

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

*U.S. Congress*

# Congressional Record

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

VOLUME 122—PART 3

FEBRUARY 5, 1976 TO FEBRUARY 18, 1976

(PAGES 2463 TO 3714)

gration is a flagrant violation of this Convention.

4. Is Israel entitled, according to International Law, to grant Israeli nationality to Jews living in the Soviet Union?

In some anti-Jewish publications in different parts of the world, we have been accused of the fact that we consider all Jews living outside of Israel as being Israeli nationals and as such, having legally binding obligations towards the State of Israel.

As is well known, our Nationality Law was amended in order to enable us to grant Israeli nationality to Jews who, due to circumstances beyond their control, were unable to immigrate to Israel.

In order to clarify the situation, it should be stressed that:

(a) All problems concerning the acquisition or loss of nationality are governed by the laws of the State. This principle was adapted by the International Court of Justice in the *Nottebohm* case.<sup>3</sup>

It is for Liechtenstein, as it is for every sovereign State, to settle by its own legislation the rules relating to the acquisition of its nationality, and to confer that nationality by naturalization granted by its own organs in accordance with that legislation.

It is not necessary to determine whether international law imposes any limitations on its freedom of decision in this domain.

Nationality is within the domestic jurisdiction of the State.

(b) Israel grants Israeli nationality only to those that apply for it. It is not granted en bloc. The numerous applications we receive from all parts of the Soviet Union, the protests of Jews in Moscow, Leningrad, Minsk and their demand for emigration to Israel constitute the best proof that there is a link, there is affinity between them and the State of Israel. And affinity is one of the elements to be taken into consideration in granting nationality.

(c) The Soviet Government itself has recognized Israel as the homeland of the Jewish people. On May 14, 1947, speaking in support of the establishment of the State of Israel, Andrei Gromyko, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations, stated: The fact that no West European State has been able to ensure the defense of elementary rights of the Jewish people, and safeguard it against the violence of the Fascist executioners, explains the aspirations of the Jews to their own State. It would be unjust not to take this into consideration and to deny the right of the Jewish people to realize this aspiration.<sup>4</sup>

These are some of the legal aspects concerning the Jewish problem in the Soviet Union. By raising this issue in U.N. forums and in other International Organizations—we do not violate any rule of International Law. We do not ask for any special privileges for Soviet Jews: we demand of the Soviet Union to abide by its own laws and to act in accordance with the several International Instruments to which it is a party.

#### CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in recent months the "Child and Family Services Act," has been the subject of a totally fraudulent propaganda campaign in Minnesota and other States. The literature being circulated about the bill is generally unsigned and is completely unfounded. Among the allegations being advanced about the bill are that it would somehow undermine religious instruction and would somehow take the authority

for child-rearing from families and turn it over to the State. The literature also claims that provisions of a so-called Charter of Children's Rights—which was actually drafted in Britain—is part of this bill. These charges are totally without foundation.

This bill is supported by a wide range of civic and religious organizations, including the U.S. Catholic Conference, the United Methodist Church, the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, the UAW, and the AFL-CIO, the PTA, the League of Women Voters, and the American Home Economic Association. The Archbishop of St. Paul and Minneapolis, Reverend Roach, has stated on behalf of all Minnesota Catholic bishops that the "bill would fill an urgent need."

Many other responsible organizations and individuals have expressed their concern about the misleading effects of the propaganda campaign and have been working hard to refute the outlandish charges being lodged against it. In addition, a number of articles and media releases rebutting the attack have recently appeared. At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several of these articles.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SENATOR WINSTON W. BORDEN COMMENTS ON SENATOR MONDALE'S CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES BILL

This is State Senator Winston Borden with some comments on Senator Mondale's child and family services bill.

Anonymous scandal sheets circulated by extremists in northern Minnesota against Senator Mondale's Family Services Act are a disservice to all of us.

This Bicentennial Year promises political comment and turmoil equal to that surrounding the birth of our Nation in 1776.

Intense political comment can strengthen our democracy. Those who comment on issues should be willing to stand behind their statements.

The scandal sheets state that the Government will raise our children in the same manner as communistic countries. It is difficult to imagine anything further from the truth.

Twenty-six Senators and almost 100 Representatives joined Senator Mondale in authoring the bill. It is supported by the PTA, the AFL-CIO, the United Methodist Church, the U.S. Catholic Conference, the Baptist and Lutheran Churches, the National Association of Retarded Children, and the National Education Association.

Reasonable people can differ on the merits of the Child and Family Services Act. But citizens deserve a more thoughtful discussion of the issues than that provided by the extremists in its unsigned flyers.

[From the Baptist Standard, Jan. 15, 1976]

#### SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT ABOUT CHILD SERVICES ACT

Have you seen a circular warning that the federal government is plotting to take away your children if you insist they take out the garbage?

The bills which the circular asserts contain this alleged plot are H.R. 2966 and S. 626, the Child and Family Services Act of 1975. These bills, which are almost identical, are currently pending in House and Senate subcommittees, but the allegations contained in the circulars are false and misleading.

