

U. S. Congress
UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92^d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 118—PART 1

JANUARY 18, 1972 TO JANUARY 25, 1972

(PAGES 3 TO 1240)

ated by a number of individual companies have been very much worthwhile, and have taught us valuable lessons about what can and cannot be done with limited resources. But the need now, as I see it, is for more massive collaboration by groups of corporations in diverse fields to tackle some of those major problems that surpass the resources of a single company. Businesses must learn to create consortiums to achieve social objectives so as to surmount their fears of inadequate effort, unsophisticated effort and effort exploited by free riders.

One area where they could be immensely helpful would be in the development of new towns, satellite cities and new towns within existing cities to accommodate the 75 million more Americans who will be with us by the year 2000. It is recognized that the bulk of the new growth will come through expansion of existing communities, but a significant supplement could come through newly created towns and cities. About a dozen of these new towns are now being built, but the need is estimated not in the dozens but in the hundreds if we are to provide adequately for the well-being of our additional population without worsening the problems of existing cities.

To build the number of new towns needed will, I believe, require two things: first, a new federal agency or an existing agency endowed with new powers for planning and obtaining sites in cooperation with the appropriate local authorities; and second, a private or quasi-public organization to provide the pre-development financing. As I envisage it, this might be a new kind of community development bank offering long-term bonds that would make possible full evolution of a new town.

The opportunities for broad business participation in such an undertaking are numerous. For example, banks and insurance companies could further the new town concept by purchasing their share of bonds to provide the initial capital. Industrial corporations could help by considering new towns as sites for the expansion of their facilities, thus providing the economic base and job support so essential to development. Beyond this, companies interested in land development could form a consortium to build a town once a site had been selected and could participate in the venture as co-sponsors.

If the business community can respond to criticism in active ways such as these and then relate the story of its successful performance, I think we can win over the majority of citizens and convince them that we are contributing constructively to the building of a better society.

By first recognizing that today's criticisms are different in kind from those of the past, we can then map out more intelligent approaches to meet them. As I see it, these new approaches should take into account the need for consistently better performance effectively communicated; the need for businessmen themselves to become reformers; and the need for all business enterprises, not just a few, to participate in the effort.

Since the early writings of Karl Marx, critics have been predicting the demise of the corporation and the downfall of the American business system. Thus far these predictions have not come to pass because through the years the American corporation has proven remarkably resilient in adapting to changes, and I am confident that it can and will demonstrate equal adaptability in the decade of the Seventies.

In my view the most successful companies, in the future, will be those that are creatively concerned not only with increasing the nation's wealth but also with enhancing the people's welfare.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, citizens band two-way radio is a system

which has many multiple and worthwhile uses among amateur operators across our Nation. Besides serving as an interesting form of entertainment, this two-way communication has many useful services relating to emergency communications in the event of accidents or natural calamities.

The popularity of the citizens band radio is well established by the fact that nearly 2 million licenses have been issued by the FCC.

It is becoming clear to experts that the current class D citizens band will soon become too overcrowded to fulfill demands that will be placed upon it. There has been a proposal for a new class E citizens band. It appears that this proposal has some merit.

An article published in the February 1972, issue of *Popular Electronics* goes into this matter in some detail. Because this article offers more detailed information on this subject, I submit it for the consideration of Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

CLASS "E" CB OF THE FUTURE?

Back in 1958, the Federal Communications Commission recognized the need and the right of individual citizens to have the safety and convenience of personal two-way radio. And so, it established our current class D Citizens Radio Service at 27 MHz. In past years, citizens radio has grown beyond the wildest dreams of those who created the service. Somewhere around 1,800,000 licenses have been issued with about 900,000 currently active.

As the number of CB users continues to grow, it becomes increasingly clear that more channels—beyond the original 23—are required. It is this very real need that has led many individuals and groups to present countless proposals to the FCC for its consideration.

Last year (see "Communications," *POPULAR ELECTRONICS*, September 1971), the Citizens Radio Section of the Electronic Industries Association recommended the establishment of the class E Citizens Radio Service at 220 to 222 MHz. It should be stressed here that the new proposed class E service would be in addition to the present class D service. Briefly summarizing the EIA proposal, the new service would utilize a relatively unused portion of the amateur 220-225-MHz band, and would provide 80 new channels. Industry sources indicate that 80 channels would provide uncrowded operation for a minimum of 2.5 million licensees.

Power output to the antenna would be limited to 25 W, with special public safety agencies permitted to license a base station at 100 W output to the antenna when using this band to assist in public convenience or necessity for safety. Antenna height would be limited to 20 ft above the nearest man-made structure or natural object within 500 yards; or 60 ft above the existing terrain (whichever is higher).

