"Our discouragement and despair is beyond words. Just when our suburban community is making headway in the effort to solve the problems of core cities by making housing available for our low income persons, we have been dealt a serious blow." (Senator Hubert Humphrey; Senator Walter Mondale; Representative Bill Froehle, and press, from Gwen Luhans, President, Minnetonka-Eden Prairie League.)

New Jersey. LWV of Ewing Township, State Police Department, West Trenton 08628: "We feel that the putting of a moratorium on the federal housing funds has been a serious blow to our community. For years we have been trying to find a way to force the uprooting, remodeling and removal of houses near us. This moratorium has been ill advised and devastating. We feel that the moratorium needs to be lifted with 96 units of absolutely wretched housing which becomes worse each passing day."

[From letter to Senator Hugh Scott and Senator Richard Schweiker, from Gilda de Ferrari, Board member "Beaver County League."]

Pennsylvania. LWV of Pennsylvania, 5th and Market Streets, Philadelphia 19105:

An alert sent by the State Human Resources Chairman to all local leagues pointed out that the Housing Moratorium seriously affects the supply of housing for low and moderate income families. The Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency (PHFA) has been required to abandon its current housing for people of moderate income because of the freeze. PHFA had intended to use federal subsidies as a means of reducing housing costs. The moratorium would lower their sales and rental prices. 'Seed money' for development costs, and 'write-downs' of development costs previously provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development will no longer be available as a result of the federal freeze. . . . In Pennsylvania alone, Farmer's Home Administration has estimated a loss over the next 18 months of $24,495,975 and 1,827 man years of employment for home builders.

[Sent by Mrs. Mark Neuman, State Human Resources Chairwoman,]]

Wisconsin. LWV of North Shore, 4221 North Milwaukee Avenue, Milwaukee 53211:

"On March 9, 1973, a meeting was held in Milwaukee for the purpose of evaluating the effects upon our area of the recent housing moratorium. Representatives of the project developers, local government, and several communities were present. The meeting was held to work out agreements with the Metropolitan Housing Authority (West Carrollton and German Township). We were on our way to some reasonable housing solutions and the moratorium on public housing upset this attempt. The Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission has estimated that a minimum of 1,125 low and moderate income units in the region, and an additional 200 in the city of Dayton, will be lost because of the freeze. Several Communities are becoming aware of the Dayton Plan and beginning to work out agreements."

[From letter to Senator William Proxmire; Senator Gaylord Nelson; Representative Glenn Davis, from Helen McGregor, President, North Shore League.]

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. President, there is no more important or difficult task facing our society. Our success in winning the goals of order and justice. Though the best of human minds have concentrated on this dilemma for centuries, we are still a frightening distance from achieving a solution. One of the most important lessons we have learned, however, is that we should place more emphasis on the youth of our society, on guiding our young people away from a criminal career.

...I am pleased therefore that the Columbus Human Rights Law Review has published an outstanding collection of thoughtful articles and essays on the Juvenile Justice system in its fall 1972 issue. Among the authors is my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Senator Bayh, the chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am informed now that this excellent symposium was entitled "The Legal Rights of Children: Status, Progress and Proposals," and I hope that in this form it will reach the wide audience which it deserves among all Americans concerned with the Juvenile Law system.

THE WATERTAGE AFFAIR

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, the continued controversy surrounding the "Watertage affair" has done much to undermine the confidence of the American people in the workings of their government. The only way that this confidence can be restored is for President Nixon to come forth and explain to American people a full accounting of the facts leading to the Watergate episode, and any other acts of political sabotage and espionage which may have occurred last year. That is the least I ask.

...I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Minneapolis Star be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, since this editorial points out this need for full disclosure and its importance to our democratic system.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star. April 3, 1973]

STOP DUCKING, MR. PRESIDENT

Last Aug. 29, President Nixon said he had directed John W. Dean III to determine if any White House staffers were involved in the Watertage scandal. Using Dean's findings, he declared daily that none "presently employed" were. This is the essence of the White House position since.