The Child and Family Services Act of 1975 is actually designed to help both children

and parents—particularly those parents who are working or who cannot, for a variety of reasons, adequately care for their children during working hours. It provides for full-time or part-time child care programs, before and after school as well as summer programs; education and consultation for parents; prenatal medical care for mothers who cannot afford it, to help protect the unborn child; food and nutritional services for poor children; treatment of medical and psychological problems of children if their parents request such treatment; and help for children with handicaps or special learning disabilities.

The fact that Congress is even considering this act has generated a wave of unusual protest—unusual in that most of it seems to be the result of unsigned circulars which have been widely distributed by churches and individuals. These circulars, often headed "Rearing children by the government or by parents," contain a wealth of inflammatory misinformation and untruth.

Sen. Walter Mondale (D.-Minn.), chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling the Child and Family Services Act, in a speech on the Senate floor (*Congressional Record*, November 19, 1975, pp. 37380-37384), stated that the act is "being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

Some falsehoods attributed to the act are that parents who are not doing a good job will have their children taken away from them, that parents cannot teach their children about God, that a charter of children's rights is being added to the act, and that parents would lose the right to form their children's characters.

To set the record straight and to refute the proceeding untruths, the following facts are given:

(1) The act, instead of taking child rearing away from the parents, clearly states that "Child and Family Service Programs must build upon and strengthen the role of the family and must be provided on a voluntary basis only to children whose parents or legal guardians request such services, with a view toward offering families the options they believe to be most appropriate for their particular needs."

(2) There is no "child advocacy" clause nor is there a "charter of children's rights" anywhere in the bill, and neither of them will be added. The "charter of children's rights" was developed years ago by the unofficial British Advisory Center of Education but was never seen seriously proposed in England. Sen. Carl Curtis (R.-Neb.) read a portion of this British group's proposal into the *Congressional Record* in a Senate debate on another child services bill on December 2, 1971. The text is found on page 44125 of the *Record*. However that material was not a part of the 1971 bill and is not a part of the present act.

(3) The act specifically prohibits any practice which would "infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents or guardians with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical or other developments of their children."

(4) The act prohibits any medical or psychological examination or treatment unless the parent or guardian provides written permission.

(5) The privacy of families is protected by the provision that no "section of this act be construed or applied in such a manner as to permit any invasion of privacy otherwise protected by law or to abridge any legal remedies for any such invasion which are otherwise provided by law."

These statements of fact should not be interpreted to mean that the act is free of potential church-state problems. The Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs gave testimony on the act before a joint House-

<sup>3</sup>I.C.J. Reports, 1955, pp. 20-21.

<sup>4</sup>U.N. GAOR, Special Session, no. 132, 1974.

Senate committee last spring. In that testimony it was pointed out that the inclusion of religious organizations as possible operators of some child care programs would raise the problem of using public funds for what might be religious education and indoctrination.

In summary, close examination of the current bills simply makes it obvious that the allegations in the circulars now flooding the country are a "parade of imaginary horrors." If one is to oppose this act it should be done on the basis of informed judgment and not on the basis of a circular made up of patent untruths and wild distortions.

JOHN W. BAKER,

Rosemary Brevard, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

[From the New Prague Times, Dec. 11, 1975]  
UNSIGNED CIRCULAR IS REPLETE WITH FALSEHOODS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS

Customarily when an anonymous letter is received at The Times, it is consigned forthwith to the round file, with or without reading. That is standard practice in newspaper offices.

However, an unsigned mimeographed flyer came to our attention recently which is being widely circulated throughout the country and which calls for refutation and repudiation. The mimeographed circular bears no name, no address and no source of identification. That in itself is reprehensible and lacking in courage of conviction. It is wholly a collection of misrepresentations and downright falsehoods.

The anonymous flyer castigates the proposed Child and Family Services Act of 1975 alleging, in brief, that this legislation would deprive parents of parental direction and control of their children and Sovietize the youngsters in some kind of communal system.

In a speech delivered before the United States Senate on November 19, Senator Walter F. Mondale of Minnesota, one of the sponsors of the bill in Congress, declared:

"Contrary to these unsigned allegations, the child and family legislation contains nothing that changes or affects the legal relationship between parents and their children. Instead, it simply offers to families—on a totally volunteer basis—access to health, education and child care services which they want for their children but often cannot afford. It offers prenatal health care and early medical screening and treatment to detect and rectify handicapping conditions, and day care for children of working mothers, and the bill specifically limits eligibility for these services to "children whose parents or guardians request such services"—S 626 section 2½ section 106 (b).

"In addition, this legislation is deliberately and carefully designed to provide parental control of any services offered. Thus, the bill requires that all programs funded would be selected, established and controlled by the parents of the children participating in them".

In the Congressional Record of that day, Senator Mondale categorically listed and refuted each and every one of the allegations made in the anonymous circular, with citations from the wording of the Child and Family Services Act.

Anyone who has known and watched Fritz Mondale's career from his early activities in public affairs, through his service as Minnesota attorney general and now to a United States Senatorship knows full well that he could not be a party to any such program as the anonymous circular falsifies. The people of Minnesota have demonstrated their confidence and trust in Walter F. Mondale by overwhelming majorities at each election in which his name has appeared on the ballot.