The proposal suggests guidelines for the specific use of channels for various applications, such as highway communications assistance, home-to-vehicle, car-to-car, etc. The basic reason for such recommendations is to guide the service in an ordered growth, foreseeing potential requirements.

What would it be like to operate on class E CB? First of all, a class E CB system is intended to be—and definitely is—a short-range system. Range would be 10 to 20 miles

mobile-to-base depending upon antenna height, location, etc. At 220 MHz communications range is essentially limited to line of sight. Skip communications and skip interference would be non-existent in the class E service. Communications quality and range would be very consistent since atmospheric conditions have little effect on 220-MHz propagation. Also almost non-existent on class E would be man-made interference (often found on class D) caused by such things as ignition noise, diathermy, and other industrial radiations. To summarize, if you've ever heard a very good police communications radio system, class E CB would be very similar in performance.

Is Class E right around the corner and what will equipment cost? No one can really answer that question. Too many factors are involved and too many details still require further analysis and discussions by the FCC. Best industry estimates put the proposed service at least a year away even if immediate rule making were to take place. It takes a while to put the machinery together for such a significant step in personal communications.

If you're currently considering getting into CB, take a close look at the present class D service which will admirably serve the CB'ers needs for years to come. Equipment in the \$100 class is quite common in Class D. It is estimated that class E equipment will be in the \$250-\$300 rank when it is introduced. Manufacturers anticipate that it will take two or three years after the establishment of class E before unit volume will enable cost of radios to drop to \$100 or \$150. You may find that class D is the low-cost way you'll want to go or perhaps you'll choose to wait for class E. There's also much talk on the air by people who want both!

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MONDALE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, it is perhaps the mark of our critical national mood that when we see favorable articles about a public figure we usually suspect the hand of the politician's own press secretary. But the *New Republic* for December 25, 1971, contains an article on an outstanding Senator that was as laudatory as it was deserved. There is no cause for skepticism.

Entitled "Mondale of Minnesota," the article is both accurate and sympathetic in its portrayal of a brilliant Senator, close friend, and promising national leader.

In the U.S. Senate only 7 years, WALTER MONDALE has moved quickly to establish himself as one of the most resourceful Members of this body. This year he coauthored one of the most important pieces of legislation to emerge from the Congress in years, the day-care bill which President Nixon mistakenly and tragically vetoed.

Senator MONDALE's solid reputation is explained by his outstanding work in this body. Members of both parties have learned that when he takes the floor, they may expect, as a matter of routine, well researched, penetrating analyses, whether the issue is child welfare, foreign affairs, or any other matter. Moreover, they know that an issue will not be dropped once the glare of publicity fades; for when Senator MONDALE champions an issue, real work then begins.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article about one of our most

talented colleagues be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHAMPION OF POWERLESS PEOPLE—MONDALE OF MINNESOTA

(By Robert Coles)

Minnesota in recent years has done rather well in Washington. Within the past three years two of the state's sons have joined the Supreme Court, one as Chief Justice; and in 1968 the state's two senators fought for the Democratic presidential nomination. Hubert Humphrey and Eugene McCarthy were sent to Congress and kept there by the people rooted in the Granger movement of the 1870s, in the Farmers Alliance and the Populist Party, in the effort of small landowners and workers of the Midwest to fight the economic and political power of Eastern banks and corporations. Both parties in Minnesota have responded to that popularist tradition: the Democrats with men like Humphrey and McCarthy; the Republicans with men like Charles Lindbergh's father, a strongly progressive congressman from the state's sixth district, former governor Harold Stassen, and most recently, former senator Edward Thye, who back in the forties and fifties was a vigorous internationalist, a champion of federal aid to the country's colleges and schools, an enemy of racial segregation.

Walter F. Mondale took over Hubert Humphrey's seat in the Democratic landslide of 1964. He was then 36, had been attorney general of Minnesota, and before that active in the state's Democratic and Farmer-Labor parties, which successfully bring together (in contrast, say, to what happens to Nebraska or Indiana) the workers of St. Paul and Minneapolis and Duluth and the rural people who predominate in the hundreds of villages and small towns that stretch from the Iowa state line to the Canadian border.

Right off Senator Mondale showed his inclinations. He chose, out of a number of possibilities, membership on the Senate's subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs. He has since joined an interesting group of subcommittees which do not have the political clout and power of the Judiciary Committee or the Armed Services Committee but have insistently and skillfully revealed how very much needs to be done if a wealthy United States is going to be just and free. The names of the subcommittees tell a story of our continuing difficulties: Migratory Labor, of which the senator was for a time chairman; Education; Employment, Manpower and Poverty; Indian Education; Labor; Retirement and the Individual, of which he has been the chairman; Housing for the Elderly; Consumer Interests of the Elderly; Health of the Elderly; and finally the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, of which he is now the chairman.

