

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 2

JANUARY 18, 1973 TO JANUARY 30, 1973

(PAGES 1319 TO 2610)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1973

weekly. This would buy \$106 worth of food stamps for \$42 per month—a non-taxable subsidy of \$16 per week. The California Welfare Department paid him \$282 per month in emergency relief, or \$70 per week. This gave the striker \$34.65 more per week in disposable income than he earned before calling the strike. He would have needed a raise of about \$.90 per hour—an increase of almost 33 percent—just to stay even with his strike income.

It is obvious that the food stamp program played a major role in destroying this worker's incentive to return to work without exorbitant wage increases of a kind which brought the country to the brink of economic disaster in the summer of 1971. Negative incentives to workers such as the food stamp program make it easy to understand why this country's relative productivity is lagging—in this case, we—the taxpayers of the Nation and of California—pay a man more not to produce than he gets for working.

The argument has been made that those on strike have so-called right to food stamps because they are taxpayers when they are working. If this argument was carried to its logical conclusion by every taxpayer, then childless payers of school taxes could rightfully complain about the lack of return to them individually from their tax dollars. Or, those who do not own automobiles could rightfully complain that they get no return to them individually from taxes used to build streets and roads.

Advocates of food stamps for strikers make emotional appeals based upon the specter of starving wives and children. This argument becomes hard to accept as the general level of affluence in the labor force increases. Furthermore, the timing of most strikes is well known in advance, allowing any thoughtful worker to take necessary provident steps. I fully support the right to strike, but that right does not mean that those on strike have a right to public subsidies such as food stamps.

This bill does not effect the rights of workers who are out of work because of an employer lockout. However, I believe it would deny food stamps in selective strikes. An example of a selective strike occurs when the employer operates a number of plants. The same union is the bargaining agent in all of the plants. The plant chosen to be struck is strategic to the operations at other plants of the employer to the extent that he has no alternative to closing down one or more of the other plants. This is not the usual lockout used as a bargaining tool. Where the striker or unemployed worker is a member of the same union which is using the selective strike technique, I do not believe he should be entitled to food stamps and the bill so provides.

If Congress wishes to in some small measure cut down the number and especially the long duration of strikes the bill offers a beginning. It does not attempt to cut down on aid to dependent children, welfare, or unemployment compensation for strikers. By confining it to food stamps, we will be in better position to judge the effectiveness of Federal Governmental support of strikers.

S. 413

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) was added as cosponsor of S. 413, to permit American citizens to hold gold.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. TALMADGE, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a rural environmental assistance program.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, the Vote Registration Assistance Act of 1973.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10

At the request of Mr. SCHWEIKER, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 10, the school prayer amendment.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

At the request of Mr. BROCK, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 14, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to open admissions to public schools.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

At the request of Mr. BROOKE, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 20, designating January 15, of each year as "Martin Luther King Day."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO APPORTION FUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS

(Referred to the Committee on Public Works.)

Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. COOK, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. MCCLURE, Mr. MUSKIE, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia) submitted the following concurrent resolution:

S. CON. RES. 6

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to make the apportionment for the fiscal year 1974 of the sums authorized to be apportioned for such year for expenditure on the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, using the apportionment factors contained in table 5, House Committee Print numbered 92-29.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, AND 32—ORIGINAL RESOLUTIONS REPORTED

(Placed on the calendar.)

The following original resolutions were reported by Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 25

Resolution authorizing the revision and printing of the Senate Manual for use during the Ninety-third Congress

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Ninety-third Congress, that said Rules and Manual shall be printed as a Senate document, and that two thousand additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which one thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, five hundred and fifty copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining four hundred and fifty copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the Committee.

S. RES. 26

Resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Cannon of Nevada, Mr. Allen of Alabama, and Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Cannon of Nevada, Mr. Pell of Rhode Island, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Cook of Kentucky, and Mr. Hatfield of Oregon.

S. RES. 27

Resolution to pay a gratuity to Roger G. Anderson

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Roger G. Anderson, widower of Marilyn E. Anderson, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to three months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

S. RES. 28

Resolution to pay a gratuity to LeRoy Spears, Sr.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to LeRoy Spears, Senior, father of Joy M. Spears, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

S. RES. 29

Resolution to pay a gratuity to Richard E. Burgess

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Richard E. Burgess, widower of Jeannette A. Burgess, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to one year's compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

S. RES. 30

Resolution to pay a gratuity to Norinne B. Bratt

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Norinne B. Bratt, widow of James L. Bratt, Junior, an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT, JUNE 7, TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1968

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, June 7, to file a privileged report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1968.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped it will be possible for the bill to be on the floor on Tuesday next June 11.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is unanimity in deploring the dastardly attempt to take the life of the junior Senator from New York. I join with others in the prayer he will enjoy a complete recovery.

