievable that we are almost forced to remain indoors at night, due to the fact that it is no longer safe to walk on the streets. An all-out effort should be made to apprehend and punish criminals and to protect the innocent.

In the hope that you will support these issues and move forward to achieve the implementation of the extremely needed measures which will bring order and peace to our cities, I remain,

Very truly yours,

JORGE CARNICERO.

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 30, 1968.

HON. JOHN McMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on D.C.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It must be more obvious to you than to us, the law abiding tax paying citizens of the District of Columbia, that the present government of the

District is an abject failure. Under the present regime crime has continued to increase part of the city has been burned down while police stood idly by waiting for orders to use force. Murder, rape and arson continues unchecked, bus drivers are robbed and killed, looting goes on, all over the city.

Sir, the addition of 1000 or 10,000 policemen is NOT the answer. As long as criminals are released "in the custody of their parents" and paroled to commit more crimes the reign of terror will continue.

It is my opinion that Congress should take action immediately to dissolve the present government of the District and regain control over its administration before it is too late.

The occupation of park land which belongs to all the people by the "poor people" is detrimental to the nation's capitol. I hope that you will use your influence to terminate this monstrosity at the earliest possible time. I hope you will support and insist on the passage of the Bill introduced recently to effect this action.

Most sincerely yours,

THOMAS W. HERRON.

DERBY, CONNECTICUT, *June 17, 1968.*

DEAR MR. McMILLAN: I am writing to you as chairman of the House District of Columbia Committee. I endorse H. Res. 1129 introduced by Representative John Rarick.

I, too, would like to know why the President didn't immediately put a halt to the rioting and why a state of anarchy was allowed to be built before effective action was taken.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EUGENE WIRKUS.

(Whereupon, at 1:05 p.m., the hearing in the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)

(Subsequently, the following material was filed for the record:)

[Editorial broadcast by WMAL/AM/FM/TV, Washington, D.C., during the week of June 30, 1968]

RETURN TO "NORMAL"

District officials have been hailing a "return to normal" since the clearing of Resurrection City and the subsequent civil disorder a week ago.

Statistics just released show that "normal" during the first quarter of this year meant some 40 murders, 1,800 robberies, 700 aggravated assaults, 4,000 burglaries, and 2,000 auto thefts. Since the April riot, of course, crime has increased.

We do not believe there is any longer such a thing as normalcy on the streets of Washington.

The Federal Government could and should help correct this situation by bringing in Federal troops. The troops need not intervene in the local crime problem. They could simply control demonstrations, which are a Federal problem, but take up thousands of police man-hours. This action would allow the police to concentrate exclusively on the local crime problem.

The Federal Government is currently lathered up about controlling guns. We hope the Government will soon become equally concerned about the gun toters who prowls the streets of the Federal City.

[Reprint from advertisement in the Washington Post, June 20, 1968]

WHAT WOMEN CAN DO TO END VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

Many years ago in London, a severe outbreak of cholera devastated the population. An English physician named John Snow had a hunch. He looked up the addresses of all the cholera victims and found that every one of them drew their drinking water from the same pump on Broad Street. Dr. Snow knew little of the nature of the cholera organism or how it transmitted the disease in the water. But he removed the handle of the Broad Street pump. And he stopped the epidemic.

American women may not know the precise reasons for the contagious violence and brutality of our times, where it comes from, what makes it flourish. But they do know some of the sources from which their children are drinking in this violence, and they know they have to turn it off before the poison gets beyond reach.

American women will turn it off because they are weary of the bomb-burst, the gunshot, the fisted hand. They have had enough of violence late and soon, and of the people and groups who use it for their own ends. They are sick with the collective havoc of the mindless crowd, and the individual savagery of those whose discontent has festered into rash destruction.

The bullet that killed Robert F. Kennedy has wounded us all. John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King—each of these murders set off acute phases of our anxiety. There is a pervasive sense of fear, the feeling we are in the grip of terrible forces we cannot even name—within the borders of our country, within the setting of the entire world.

The sickness has been here a long time. It simmers and flares in the ghettos where people have felt its curse for years and would now pay it back in kind. It mows down our men—and theirs—in Vietnam. It erupts on the campuses of the nation, where some of our young men and women have turned against their own proclaimed abhorrence of violence and have disfigured not just their universities but their own lives. It stalks our cities, our parks and subways, and destroys the green and gentle calm of the countryside.