Mondale is an active, outgoing, attractive, and unusually intelligent man, who does not need legislative aides and administrative assistants to tell him what to say, what to do, or how to vote. His concerns are not shared by powerful lobbyists, or members of the military-industrial complex—all of whom have other things to do than worry about how, for instance, thousands of migrant children get along as they are dragged all over America, and at 10 or 12 or 13 set to work picking crops. "I am concerned with powerlessness," the senator begins bluntly when he speaks to a visitor, and he goes on to say what he has said for the record many times in the course of hearings held by his subcommittee on Migratory Labor: "I don't believe the American people really know just how impoverished and hungry and above all, powerless so many of their fellow citizens

are—not only in the urban ghettos, but in the rural areas, where migrants like the people I've heard testify before our committee live by the hundreds and hundreds of thousands. They move all over. They belong nowhere. They don't vote. Often their children don't even go to a school. It's a disgrace, and it's even more of a disgrace that the public doesn't know what's going on, because such conditions are not considered 'news.' These people just go on being exploited. They are paid less than other workers and they do the hardest work imaginable. I have tried to find out for myself how migrants live, and I want to help them—really help them, not urge band-aids for the deep wounds they have. It's easy to disguise the problem and talk about 'increased benefits' for them. Sure they need medical care and schools that even half take notice of their children; but the real problem is that migrants (and maybe a lot of other people, too) are powerless, which means they have no real say in what happens to them. They don't get the protection of a whole group of laws we enacted in the thirties to protect the working man, to guarantee him collective bargaining rights and a minimum wage and unemployment compensation and all the rest. This committee's job is to document all that."

Mondale knew about migrant workers long before he came to the Senate. As a youth he worked his way through college in canning factories and out in the rich farmland of Minnesota, where he saw first-hand how migrants live. He lived with them and eventually began to organize them: "That was something you don't forget. I guess every working man has heard those kinds of stories, even if now most workers have unions, which prevent such practices. I'll never forget how quickly it all happened: we asked for better wages, and a little money to tide us over, because the summer was unusually wet, and the crops couldn't be harvested for a while and the migrants were left sitting around with no money, nothing. The next thing we knew they were all packed up and shipped South, like so much bad merchandise. They were "troublemakers," and I guess I was too, for trying to organize them. We didn't get far that summer, but you have to keep trying. My father was a Methodist minister, and when I was a boy he taught us to care, to be concerned about social problems, and not to give up easily. We were fortunate to be in a state like Minnesota. In the finest of the small towns—in Ceylon, for example, where I was born—people are ultimately affected by the way Americans live up a hollow in Appalachia or on an Indian reservation or along that Mexican border of ours."

The senator has seen what goes on along the Mexican border. At six in the morning one day a couple of years ago he had been watching Mexicans cross into Southern California for hours. Finally a US Customs official told him to "get out of here." Mondale looked like a tramp, or a troublemaker. He had on khaki pants and an old sweater and a sports shirt. When told to leave he refused. He was then asked to identify himself. The long lines of Mexican nationals were then stopped, and their credentials checked. The senator has no illusions, however, that anything short of new laws will stop what he describes: "At one in the morning they start crossing the border, and at two in the morning American farm foremen start signing them up on the streets of those border towns. By three you can see the buses and trucks driving farther into California or Texas, and by five or six they're working. You can't blame the Mexicans; they get 20 or 30 cents an hour in their own country, and I met some in our country working for 60 or 70 cents an hour, way below the minimum wage. What it all amounts to is very simple: American farm workers are undercut—in several ways. Their wages are undercut by foreign labor; just as important,

they can't bargain with owners when all the owners have to do is bring in hungry, docile, frightened Mexican workers. The problem of the migrant workers won't be solved until we close that Mexican border to imported, underpaid farm labor. No union in America could survive that—the use of foreigners by a company whenever it finds domestic workers too 'demanding.' And now Mr. Nixon and Mr. Mitchell have emphasized that they will try to close the Mexican border all right—to drugs."