It is regrettable we do not have the same unanimity in recognizing the need for attempting to correct the conditions which have brought about the increasing return of lawlessness, including violence, which has been rampant over the past several months.

I am referring particularly to the attitude of those in high places—in the executive, in the judicial, and in the legislative branches of our Government—where we apparently have been more interested in protecting and justifying the lawless actions of those who riot, kill, burn, steal, and rape than in protecting the innocent.

We do not need more laws. We need the determination to enforce the laws that are already on the books.

I cannot in these brief remarks set forth all of the incidents which are so well known by all of us, but I would cite the disgusting conduct of the chief law enforcement officer of this Nation, the Attorney General, who, yesterday in capitulating to the demands of anarchists, permitted not the 20 representatives from the so-called Resurrection City that he had originally agreed to hear but 100 representatives, who took over his office and made illegal threats and demands as he passively submitted to this abuse, without calling into action the law enforcement officers who were readily available.

The Attorney General listened submissively to the threats of increased violence. I do not know if he was acting

under directions of the President in permitting this mob to take over his office, but I do recall that many months ago the President did permit the late Martin Luther King to inform him that his group would obey those laws of which they approved and would violate those laws with which they did not agree, and that the President did not discourage the threats that were made at that time. This was notice to the world that the President could be intimidated and that he would yield to the illegal demands of other groups, thereby losing not only the respect but inviting the accelerated increase in crime and violence, by the lawless element of this Nation.

There is a need for return to law enforcement by all the departments of the Government, and this new direction should start at the White House, with direction to the Department of Justice to get on the side of the people who respect law and order.

REPUBLICAN URBAN AFFAIRS TASK FORCE HEARINGS ON MAJOR PROBLEMS CONFRONTING THE URBAN AREAS

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY will testify before the House Republican urban affairs task force on Thursday, June 6, at 12 o'clock noon in room H-202 in the Capitol. This will be the 10th in a series of task force hearings on major problems confronting the urban areas.

Senator PERCY, a recognized proponent of involving the private sector in meeting our Nation's housing needs through his proposed National Home-Ownership Foundation, will address the task force on our Nation's housing needs. Additionally he will present his views on involving the private sector in programs to meet other urban problems.

I am very proud of the record established by the House Republican urban affairs task force in seeking the advice of these several experts on the urban crisis. Among the experts testifying before the task force have been New York City Mayor John Lindsay, the executive directors of the League of Cities, Patrick Healey; the National Association of Counties, Bernard Hillenbrand; the U.S. Conference of Mayors, John Gunther; and Dr. Thomas Matthew, of the National Economic Growth and Reconstruction Organization.

These public hearings have produced invaluable information for the continuing dialog on one of our Nation's foremost problems. In speaking for the Republican urban affairs task force, I wish to say we are glad to be a part of this constructive dialog.

ENFORCEMENT OF CRIME LAWS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for

1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I am moved to take the floor to commend my colleague from Missouri [Mr. JONES] for what I think is a splendid statement. I think it is about time this were underlined. We do not need more laws. We need enforcement of the laws that are on the books. Let me illustrate specifically. We have the Federal Firearms Act and the National Firearms Act. If these acts were properly enforced, the assassination of President Kennedy and the assassination of Martin Luther King could never have occurred. This will probably prove to be the case in the attempted assassination of Senator ROBERT KENNEDY, as well.

Our Committee on Ways and Means held hearings on this matter 2 years ago. We had the Attorney General of the United States come before us with examples of guns being sold across our borders to criminals, this is against these laws. I think 40 were sold by one operator in Maryland which were shipped to criminals in the District of Columbia. I asked the Attorney General then whether they had revoked the Federal license that this gun dealer in Maryland had. They had not done that. Had they carried out the law requiring this gun dealer to keep a list by name and address of those to whom he sold the guns? They did not check on that. Did they require these people to identify themselves so that they could not use fictitious names? They had not done that. They had done nothing. To this very day the Attorney General of the United States is not enforcing these laws, nor is the Department of the Treasury, which has a part of this jurisdiction for the enforcement of these laws, enforcing them.

Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks I will put some further details in, but let me say that this is what we need—a little law enforcement of the acts that we have on the books today, particularly by people in high positions.

In this context it is important to bear in mind that we have had firearms legislation on our Federal statute books for the past 30 years. The history of the firearms legislation began with the National Firearms Act of 1934, which was enacted to curb the flow of machineguns, sawed-off shotguns, and other nonporting weapons to the gangsters who flourished in that period. In 1938 the Federal Firearms Act was enacted. This legislation was more comprehensive than the original National Firearms Act in that it included provisions for the regulation of interstate transportation of all varieties of firearms. Both of these acts provide for enforcement by the Secretary of the Treasury under licensing and fees provisions under sections 5801-5862 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The House Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, considers all legislation dealing with amendments to the Internal Revenue Code. Conse-