

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

*U.S. Congress*

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 2

JANUARY 27, 1975 TO FEBRUARY 5, 1975

(PAGES 1285 TO 2628)

annually a proclamation designating February of each year as "National History Month." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, today I am introducing a resolution authorizing and requesting the President annually to issue a proclamation designating February as "National History Month."

A country which cannot remember the errors of the past is condemned to repeat them, so the scribes tell us. Just as importantly, a country which does not do everything possible to perpetuate the glories of its past, its traditions and values and hopes and dreams, risks forfeiture of its greatness. In recent years there was an alarming tendency, especially among some of our young people, to push the study of the past aside and to focus on the "relevance" of the present. Now, however, there is a refreshing breeze carrying with it the realization that change for a better tomorrow relies heavily on an understanding of the past.

Fact and parcel of this new realization is the coming of the Bicentennial which has created renewed awareness of the national past. Communities across the land are enthusiastically developing projects to commemorate the 200th anniversary of our country's birth.

By setting aside 1 month a year for special emphasis on the heritage of America, we can help perpetuate this developing enthusiasm. We can extend the Bicentennial energies into each succeeding year. And we can give special weight to historical projects in our schools with a designated history month each year.

Mr. President, as we face the many serious challenges which abound wherever we look, I believe it is fitting indeed that we mobilize the heritage of our land for the difficult days ahead. A sense of history can provide direction and meaning to a people, and help them through the adversities they face. We will do the Nation a service by proclaiming History Month, and I hope my colleagues will agree with me and join in support of this resolution.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

S. 28

At the request of Mr. MOSS, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 28, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against tax, or in the alternative a deduction, for energy conserving residential expenditures.

S. 32

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) was added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 32) to establish a framework for the formulation of national policy and priorities for science and technology, and for other purposes.

S. 214

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my distinguished colleague the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY) be added as a cosponsor of my

bill, S. 214, for the modernization and general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FONG. I particularly welcome Senator BUCKLEY's cosponsorship because he has special knowledge and background in the patent field. In the preceding Congress, he introduced his own bill, S. 2930, which sought to improve existing law.

In S. 214, I endeavored to retain what has been proven meritorious in present law and to build upon that law with features taken from his bill and several other measures considered last year by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights. I offered S. 214 this year as a vehicle that possibly could break the legislative impasse of the past 8 years on patent law revision.

S. 320

At the request of Mr. TALMADGE, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 320, the Emergency Natural Gas Act of 1975.

S. 323

At the request of Mr. MOSS, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 323, a bill to regulate commerce and to protect petroleum product dealers from unfair practices, and for other purposes.

S. 411

At the request of Mr. GOLDWATER, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 411, a bill to provide tax relief for condominium owners, homeowners' associations, and cooperative housing corporations.

S. 445

At the request of Mr. HUGH SCOTT, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE) were added as cosponsors of S. 445, a bill to assure that an individual or family whose income is increased by reason of a general increase in monthly social security benefits, will not, because of such general increase, suffer a loss of or a reduction in the benefits the individual or family has been receiving under certain Federal or federally assisted programs.

S.J. RES. 12

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) was added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 12) to defer oil import fees on oil price increases.

S. CON. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. CHURCH, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no legislation imposing a ceiling on social security cost-of-living increases be enacted.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 41—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED CONTINUING THE AUTHORIZATION FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 41

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is authorized, from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, to employ two additional professional staff members and two additional clerical assistants, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with the provisions of section 105(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958, as amended.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 42—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance, reported the following resolution:

S. RES. 42

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Ninety-fourth Congress, \$30,000 in addition to the amounts, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and in Senate Resolution 148, Ninety-third Congress, agreed to August 2, 1973.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 43—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION DESIGNATING NATIONAL CHILD ABUSE AWARENESS WEEK

(Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. STAFFORD) submitted the following resolution:

S. RES. 43

Whereas each year some 60,000 children in the United States are reported to have been abused, some to the point of permanent injury and death; and

Whereas experts believe that child abuse in our country is more prevalent than is revealed by current statistics; and

Whereas child abuse is a national problem found in all types of families and communities; and

Whereas, although every State in the Union has a law requiring the reporting of child abuse or suspected child abuse, child abuse still is often undetected and untreated; and

Whereas the "National Conference on Child Abuse" sponsored by the Parents Anonymous organization, the Memorial Hospital Medical Center of Los Angeles, Calif. and the Center for Health Education of the University of California, Irvine, will take place February 13 through 15; and

Whereas awareness of the problem of child abuse is the first critical step in the identification, prevention, and treatment of child abuse: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that in order to help the Congress and

the Nation to gain a better understanding of what must be done to insure the safety and well-being of our children, the period February 9 through February 15, 1975, be designated as "National Child Abuse Awareness Week."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am introducing today a Senate resolution proclaiming the week of February 9 to 15 as "Child Abuse Awareness Week." The dates have been selected to coincide with the "National Conference on Child Abuse" which will take place in California February 13 through 15. The conference is sponsored by Parents Anonymous, the Memorial Hospital Medical Center of Long Beach, Calif., and the Center for Health Education of the University of California, Irvine.