Mondale has marched with California's United Farm Workers to the Mexican border in protest against the hiring of Mexican labor to break the strike Cesar Chavez and his men worked so long and hard to make effective. He has traveled to Alaska in order to see first-hand how Indians and Eskimos live, or rather, barely survive. He and his wife have gone on a "welfare diet," eating only what poor people on welfare can afford to eat: "I went on that diet and I went to the border to see, to feel, to be there, to experience what is going on, rather than read about it. A lot of people, well-meaning people, never know how it really goes for the poor—down along the Mexican border, or in the cities or out in the countryside, too. That's why I've wanted to take our Senate investigations out of Washington—and also, bring the workers themselves to the hearing rooms of government buildings. It's very hard, though; you hear heart-breaking testimony, and you wonder how the public can be told about what you and your staff have found—how these very poor and hurt people live and try to get by, against overwhelming odds. And, of course, you try to get laws passed that will help them."

Mondale's office has in recent years sent out one after another remarkable law to the Senate floor. He sponsored the bill, vetoed December 9 by President Nixon, to create an effective "child development program," one that would commit billions of dollars for "needed health care, nutritional aid, educational assistance, and social services." (The text of the bill provided a long and first-rate description of what hunger and poverty do to children psychologically and physiologically.) He has asked for an annual "social report" that would do for health and education what has long been done with the nation's business and commerce by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. He has proposed that the various legal services programs for the poor be given much more money and the kind of organizational and administrative protection they will need if they are to continue working for penniless clients, who have complaints against people rich enough not only to hire good lawyers, but exert all sorts of pressures on governors, congressmen, and the White House. A while back he went to Vail, Colorado, during the Senate's August vacation, to meet with some hundred lawyers from local offices of the OEO's Neighborhood Legal Service Project who feared that offices set up to help Navaho Indians, migrant workers in Florida and California, and ghetto residents were in serious jeopardy.

On Vietnam, Mondale is candid "I came to the Senate in 1964 and didn't know much about Asia and Vietnam, like many others here in Washington at that time. I supported the President at first. In all honesty I think I was wrong, and over the past few years I've said why. I guess I began to wonder what was really going on there in 1966, and that's why I went to Vietnam then. I became more and more concerned as I listened to the growing dissent of people I respected very much. I eventually became totally convinced that this country has been terribly hurt by that war; not only have we lost men and wealth, but our whole sense of what is and is not important has been affected for the worse. In recent years I have spent hours with students all over the

country, and I believe I've heard and responded to their message; they see us in a moral and political swamp, full of corruption, intrigue, and worse. I think over time a lot of us came to see that—but it took us too much time, much too much."

He worries about the future. Are we headed for years and years of conservative rule, with high military budgets and stingy, if well-advertised domestic expenditures for what he calls our "human needs"? He can range wide and eloquent on the subject: "I don't believe the people want a stop to the progressive legislation we've put through since 1933. Yes, you have the backlash, and the fear of the ordinary worker that he's being left out. He is, too. He needs more efficient and less expensive—less ruinous, if the illness is serious—medical care. He needs to be protected from fraudulent advertising and from products that are useless or dangerous. He deserves a tax system that gives him as much consideration as the oil industry or a millionaire who somehow ends up paying nothing to the government every April 15. I've talked in union halls, to steelworkers, to men and women who work hard all day and try desperately to make ends meet and have a little left over for a vacation or maybe some repairs on the house. They're not fed up with the thought of more social legislation.

They know what they want and need. I'll start talking about some of these problems and they won't let me go. The problem is that we've talked a lot about changing things, about fighting poverty and improving our national life—but we've voted a pittance of money to achieve these goals. Then we turn around and say the people are 'fed up,' and of course they are—at a lot of words that aren't backed up by concrete, well-subsidized action. I hear that there's a new majority and that they can be brought together on negative promises: we won't bother you on school desegregation; we won't ask you to do this or that for the next guy. People will get wise to that kind of appeal after a while. They can be scared and frustrated, but if my party keeps saying what it's for, not against, the majority of the American people will listen, as they have in the past."

Mondale keeps on trying: "Three minutes after we launched our men to the moon from Cape Kennedy I banged the gavel here in Washington to open hearings on the miserable conditions of the blueberry pickers in eastern North Carolina. I was proud to be in Washington that day, holding those hearings. The pickers were out on strike, and we thought we should listen to their complaints. Perhaps we belong on the moon, but we surely belong there, in North Carolina, aiding such workers—belong there with all the resources the nation could mobilize, if it only wanted to do so."

There are times when the mind dreams of what it would be like if an effective majority of the Senate shared Senator Mondale's concerns, and if the President of the United States did, too. One can also wonder how the American working man would respond to a presidential candidate like Mondale. But most senators like him, senators who carry on the populist tradition, stand little chance of heading a national ticket. They are apt to be without means, they speak too bluntly, they show a deeply felt compassion that gets them nowhere with lobbyists and tends to turn off many of those rich "backers" who decide for their own reasons whether a candidate will ever have a chance to get going and stay going.