It was not good enough then because the particular Wire was too important. It is not good enough now because, in a contrary sense, it may be too broad. President Nixon is out on a limb. To give him the benefit of the doubt, he could be the victim of subordinates who were more arrogant than venal. But even putting the best possible construction on the scandal—the right word, for it is no longer a "capex"—Nixon simply has not..."
WHAT SHOULD BE THE U.S. POLICY ON CUBA?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, on March 31, the Baltimore Sun carried a discussion of U.S. policy toward Cuba by two distinguished Members of Congress, Senator Edward J. Gurney and Mr. Whalen (R., Ohio). The opposite view is by Senator Gurney (R., Fla.).

The time is ripe for the United States to resume trade with Cuba. There were no objections, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 31, 1973]

WHAT SHOULD THE U.S. POLICY ON CUBA?

After more than a decade of mutual diplomatic isolation, the United States and Cuba recently reached an anti-hijacking agreement that could have wider ramifications. Arguing for a normalization of relations is Repre­

sentative Charles W. Whalen, Jr., and the opposite view is by Senator Gurney (R., Fla.).

The time is ripe for the United States to take appropriate steps to normalize relations with Cuba.

For the past decade relations between these two countries have been marked by mutual distrust and hostility, initiated by the Cuban revolution and the Russian military build-up in Latin America. The United States, the Russian military build-up on the island, the expropriation of U.S. owned properties in Cuba, and the Bay of Pigs invasion. The United States in 1961 severed its economic and diplomatic ties with the Castro government, encouraged other nations in the Western Hemisphere to follow suit, and imposed a trade embargo on Cuba from renewed U.S. relations with Cuba.

The recent signing of an antihijacking agreement, which resulted from our in­

terests and the expressed wishes of the U.S. government. To

It is inconsistent for us to trade with the Soviet Union while maintaining a complete trade embargo with Cuba. Resumption of trade would be consistent with the poli­

cies now pursued by many of our closest allies, such as Great Britain, Canada, and Japan, who trade with Cuba.

Third, a more relaxed political atmosphere in the Western Hemisphere would result from renewed U.S. relations with Cuba. Isolation of Cuba long has been a divisive issue, but recent developments should be a significant deterrent to air piracy.

Second, in time Cuba might be re-establish­

ed a guarantor of our right to export trading part­

er. During the last year the United States traded with Cuba, our exports to that nation exceeded $1 billion. Cuba supplied the United States with sugar and certain essential minerals while buying pri­

mately finished goods from us.

It is inconsistent for us to trade with the Soviet Union while maintaining a complete trade embargo with Cuba. Resumption of trade would be consistent with the poli­
cies now pursued by many of our closest allies, such as Great Britain, Canada, and Japan, who trade with Cuba.

Third, a more relaxed political atmosphere in the Western Hemisphere would result from renewed U.S. relations with Cuba. Isolation of Cuba long has been a divisive issue, but recent developments should be a significant deterrent to air piracy.

Second, in time Cuba might be re-establish­
ed a guarantor of our right to export trading part­ner. During the last year the United States traded with Cuba, our exports to that nation exceeded $1 billion. Cuba supplied the United States with sugar and certain essential minerals while buying pri­mately finished goods from us.

Finally, Cuba contributed to the division between the United States and Castro government—has expressed an intention to rap­

proachment as evidenced by recent articles in Pravda.

In order to move toward the goal of re­

normalization of U.S.-Cuba ties, eleven House col­

leagues and I proposed that several steps should be taken by the legislative and ex­

ecutive branches of government.

A new political climate is clearly in our best interests.

First, Castro has shown no indication that he wants the U.S. to be anything other than a punching bag to use as an excuse for his domestic failures; second, there is no evidence that he is willing to compensate American investors for untold trouble and expense.