Parents Anonymous, which has been instrumental in bringing the problem of child abuse to national attention, offers help to families in times of crisis. Among its members are parents who have in the past abused their children. These parents and the professionals who work with them have been most effective in helping other parents to overcome the problems and tensions which can lead to child abuse.

My Subcommittee on Children and Youth devoted nearly a year to hearings and investigation of this tragic problem. About a year ago, the President signed the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, which I introduced in the Senate.

In the course of our hearings we learned that an estimated 60,000 children are reported to have been abused each year, and that existing services were inadequate to prevent, identify and treat the families involved.

Now that the law has been signed and funding provided by Congress, I am confident that we are on our way to making significant progress in this area. I continue to believe, however, that Government action is not enough. Creating greater public awareness of the problem of child abuse is the best way of assuring that effective action is taken. For this reason I am pleased to offer this resolution designating the second week in February as "Child Abuse Awareness Week."

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 44—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, reported the following resolution:

##### S. RES. 44

*Resolved*, That, in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by sections 134(a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in accordance with its jurisdiction under rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized from March 1, 1975, through February 29, 1976, in its discretion, (1) to make expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration,

to use on a reimbursable basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed \$875,000, of which amount not to exceed \$12,000 may be expended for the procurement of the services of individual consultants, or organizations thereof (as authorized by section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended).

SEC. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than February 29, 1976.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 7—SUBMISSION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE IMPOSITION OF ECONOMIC CONTROLS

(Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.)

Mr. BEALL submitted a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that business concerns which lower prices shall not be penalized if certain economic controls are imposed.

(The remarks of Mr. BEALL on the submission of the above concurrent resolution are printed earlier in the Record.)

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

##### S. 172—MILEAGE EXPENSES OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

###### AMENDMENT NO. 2

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.)

Mr. ABOUREZK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 172) to revise certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to per diem and mileage expenses of employees and other individuals traveling on official business.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, the Senate Government Operations Committee has just reported out of committee, S. 172, the bill relating to per diem and mileage expenses of Government employees traveling on official business. With the unprecedented price of fuel and with the ever spiraling rate of inflation, it is gratifying to know that swift congressional action on this legislation is underway.

Although I wholeheartedly support this legislation, there is one, serious discrepancy in the present law which I feel needs to be corrected, and could be corrected by this bill. Present law provides for a per diem allowance of \$25 in most cases and an 11-cent-per-mile allowance for most Government employees. Yet, the reimbursement rates for veterans traveling on official business to veterans' facilities for treatment or for other officials business is significantly less. Current reimbursement rates were set back in 1968 at \$12 a day or 6 cents per mile.

Last year I pointed out this discrepancy and I was gratified that a provision which established more equitable

treatment of veterans in this regard was considered in the Congress and adopted. Unfortunately, with the President's veto of the bill last year, the per diem legislation had to be reintroduced. The House has included the veterans provision in this year's bill and I feel cautiously confident that the Senate will again be sympathetic to the provision.

Opponents of the veterans' travel provision have pointed out that the distance traveled by veterans to VA facilities is less than 50 miles. It is obvious that such statements are made without consideration for those thousands of veterans who have to cross the vast territory in the States of South Dakota, Montana, Alaska and others west of the Mississippi. For in these States, our veterans, many of whom are disabled, are forced to travel hundreds of miles to get to the VA facility nearest them. In a large percentage of these cases, these veterans are required to leave home the day before to meet an early morning appointment, thereby requiring them to seek lodging overnight.

There seems to be no justifiable reason why there must be two significantly different figures for two U.S. citizens traveling on official business. Veterans should have the same privileges under law that are granted to others traveling in a Government-related capacity. I believe that the Congress and the American people recognize this and will support this provision when the opportunity presents itself in the near future.

It is significant to note that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have continued to push hard for equitable veterans travel rates and have passed resolutions calling for more realistic allowances. I certainly concur with these resolutions and urge my colleagues to consider the advice of these knowledgeable organizations on this matter.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-TERM CARE ANNOUNCES NEW YORK HEARINGS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I would like to announce a second day of hearings this year by my Subcommittee on Long-Term Care, U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, to be held in New York City on Tuesday, February 4, 1975, at the New York County Lawyers Association Building, 14 Vesey Street, beginning at 10 a.m.

This will be the 24th hearing in the sequence "Trends in Long-Term Care" which began in July 1969. As the result of these hearings the subcommittee has prepared a 12-volume report on nursing home problems. Our introductory report, "Nursing Home Care in the United States: Failure in Public Policy" was published in November; our first supporting paper dealing with nursing home abuses was released in December, and second supporting paper dealing with nursing home drugs was issued in January. Subsequent reports will follow monthly for the next 9 months.

The New York hearings grow out of investigations conducted by the New York Times, and Mr. John Hess in particular, and the office of the welfare inspector general and the temporary commission on living costs and the en-