

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

U.S. Congress.

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 10

APRIL 12, 1973 TO APRIL 18, 1973

(PAGES 12003 TO 13222)

"Our discouragement and despair is beyond words. Just when our suburban communities were making headway in helping to solve the problems of core cities by making housing available for our own low income persons, funding has been removed. . . ."

(To Senator Hubert Humphrey; Senator Walter Mondale; Representative Bill Frenzel; and press, from Gwen Luhta, 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 housing program because of possible abuses and problems is a form of cynical discrimination against programs which are very meaningful to a large number of people in our state and community. Ewing Township, like most New Jersey communities in the most thickly populated state in the United States, has a severe housing shortage in all areas but has no housing available at all for people with moderate or low income. . . . As League members we cannot sit by and watch the Executive Branch of our government subvert the will of Congress and the will of the majority of people who elected that Congress by refusing to spend funds appropriated and desperately needed."

(To President Nixon and HUD Secretary Lynn, from Marcia Felcone, President, Ewing Township League.)

New York. LWV of Rochester Metropolitan Area, 75 College Avenue, Rochester 14607:

Participating in the NY State Emergency Committee Opposed to the Housing Moratorium.

The estimated loss to Monroe County includes 200 new single family section 235 units, 55 rehabilitations—235-J, 5798 multi-family section 236 units, and 484 public housing units. Total housing units that would have entered the housing pipeline after January 5, 1973 is 6,537; the direct construction cost, not counting land—\$132,251,000; associated community development—\$17,133,000. Using a multiplier effect of \$3.00 per \$1.00 of the total estimated dollar loss of \$149,384,000, the total impact loss reaches \$481,200,000 in Monroe County alone—a significant loss in time of high unemployment.

(Data gathered for state meeting of Emergency Coalition, submitted by Gloria Samson, Housing Chairman, Rochester Metro League.)

Ohio. LWV of Greater Dayton Area, 120 West 2nd Street, Dayton 45402:

"The housing moratorium in the Dayton area will have the effect of punishing the poor and those with a moderate income for the inadequacies of administrators or those who gain financially from the programs. . . . Several Communities are becoming aware of the Dayton Plan and beginning to work out agreements with the Metropolitan Housing Authority (West Carrollton and Germantown.) We were on our way to some reasonable housing solutions and the moratorium on public housing upsets this apperant. The Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission has estimated that a minimum of 1,125 low and moderate income units in the region, and 283 units in the City will also be lost.

"We are concerned that this moratorium may signal a renegeing by federal government on its commitment to assist with low income housing. Also, when the moratorium is lifted there will be a long time lag before new housing starts can get underway. We repeat, for the people who need public housing, there are no alternatives. In addition to the housing moratorium, the City of Dayton will lose one half of the allocated HUD funds for code enforcement for 1973, with no funds allocated for 1974. The loss of funding for code enforcement, which will come to an end in 1974, may well leave whole sections of our city susceptible to blight."

(Statement by Gail Levin, LWV of Dayton Area.)

Pennsylvania. LWV of Beaver County, 209 Marble Street, Aliquippa 15001:

"It was quite a jolt to read the information in our local paper that the Administration had revised the moratorium date on HUD-sponsored housing projects and set it back to December 31, 1972. This is a serious blow to our community. For years we have been trying to find a way to force the upgrading of one of the worse housing areas in Aliquippa. . . . It has been only in the last two months that we felt the psychological climate would permit the project to proceed. (That is, for a 96-unit known as the "Bricks" area.) A plan for the 96 units has been presented to HUD. The non-profit sponsor has received a feasibility letter for the \$1,900,000 project and was awaiting firm commitment. The new federal regulation has seemingly canceled out all the painstaking work of the last two years. Aliquippa is left 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, 8th and Market Streets, Philadelphia 19015:

An alert sent by the State Human Resources Chairman to all local leagues pointed out: "These cuts will seriously affect the supply of housing for low and moderate income families. The Pennsylvania Housing Finance Agency will be limited to financing housing for people of moderate income because of the freeze. PHFA had intended to use federal subsidies as a means of reducing housing costs so builders could lower their sales and rental prices. 'Seed money' for pre-development costs, and 'write-downs' of development costs previously provided by the Department of Community Affairs will no longer be available as a result of the federal freeze. . . . In Pennsylvania alone, Farmer's Home cuts will result in a total estimated 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 Maryland Avenue, Milwaukee 53211:

"On March 3, 1973 a meeting was held in Milwaukee for the purpose of evaluating the effects upon our area of the recent housing moratorium. Attending were representatives or organizations concerned with the need for increasing the supply of low and moderate income housing throughout Southeastern Wisconsin. The League of Women Voters shares this concern and I (Helen McGregor, President) went as a representative of the North Shore League.

"The impact at the state level was reported by a representative of the State Department of Local Affairs and Development. Over an 18-month period an estimated loss of 13,245 units will occur and this will mean a total loss of one-half billion dollars worth of economic activity and 17,800 jobs throughout the state. The DLAD also says that the state cannot take over the housing programs because it cannot provide either the depth of subsidy necessary or the expertise which the local governments need and receive from the federal government. As for how revenue sharing will affect the problem, local governments are not likely to opt for as controversial a use as low and moderate income housing.