U.S. EXPROPRIATION POLICY— SHORTSIGHTED

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the recent Presidential pronouncement concerning

expropriations of U.S. private companies abroad.

I believe that the editorial in the Washington Post aptly characterized the policy as shortsighted. Instead of additional fuel to the charges by developing nations that the interest of the United States is primarily one based on the private interest of foreign investors, we should seek to divorce Government policy from private interests. Our primary goals should be to encourage social and economic development of the low-income nations of the world as a fundamental prerequisite for political stability. The expropriation policy enunciated by the President works against these goals.

And in the general context of our relations with Latin America, this policy is viewed as an affront to independent nations. It will be resented by Venezuela or Costa Rica as much as by Chile. For these nations naturally object to the President deciding that it is not in their interests to nationalize any American company.

The action by the President reflects an accommodation with the corporate interests of the United States, an assurance that the administration will stand with them, regardless of their past activities, against the decisions of Latin American governments.

This announcement by the President is merely another indication that there exists at the White House a disturbing lack of understanding of the forces at play in Latin America. From the original decision to send Governor Rockefeller on a study tour through Latin America to the imposition of the import surcharge last August, and now to the current expropriation announcement, there has been a demonstrated absence of interest and absence of understanding of the needs of the people of Latin America. I hope that attitude changes before it is too late.

The expropriation decision also contained a disturbing change in U.S. policy toward multilateral institutions. As part of the economic retaliation against a nation which expropriates U.S. companies, it is now to be our policy to oppose those nations' development loan requests in multilateral institutions.

I find this policy decision particularly disturbing. It implies that multilateral agencies such as the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank are our tools to wield however we wish. It directly conflicts with the President's previously expressed view that we should be seeking a partnership with other nations in multilateral development efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that articles in the New York Times and the Washington Post concerning the President's decision be printed in the RECORD at this point, as well as the Washington Post editorial which aptly cites the negative consequences of this policy.

Also, since this decision obviously was prompted by the recent events in Chile, I would ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the commentary on the Chilean expropriation by a group of Rutgers University scholars.

Also, I would urge that a short treatise on the question of private foreign investment and the need for alternative strate-

gies, a study by Prof. Albert O. Hirschman, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1972]
NIXON ANNOUNCES TOUGH U.S. STAND ON
EXPROPRIATION

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 19.—President Nixon announced today that the United States would now follow a tougher attitude toward foreign countries that expropriate private American holdings without adequate and swift compensation.

He said in a statement that foreign countries could assume that the United States would refuse to make any new aid agreements with them unless they were taking "reasonable steps" to provide just compensation, or unless there were other factors that in the judgment of the United States required the continuation of aid.

The statement, issued at the White House, appeared to be directed largely at several Latin-American countries that have nationalized United States investments.

INTERNATIONAL LAW CITED

The key passage declared:

"Under international law, the United States has a right to expect that the taking of American property will be nondiscriminatory; that it will be for a public purpose; and that its citizens will receive prompt, adequate, and effective compensation from the expropriating country.

"Thus when a country expropriates a significant United States interest without making reasonable provision for such compensation to United States citizens, we will presume that the United States will not extend new bilateral economic benefits to the expropriating country unless and until it is determined that the country is taking reasonable steps to provide adequate compensation or that there are major factors affecting United States interests which require continuance of all or part of these benefits."

For the first time Mr. Nixon set forth a systematic Presidential view of expropriations. Officials said that until now most expropriations had been handled case by case without general guidelines.

The new policy represents a compromise between the positions taken by John B. Connally, Secretary of the Treasury, and the State Department. Mr. Connally had wanted an automatic cutoff of United States loans to countries that take over private foreign holdings without prior settlements. The State Department had wanted more flexibility.

Economic retaliation will not be automatic, as the Treasury had hoped, but the new policy includes the threat of eventual retaliation if the expropriating country fails to move quickly to provide compensation.

Peter C. Peterson, the President's foreign economic adviser, who briefed newsmen, said that the policy should also "accelerate decisions" on expropriations and presumably those decisions would be to withhold funds.

The State Department got the flexibility it wanted, however, in Mr. Nixon's language permitting aid to continue if other "major factors"—that is, national security—were considered more important than prompt and fair compensation. The State Department had argued that an approach that was too tough would jeopardize American foreign policy interests for the sake of a few investors.

The statement also said that to strengthen its bargaining position with nations that expropriate American-owned companies, the United States could be expected to "withhold its support from loans under consideration in multilateral development banks."

This was a reference to the World Bank,