Incidentally, Russia—whose presence in Cuba contributed to the division between the United States and Castro government—has expressed an intention to rap­proachment as evidenced by recent articles in Pravda.

In order to move toward the goal of re­normalization of U.S.-Cuba ties, eleven House colleagues and I proposed that several steps should be taken by the legislative and ex­ecutive branches of government.

A new political climate is clearly in our best interests.

First, Castro has shown no indication that he wants the U.S. to be anything other than a punching bag to use as an excuse for his domestic failures; second, there is no evidence that he is willing to compensate American investors for untold trouble and expense.

Incidentally, Russia—whose presence in Cuba contributed to the division between the United States and Castro government—has expressed an intention to rap­proachment as evidenced by recent articles in Pravda.
WHAT SHOULD BE THE U.S. POLICY ON CUBA?

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, on March 31, the Baltimore Sun carried a discussion of U.S. policy toward Cuba by two distinguished Members of Congress, Senator Edward J. Gurney and Representative Charles W. Whalen, Jr. In light of recent developments in United States-Cuban relations, leading to the signing of an anti-hijacking agreement, this debate featuring both sides of the question, "What Should Be the U.S. Policy on Cuba," is particularly timely. I believe the House is being asked to make a policy decision, and ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Record.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun, Mar. 31, 1973]

WHAT SHOULD THE U.S. POLICY ON CUBA?

After more than a decade of mutual diplomatic isolation, the United States and Cuba recently signed an anti-hijacking agreement that Cuba had long sought. The agreement mandates that the United States will not use as a basis for normalization of relations is Representative Whalen (R., Ohio). The opposite view is by Senator Gurney (R., Fla.).

By Representative Charles W. Whalen, Jr.

The time is ripe for the United States to take appropriate steps to normalize relations with Cuba.

For the past decade, relations between these two countries have been marred by mutual distrust and hostility, initiated by the Cuban subversive activities in Latin America, the Russian military buildup on the borders of Cuba, the expropriation of U.S.-owned properties in Cuba, the Bay of Pigs invasion, and the United States in 1961 severed relations with Cuba.

The United States has expressed other nations in the Western Hemisphere to follow in the Organization of American States, and in effect, isolated Cuba from the rest of Latin America.

The political realities of 1973 indicate that a careful review of United States-Cuba relations is in order. Three major developments are related to the current status of U.S.-Cuba relations, which make the normalizing of relations between the two countries desirable and potentially attainable.

First, the President's policy of dealing realistically with all types of governments has resulted in a relaxation of tensions with the Cubans, and the reopening of discussions between the Soviet Union and Cuba. A dialogue with Cuba would be in line with this philosophy. Further, it would eliminate a policy inconsistency which thrives for friendship and diplomatic relations with the United States, while recognizing Cuba's subversive activities in those nations that have lessened perceptibly since the Che Guevara incident and Castro's ham-handed efforts to export violent revolution to other Latin American nations who want no part of his brand of communism; and, fourth, Castro's growing distrust of the Soviet Union, ties which nearly brought on a nuclear war once, and which continue to threaten the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere.

The record is quite clear as to Castro's responsibility for the breakdown in relations and his persistence in wanting to dictate over the years. Anyone who studiess the facts carefully would be hard pressed to come to any other conclusion.

Castro came to power on January 1, 1959, riding a wave of popular support. Taking advantage, he first eliminated all opposition.

Then he followed up by instituting, in the name of land reform, a program of property expropriation, with deliberate emphasis placed on American holdings. And, although he promised compensation, it was never forthcoming. By November 1960, Castro's Cuban government had confiscated over $81 billion worth of American-owned property, without regard for either the rights of the owners or the expressed wishes of the U.S. government. To date, none of this property has ever been paid for.

Simultaneous with these expropriations came an increase in the verbal attacks on the United States.

Castro then added force to his words by ordering the United States to cut back its embassy staff to an inoperable level of 11. Since then Castro has given no indication that he favors the renewal of normal diplomatic relations on anything other than his own terms.