"The Community Relations and Social Development Commission said that in one year's time, 3,200 units of low and moderate income housing will be lost by Milwaukee County. It was reported by the Conference on Religion and Urban Affairs that with 1,500 applications for housing for the elderly now on file and the vacancy rate zero, 400 units have not been eliminated."

(From letter to Senator William Prox-

mire; 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 for any society than achieving the twin 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 Columbia 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 Indiana, Senator BAYH, the chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am informed now that this excellent symposium has been reprinted as a book 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 WATERGATE AFFAIR

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the continuing controversy surrounding the "Watergate 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 forward and give the 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.

Mr. President, 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 Watergate scandal. Using Dean's findings, he declared flatly that none "presently employed" were. This is the essence of the White House position since.

It was not good enough then because the position was too narrow. 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 every 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 "caper"—Nixon simply has not

shown the political sensitivity for which he prides himself. A harsher assumption would be that he is ducking. If so, it is too late for that.

He should have spoken out on the basis of what has been proved or confessed to already, disavowing the snooping, sabotage and burglary that, after all, were done on behalf of his re-election campaign. By the most elementary logic, quite apart from allegations now being made by James W. McCord, it is obvious that somebody with lots of clout and lots of money was calling the signals for the hapless convicted defendants. It wasn't a self-starting, free-lancing band. This was clear from the evasions on the record at the trial.

Significantly, the most urgent admonitions are coming from Republicans and political conservatives, in and out of office. The substance of their rebuke is that Nixon will have to confess error, and if the consequence of the trials and investigation is convincing proof of involvement within his official family, he can spare no feelings, including his own. He should act before the White House is acted upon. If some must then depart, so be it. The office he has so often held up for world veneration requires that. He should, in short, clean house.

We think Nixon has deluded himself if he interprets his landslide victory as a mandate for disdainful silence. Far better was his once proud standard, "clear as a hound's tooth."

Nixon should realize that his diverting role as the global planner and peacemaker is being overshadowed by the clamor of domestic events, of which Watergate is one. So we say, come home, President Nixon.

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 antihijacking agreement, this debate featuring both sides of the question, "What Should Be the U.S. Policy on Cuba," is particularly timely. I highly recommend it to my colleagues 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 BE 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 could have wider ramifications. Arguing for a 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 marked by mutual distrust and hostility, initiated by the Cuban subversive activities in Latin America, 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

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 responsible for a new political climate 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 People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. A dialogue with Cuba would be in line with this philosophy. Further, it would eliminate a policy inconsistency which thrives for friendship and an increasing dialogue with Russia while isolating China for permitting a Soviet presence.

Second, there is a growing trend among Latin American countries to re-establish formalities with Cuba as evidenced by OAS votes and independent behavior of Latin countries. Only two weeks ago Cuba was invited to participate in a working caucus by the Latin American delegations to the United Nations after having been excluded from discussions since the 1961 OAS sanctions. Cuba's subversive activities in those nations has lessened perceptibly since the Che Guevara's unsuccessful 1967 efforts in Bolivia. In the eyes of these governments, Cuba no longer poses a serious threat to their existence.

Third, Prime Minister Castro's policies toward the United States and other Western Hemisphere nations are becoming less strident. The recent signing of a hijacking agreement between the United States and Cuba is evidence that the Cubans are willing to discuss and negotiate on matters of mutual concern. Furthermore, Cuba's involvement in subversive activities throughout Central and South America has significantly waned, according to testimony from State and Defense Department officials. Their statements reveal that Cuba clearly has lost the revolutionary fervor of earlier days.

What benefits will accrue to normalize relations with Cuba? First, the anti-hijacking agreement, which resulted from our indirect dialogue with the Castro government, should be a significant deterrent to air piracy.

Second, in time Cuba might be re-established as one of our important trading partners. During the last year the United States traded with Cuba, our exports to that nation exceeded our imports by \$19.1 million. Cuba supplied the United States with sugar and certain essential minerals while buying primarily 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 policies 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 within the OAS. Moreover, it has caused anti-United States feelings among several Latin American groups. A detente with Cuba should eliminate tensions and lead to greater economic and political cooperation among the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Obviously, certain major issues will have to be resolved before diplomatic relations can be restored. Of particular concern are the status of Cuban refugees, the future of the Guantanamo Naval Base, compensation for expropriated property and the reallocation of sugar quotas. It is my judgment that none of these issues is impossible to resolve.

Incidentally, Russia—whose presence in Cuba contributed to the division between the

United States and Castro government—has expressed an interest in U.S.-Cuban rapprochement as evidenced by recent articles in *Pravda*.

In order to move toward the goal of re-summing U.S.-Cuban ties, eleven House colleagues and I proposed that several 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 continuing 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, there has been a concerted effort on his part to export violent revolution to other Latin American nations who want no part of his brand of communism; and, fourth, Castro has developed strong military ties with 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 breakoff in relations and his persistence in widening the rift over the years. Anyone who studies the facts carefully would be hard pressed to come to any other conclusion.