It rams its way into our homes, on the television screen that brings instant brutality and savagery, instructing children in the ease and casualness with which life can be humiliated, tormented, twisted. The need to respect the fragility and preciousness of life is blotted out by the thousands of good-man-bad-man deaths that make up the daily television-tube feeding of children.

It weakens those precious arts of gentleness, of compassion, of moderation, of love that women alone can give to their families and the world.

McCall's believes that the violence in our land is not a shameful national flaw of character that must be regarded as inevitable.

Violence is not the accidental product of a few crazed assassins that can be cured by adding some Secret Service men. Nor is it simply a lapse in what is known as "law and order" that can be corrected just by a massive crackdown on youth or restless minorities.

The attack on violence must be basic. It must be knowledgeable. It must be thorough.

McCall's makes no rigid distinction between the breakdown of law and order in the nation and the breakdown of law and order in the world. Violence is airborne. Violence among nations cannot be separated from the violence within nations.

In a very real sense, Robert F. Kennedy paid with his life for the failure of the world's nations to develop an effective mechanism of world law. If the United Nations had been given the workable authority to resolve the crisis in the Middle East, Robert Kennedy might be alive today.

The Middle East is not the only area in the world on which an American President or a Presidential aspirant must take a position. Nor is the Middle East the only area in which passions are attached to triggers.

American women can see to it that the first order of business for American policy makers is to move mightily inside the United Nations in the effort to equip it with the responsible authority to substitute law for force in the affairs of nations.

Attacking the basic causes of violence in the world is inseparable from the need to eradicate it at home. Here, within the United States, there is much that women can do if only they are willing to use the power that is clearly theirs.

Approximately fifteen million women read McCall's magazine. We believe that these women, by acting together and acting promptly, can play a pivotal role in combating violence where it occurs.

Here is a five-point program that can make a difference if enough women get behind it:

(1) *Guns*.—The present gun-control legislation, existing or proposed, must be drastically strengthened. Millions of letters to Representatives could do it. Sit down today and write informed letters to your Congressmen and two Senators. If you don't know who they are, write to us and we'll send you their names. Tell them it makes no sense to have a gun readily available, as Robert Kennedy pointed out, to every child, every insane person, every criminal who wants one.

(2) *Television and movies.*—Women can stop the outpouring of violence and sordidness on our television screens and in the motion-picture theaters. Supposedly, television and the movie industry give the public what it wants; i.e., sexual brutality, depravity, sadism, and everything else that contributes to human desensitization and violence. If this is the case, American women should be loud and clear in letting television and movie executives know that such bilge is most certainly not what they want. Hold their top men responsible. Write to Julian Goodman, President of NBC, 30 Rockefeller Plaza; Frank Stanton, President of CBS, 51 West 52nd Street; and Leonard Goldenson, President of ABC, 1330 Avenue of the Americas, all in New York City. Let them feel the weight of millions of letters. There is a direct connection between the decisions these men make and the violence in the land. Hold them to account. Have you seen a picture lately that sickens you, pains you, makes you fear for your children? You can write to Jack Valenti, at the Motion Picture Association of America, 522 Fifth Avenue, in New York, and tell him so.

(3) *Toys.*—Mothers and grandmothers of this country can wage a determined boycott against toys that foster and glorify killing. No letters or telegrams are necessary. Just don't buy them, and tell the man in the toy store why you won't.

(4) *Books and magazines.*—This includes McCall's. If we or our colleagues have done something that you feel adds to the spread of violence, write to Henry E. Bowes, President, McCall Corporation, 230 Park Ave., New York, New York 10017. We can testify to the power of strong, reasoned letters. Keep us to the mark.

(5) *World law.*—As we said earlier, women must be heard on the most urgent question of our time—world law in time to prevent war. The long, dismal negotiations in Paris over Vietnam would seem to dramatize the need for a third party at the peace table. The United States cannot indefinitely act as world policeman. If we are to prevent future Vietnams, we will have to do it through a strengthened UN.

There is no point in trying to restore sanity and balance to life in America if the human race is going to be incinerated in a flash of nuclear violence. Both President Dwight D. Eisenhower and President John F. Kennedy called for world law inside the United Nations but did not receive the kind of response from the American people that would have enabled them to press forward in that direction.