We are, of course, all aware of the circumstances surrounding the Cuban missile crisis and the way in which it was resolved. But I believe that since 1962, Castro has continued to accept sophisticated military equipment from the Soviet Union as part of his unrelenting hostility toward the United States.

Unfortunately, the Soviet military presence is only part of the problem. There is also the matter of Castro's attempts to export revolution to the Americas.

Ever since consolidating power in 1959, Castro has tried to impose his style of revolutionary government on other Latin American nations.

These efforts have not had popular support, and are further evidenced by the loss of Cuba's relations with such countries as Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, and, of course, the United States.

It is not a question of whether the concepts of democracy and freedom can ever take root in a communist society. The question is whether the Castro government can continue to act in areas outside of Cuba.

Incidentally, Castro's presence in Cuba contributed to the division between the United States and Castro government—has expressed an interest in U.S.-Cuban relations as evidenced by recent articles in Pravda.

In order to move toward the goal of resuming U.S.-Cuban ties, fourteen House colleagues and I have introduced H.R. 17727. These steps should be taken by the legislative and executive branches of government.

A normalization of relations is clearly in our best interests.

(By Senator Edward J. Gurney)

It has been 11 years since the United States broke off diplomatic relations with Fidel Castro's Cuban government in response to the cutting of our embassy staff, the continued stream of anti-American invective, and the confiscation of American property in Cuba.

In that time, four things have become evident.

First, Castro has shown no indication that he wants the U.S. to be anything other than a punching bag to use as an excuse for his domestic failures; second, there is no evidence that he is willing to compensate Americans for losses suffered at his hands; third, Castro has shown no desire to export violent revolution to other Latin American nations who want no part of his brand of communism; and, fourth, Castro has shown no interest in normalizing relations with the United States.

The record is quite clear as to Castro's responsibility for the breakdown in relations and his persistence in wanting to dictate over the years. Anyone who studies the facts carefully would be hard pressed to come to any other conclusion.

Castro came to power on January 1, 1959, riding a wave of popular support. Taking advantage, he first eliminated all opposition.

Then he followed up by instituting, in the name of land reform, a program of property expropriation, with deliberate emphasis placed on American holdings.

And, although he promised compensation, it was never forthcoming. By November 1960, Castro's Cuban government had confiscated over $81 billion worth of American-owned property, without regard for either the rights of the owners or the expressed wishes of the U.S. government. To date, none of this property has ever been paid for.

Simultaneous with these expropriations came an increase in the verbal attacks on the United States.

Castro then added force to his words by ordering the United States to cut back its embassy staff to an inoperable level of 11. Since then Castro has given no indication that he favors the renewal of normal diplomatic relations on anything other than his own terms.

We are, of course, all aware of the circumstances surrounding the Cuban missile crisis and the way in which it was resolved. But I believe that since 1962, Castro has continued to accept sophisticated military equipment from the Soviet Union as part of his unrelenting hostility toward the United States.

Unfortunately, the Soviet military presence is only part of the problem. There is also the matter of Castro's attempts to export revolution to the Americas.

Ever since consolidating power in 1959, Castro has tried to impose his style of revolutionary government on other Latin American nations.

These efforts have not had popular support, and are further evidenced by the loss of Cuba's relations with such countries as Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, and, of course, the United States.

It is not a question of whether the concepts of democracy and freedom can ever take root in a communist society. The question is whether the Castro government can continue to act in areas outside of Cuba.

Incidentally, Castro's presence in Cuba contributed to the division between the United States and Castro government—has expressed an interest in U.S.-Cuban relations as evidenced by recent articles in Pravda.

In order to move toward the goal of resuming U.S.-Cuban ties, fourteen House colleagues and I have introduced H.R. 17727. These steps should be taken by the legislative and executive branches of government.

A normalization of relations is clearly in our best interests.