Fidel 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 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 this day, 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. However, it should be noted 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 1960, Castro has tried to impose his style of revolutionary government on a number of unwilling Latin American nations.

These efforts have not had popular support, but they have caused nations like Venezuela, Colombia, Brazil, Uruguay and Bolivia untold trouble and expense.

In spite of this record, there are some people who believe that Castro has reduced his

shown the political sensitivity for which he prides himself. A harsher assumption would be that he is ducking. If so, it is too late for that.

He should have spoken out on the basis of what has been proved or confessed to already, disavowing the snooping, sabotage and burglary that, after all, were done on behalf of his re-election campaign. By the most elementary logic, quite apart from allegations now being made by James W. McCord, it is obvious that somebody with lots of clout and lots of money was calling the signals for the hapless convicted defendants. It wasn't a self-starting, free-lancing band. This was clear from the evasions on the record at the trial.

Significantly, the most urgent admonitions are coming from Republicans and political conservatives, in and out of office. The substance of their rebuke is that Nixon will have to confess error, and if the consequence of the trials and investigation is convincing proof of involvement within his official family, he can spare no feelings, including his own. He should act before the White House is acted upon. If some must then depart, so be it. The office he has so often held up for world veneration requires that. He should, in short, clean house.

We think Nixon has deluded himself if he interprets his landslide victory as a mandate for disdainful silence. Far better was his once proud standard, "clear as a hound's tooth."

Nixon should realize that his diverting role as the global planner and peacemaker is being overshadowed by the clamor of domestic events, of which Watergate is one. So we say, come home, President Nixon.

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 antihijacking agreement, this debate featuring both sides of the question, "What Should Be the U.S. Policy on Cuba," is particularly timely. I highly recommend it to my colleagues 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 BE 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 could have wider ramifications. Arguing for a 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 marked by mutual distrust and hostility, initiated by the Cuban subversive activities in Latin America, 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

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 responsible for a new political climate 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 People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union. A dialogue with Cuba would be in line with this philosophy. Further, it would eliminate a policy inconsistency which thrives for friendship and an increasing dialogue with Russia, while isolating China for permitting a Soviet presence.

Second, there is a growing trend among Latin American countries to re-establish formalities with Cuba as evidenced by OAS votes and independent behavior of Latin countries. Only two weeks ago Cuba was invited to participate in a working caucus by the Latin American delegations to the United Nations after having been excluded from discussions since the 1961 OAS sanctions. Cuba's subversive activities in those nations has lessened perceptibly since the Che Guevara's unsuccessful 1967 efforts in Bolivia. In the eyes of these governments, Cuba no longer poses a serious threat to their existence.

Third, Prime Minister Castro's policies toward the United States and other Western Hemisphere nations are becoming less strident. The recent signing of a hijacking agreement between the United States and Cuba is evidence that the Cubans are willing to discuss and negotiate on matters of mutual concern. Furthermore, Cuba's involvement in subversive activities throughout Central and South America has significantly waned, according to testimony from State and Defense Department officials. Their statements reveal that Cuba clearly has lost the revolutionary fervor of earlier days.

What benefits will accrue to normalize relations with Cuba? First, the anti-hijacking agreement, which resulted from our indirect dialogue with the Castro government, should be a significant deterrent to air piracy.

Second, in time Cuba might be re-established as one of our important trading partners. During the last year the United States traded with Cuba, our exports to that nation exceeded our imports by \$19.1 million. Cuba supplied the United States with sugar and certain essential minerals while buying primarily 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 policies 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 within the OAS. Moreover, it has caused anti-United States feelings among several Latin American groups. A detente with Cuba should eliminate tensions and lead to greater economic and political cooperation among the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

Obviously, certain major issues will have to be resolved before diplomatic relations can be restored. Of particular concern are the status of Cuban refugees, the future of the Guantanamo Naval Base, compensation for expropriated property and the reallocation of sugar quotas. It is my judgment that none of these issues is impossible to resolve.

Incidentally, Russia—whose presence in Cuba contributed to the division between the

United States and Castro government—has expressed an interest in U.S.-Cuban rapprochement as evidenced by recent articles in *Pravda*.

In order to move toward the goal of resuming U.S.-Cuban ties, eleven House colleagues and I proposed that several 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 continuing 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, there has been a concerted effort on his part to export violent revolution to other Latin American nations who want no part of his brand of communism; and, fourth, Castro has developed strong military ties with 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 breakoff in relations and his persistence in widening the rift over the years. Anyone who studies the facts carefully would be hard pressed to come to any other conclusion.

Fidel 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 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 this day, 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. However, it should be noted 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 1960, Castro has tired to impose his style of revolutionary government on a number of unwilling Latin American nations.

These efforts have not had popular support, but they have caused nations like Venezuela, Colombia, Brazil, Uruguay and Bolivia untold trouble and expense.

In spite of this record, there are some people who believe that Castro has reduced his