It is truly regrettable that able, honest and conscientious public servants who co-sponsored the Child and Family Services Act in the Congress must be subjected to such unfair, anonymous misrepresentation,—but it appears that is the burden which we place upon them.

[Lutheran Council "Focus on Governmental Affairs"]

#### CHILD CARE BILL COMES UNDER ATTACK

The Child and Family Services Bill (S. 626 H.R. 2966), which would fund day-care centers and provide a variety of nutritional, health, educational and social services to disadvantaged children, has recently come under widespread attack. In what seems to be a highly organized campaign to discredit this legislation, an anonymously circulated, two-page, mimeographed flyer charges that the bill would give the government rather than parents the right to control their children's development. As House Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill, Democrat of Massachusetts, stated in a recent speech in Congress: "Whether we support or oppose this legislation, I urge every member of the House to be on the alert for the fearmongers who spread such poison throughout the land."

In reality, the bill sponsored by Senator Walter Mondale, Democrat of Minnesota, and Congressman John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, stresses voluntary participation in the child care program. Parents would form at least half of the membership of any group setting policies for funded programs. The bill also bans any infringement of the "moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents with respect to the moral, mental, emotional, physical or other development of their children."

Most Lutherans working in the social welfare field support the provisions of the bill. In testifying last March before a joint Congressional committee William C. Tremiere of Tressler-Lutheran Services Associates, Inc., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, concluded: "There is an urgent need for appropriate, sensitive legislative intervention that will guarantee the basic rights of children and the supports necessary to develop and maintain healthy family life for all children in our nation. We believe the Child and Family Services Act of 1975 has the potential of meeting this need."

The Washington office of the National Council of Churches has issued an excellent statement clarifying the issues involved. The Lutheran Council has distributed this analysis, with other materials, to interested parties.

Unless Congress perceives constituent support for S. 626 and H.R. 2966, this attack, though unfair and misleading, may have caused so much damage that the bill will remain stalled in Congress for the immediate future.

[From the Kanabec County Times,  
Jan. 29, 1976]

#### ATTACK ON CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT OF 1975

Irresponsible political attacks are always with us, even more so in an election year. The recent furor about the Child and Family Services Act of 1975, co-sponsored by our Senator Mondale and Rep. John Brademas of Indiana, is a case in point.

The act would provide funds for local communities and parent organizations to provide prenatal care, medical treatment to detect and remedy handicaps, nutrition assistance and day-care programs—to parents who request them. Participation would be completely voluntary, with the rights of parents carefully protected.

Yet literature has been circulated, into the Mora area, too, that contends the bill would take away the parents' responsibility

to raise their children and give it to the government. These unsigned attacks, completely false, cited a 1971 excerpt from the Congressional Record which had nothing to do with the current bill.

Fritz Mondale has pointed out that the charges are false. Church authorities, Catholic and Protestant alike, have denounced the attacks and supported the bill. We hope the baseless charges have been put to rest.

This incident does emphasize a regrettable attitude on the part of many citizens. A lot of us are all too ready to believe the worst about our public servants and our institutions. Let's all try to be fair. Most of our people in political life are actually trying to do a good job for us. Let's not automatically damn them every time some crackpot raises a trumped-up charge.

When they're out of line, let them have it with both barrels. But try to remember that the guys in the other party aren't always wrong.

#### FOUR QUESTIONS BY A STUDENT OF ECONOMICS OF ECONOMICS

Mr. BROCK. Mr. President, the past year has been one of many ups and downs for our economy. We have been through a recession, and it now appears as if the economy is on the road to recovery. A speech by Dr. Arthur Burns, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, was recently brought to my attention. I found the speech remarkable. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FOUR QUESTIONS BY A STUDENT OF ECONOMICS (By Arthur F. Burns)

I am very pleased to join this audience in honoring the graduating class of The University of Akron. Some of you receiving a degree today will continue with your formal education; others will embark on business or professional careers. But whatever your plans for the future, our Nation's economic and political condition will inevitably remain a matter of concern to you.

Recently, I received a letter from a college student named Rebecca who posed several blunt questions concerning our Nation's economy. First, Rebecca asked, "What was the biggest economic setback this year?" Second, "What has been the biggest economic boost this year?" Third, "What plans are being made to get the U.S. out of the red?" Fourth, "What can we as citizens of the U.S. do to help the economic situation?"

These are thoughtful questions, and they are not easy to answer with confidence or precision. But they undoubtedly express the concerns of many of our citizens, and I want to take advantage of this occasion to share with you my attempt to answer Rebecca's earnest inquiry.

Turning to the first question, the list of candidates for the greatest economic disappointment of 1975 is regrettably quite long. During the past year, we experienced a severe recession. The physical output of our national economy declined sharply before recovery got under way. The unemployment rate rose to levels not seen in a long generation. Inflation continued at a disconcerting pace. The deficit in the Federal Government's budget exploded. Interest rates on municipal securities soared. And efforts to move our Nation toward independence in the field of energy made little progress.

While all these developments have been disappointing, the persistence of inflation at a time of such widespread unemployment of labor and of capital harbors the most