This is an election year. Your letters to the Presidential candidates on all these questions couldn't be sent at a more opportune time. And don't forget that your ultimate power is the ballot box.

The women of this country have heard enough about black power, white power, student power, senior-citizen power. The greatest power of all for good is theirs—woman power. No force on earth can stand against it.

The Editors, McCall's Magazine.

[From the Evening Star, June 25, 1963]

ANSWERING THE DEMONSTRATORS

(By David Lawrence)

The eyes of the world have been turned during the last few weeks on the capital of the nation which boasts of its orderly processes of freedom and democracy. For the spectacle has been one of willful groups of exhibitionists seeking to coerce Congress and the executive departments through the tactics of a "demonstration," whose leaders preach "nonviolence" but provoke disorder.

Nearly five years have elapsed since the first "March on Washington," and what was unhappily foreseen then has since occurred. On Aug. 29, 1963, this correspondent wrote:

"The 'March on Washington' will go down in history as marking a day of public disgrace—a step backward in the evolution of the American system of government. For the image of the United States presented to the world is that of a republic which had professed to believe in voluntarism rather than coercion. But which on Aug. 28, 1963, permitted itself to be portrayed as unable to legislate equal rights for its citizens except under the intimidating influence of mass demonstrations.

"The press, television and radio, the public forums in halls and stadiums—all have been available heretofore as mediums through which the 'right of petition'

could be effectively expressed and public opinion formed on controversial questions. But a minority group—led by men who drew to their side church leaders and groups as well as civic organizations—decided that a massive publicity stunt would be a better way to impress Congress and the President with the idea that unemployment and racial discrimination can be legislated out of existence . . .

"The right of petition is a fundamental principle of the Constitution, but it assumes an orderly and non-provocative procedure. The federal government had to go to large expense to police the Wednesday demonstration here and to keep people from crowding into the city who might participate in disorders.

"To say that the 'march' was successful because large-scale violence was avoided is to ignore the bitterness and resentment prevalent on that day in a city whose normal community life was disrupted. Tens of thousands of people remained secluded in their homes lest they become injured or subjected to unwarranted delays in moving to and from their residences. American citizens were prevented from pursuing their customary ways. Their right to go to their places of employment was impaired by fear of bodily injury.

"Would this have happened if the petitioners had relied on the process of reason in a voluntary society? * * * Are injustices remedied by creating more injustices, and is the cause of civil rights advanced by interfering with the civil rights of nonparticipants in the mass demonstrations?

"These are questions which will need answering, and the full effect of what may come to be called 'the mess in Washington' could be reflected in future elections. For what was proved by the big demonstration—that in free America only the mob can get laws passed covering the issue of civil rights?"

Finally, this week, when leaders of the "poor people's crusade" openly defied governmental authority, political politeness was at last brushed aside, and law and order was unhesitatingly imposed. It is a healthful and constructive sign that the people do lose their patience when protesters—no matter how just the cause—do not proceed in a lawful and orderly manner to petition their government for the redress of grievances.

Maybe there will be more "demonstrations," but little by little long-suffering officials are getting tired of artificially developed mass protests. It is significant that D.C. Mayor Walter E. Washington, himself a Negro, took part in the ending of the fiasco of "Resurrection City," as 343 of the squatters—including the Rev. Ralph David Abernathy, successor to the late Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.—were arrested. Thus was the maintenance of law and order resumed in the capital of the nation.

SILVER SPRING, Md., May 15, 1968.

CHAIRMAN, HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: Who can we call upon, From whom can we seek relief when our town is invaded by rioters?

Sympathies from high officials have only been aimed at the law breakers, at the arsonists and at the murderers. It is the voices of the militant anarchistic leaders who have reached the ears of the insurrectionists and have made an army of **law breakers.**

In a democratic form of government we expect our representatives to consider the welfare of *all* the people.

It certainly is not the duty of the law abiding citizens to form vigilante committees to protect their lives and property. We expect our government to do this for us; otherwise we would tear down the very fabric of the society we have strived to build up for 200 years.

The government must do *everything* in its power, when conditions affect the welfare of law abiding citizens against the rebellious actions of a few. It was a very small percentage of the Russian population who overthrew the Czarist government and established a communistic regime.

It can happen here!

As one who has labored for many years to build a business and see it wantonly destroyed in a few hours, I can assure you it is a heartbreaking experience. Then, to be coerced, blackmailed and prevented from continuing in business by these same few militants is inconceivable in these United States of America.

As law abiding citizens *we must have your help now.* As our representative to our Federal government you must see to it that our rights and property are protected.

We expect your immediate action now.

It is of utmost importance that immediate remedial action be taken—first, in the form of long term low interest loans; secondly, in protection against threats and constraints against resuming business activity.

As your constituent—we are looking to you for redress in this untenable situation.

Our store at 1918 Seventh Street NW., Washington, D.C., was burned to the ground on April 5, 1968, and all of our assets with it.

Respectfully yours,

BERNIE M. HORWITZ.

[Editorial broadcast by WMAL/AM/FM/TV, Washington, D.C., during the week of July 21, 1968]

POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

D.C. City Council Chairman John Hechinger has recently been pounding the drum for better police-community relations. We are in accord with the goal and the philosophy behind it. But we fear that police-community relations is a term often used, but seldom defined. Even the comprehensive D.C. Crime Commission report is vague on this aspect of police work.

The Metropolitan Police have had a Police-Community Relations Unit since 1964. Related activities, such as the Police Boys Club, are much older.

But the field of police-community relations should reach far beyond the precinct walls—into the classroom, the pulpit and the media. To some extent, it has. But the field remains broad and vague and should be explored by the City Council. This is an area the soon-to-be established Joint Congressional Committee on Crime might also adopt as a first order of national business.

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 8, 1968]

OWNER QUILTS WITH GUN BLAZING—HOLDUP No. 10 CLOSES 20-YEAR-OLD NW PHARMACY

(By Gerald Somerville, Star staff writer)

Henry R. Peters says he is closing the drugstore he has run for 20 years—crime is the reason.

Yesterday the 52-year-old Negro pharmacist, who has been held up or been the victim of burglars four times in the last year and 10 times since opening his store, prepared to lock the doors.

Peters called it quits after the latest holdup occurred in his store at 2917 Georgia Ave., NW, Tuesday when three gunmen walked in, made him lie on the floor and, after pointing a pistol at his head, demanded cash and narcotics.

The druggist managed to escape from a room he had been locked in, climbed quickly to a second-story balcony and fired five shots at the three as they fled from his store on foot. The bandits dropped the \$135 and some drugs when Peters opened fire.

"The police have also arrested one suspect, but that doesn't stop me from closing up. I've had it," he said.

Peters story is nothing new to many District small businessmen. "Many more would pull out too," he declared, "but they can't find buyers or people willing to take over for them."

"My wife and I have averaged 14 to 16 hours a day building this business up," Peters said. "We started with a \$500 loan and have grown to a point where we fill more than 200 prescriptions daily and employ 12 other people. But I'd rather give it up now than be dead."

The Massachusetts native admits he's afraid. "It's no use," he continued, I'm scared now. I'm afraid to go home, afraid to go out back of the store and I'm forced to carry a pistol with me at all times.

"I've spent thousands of dollars securing my home and store," he said, "but in the past 20 years I've been robbed of more than \$15,000. I can't stand any more losses and my delivery drivers can't be bonded anymore."

The medium built, gray-haired businessman said he may return to the Boston area where he grew up and graduated from the Massachusetts College of Pharmacy. But his plans are still uncertain. "My whole life is in this game," he said. "I don't know anything else."

To add to his frustrations, Peters said in each instance it was Negroes who have held him up. "My own people, whom I've been charged to help, are making me quit," he said.

"They talk about starting businesses for ourselves," Peters continued, "but these robbers don't let us succeed. It's a damn shame. Maybe they don't realize it, but they're only giving white racists like Wallace and his group ammunition."

Peters said he has been active in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and other civil rights groups for many years and was also a member of the District Board of Pharmacy for six years. "They used to keep Negroes off the board," he said. "But I fought hard to get us admitted, so we could do things for our people."

In a final gesture Peters, who also taught at the Howard School of Pharmacy, pointed to one of his young employes, 25-year-old Douglas Norris. "See that young fellow," he said, "he told me he was quitting even before I decided to get out. It's a shame."

Explained Norris: "You don't know what to expect anymore. Anything can happen at anytime."



