

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 3

FEBRUARY 8, 1968, TO FEBRUARY 22, 1968

(PAGES 2603 TO 3952)

"As a result of Soviet extermination and deportation practices, the total Lithuanian population declined from 3.2 million in 1939 to 2.7 million in 1959. Under normal conditions, taking into consideration the normal annual population growth of 1.25%, the population of Lithuania in 1959 should have been 4 million. In other words, the Soviets through their genocidal practices were responsible for the loss of 940,000 inhabitants of Lithuania."

The Memorandum states:

"By the summer of 1944 well organized armed resistance groups merged into an anti-Soviet Lithuanian guerrilla movement. Armed Lithuanian partisan resistance . . . lasted between 1944 and 1952. . . ."

"The activities of the Lithuanian freedom fighters were successful to such a degree that for several years after the Second World War Soviet colonialism in Lithuania was thwarted."

"The cessation of armed guerrilla warfare in 1952 did not spell the end of the Lithuanian resistance against Soviet domination. On the contrary, resistance by passive means gained a new impetus."

"Diplomatic action dealing with the Soviet Union in an attempt to normalize East-West relations through the liquidation of the unresolved problems of the Second World War," the Memorandum emphasizes, "must consider the question of Lithuania as an integral part of such deliberations. The Soviet occupation of Lithuania is a legacy of this war along with the question of Germany and Berlin and those of the other captive nations of East-Central Europe. The West should make clear to the Kremlin that the ending of Soviet occupation of Lithuania is an essential element for easing of East-West tension and a prerequisite for the establishment of a just and durable peace in Europe. Before and during the Second World War, Lithuania was a neighbor of Germany. Her frontiers with Germany were fixed in a special treaty signed by the governments of both states on January 29, 1928, in Berlin. The territory of Lithuania is contiguous to that of East Prussia, and especially to its northern part, now arbitrarily renamed by the occupying Soviet power as "Kaliningrad Region." Lithuania, therefore, cannot be by-passed while a peace treaty is concluded with Germany."

The Memorandum concludes with the following appeal: "We appeal to the United Nations Organization to investigate the aggression of the Soviet Union and to liquidate the results of this aggression by causing the withdrawal from Lithuania of the armed forces, police and administration of the Soviet Union in order to terminate Soviet colonialism."

"We appeal to the Governments of the Free world and their Delegations to the United Nations to support the aspirations of the Lithuanian Nation to regain her independence by raising the violations against Lithuanian sovereignty, perpetrated by the Soviet Union, in the institutions of the United Nations and during the proceedings of various international conferences."

"And we appeal to the parliaments of the free world to use every opportunity to urge their Governments to support the endeavors of the Lithuanian people to restore the independence of Lithuania."

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am proud that our Government has to this day refused to recognize the illegal annexation of the Baltic States by the Kremlin. Thus far, however, our policy has been essentially a negative one. I would like to propose that we convert it into a positive policy.

The new Chancellor of Germany recently announced his readiness to invalidate Hitler's Munich agreements with regard to Czechoslovakia. I believe that Moscow should now be urged by

our own Government to wipe out all the vestiges of this infamous period in history by repudiating the Ribbentrop-Molotov pacts of 1939 and restoring the sovereign rights of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

If our spokesmen could find the vision and the courage and the firmness to persuade the Soviet Union to do away with the vestiges of the Hitler-Stalin conspiracy, this action would do more than a thousand consular conventions to build bridges between East and West and to establish the basis for a genuine peace.

Mutual friendship with one's neighbors is the only true source of security. If the Soviet Union could be induced to undo the wrong she has done to her neighbors and to remove the causes of fear and distrust in Europe, this would open the way to a genuine and reciprocal process of building bridges and the Soviet Union itself would benefit enormously from this process in terms of increased friendship and increased security and increased trade and prosperity.

Let us all hope and pray and work to this end.

INTERFERENCE WITH CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I believe that the vote that has just been completed on the cloture motion establishes beyond any doubt that, sooner or later—and probably sooner—a sweeping fair housing law will be passed by the U.S. Senate.

I say that because, beyond any doubt, this vote establishes that a clear majority of this body favors the strongest possible fair housing measure.

The pending fair housing amendment is the product of years of debate, and of many varying kinds of experiences at the State and local level. Where fair housing laws and ordinances exist, it has now resulted in a strong, unshakable majority of the Senate in favor of this concept.

The fact is that this measure covered all but 2 million units out of an estimated 65 million housing units in this country. We should place particular emphasis on the fact that the last cloture vote, in 1966, on a fair housing bill, resulted in a total of 52 to 41 in favor of cloture; but that 1966 fair housing bill covered only 40 percent of the Nation's 65 million housing units. This measure covers virtually all of the housing units. The cloture motion, in that instance, passed by only an 11-vote margin. The cloture motion voted upon a few minutes ago had the support of a margin of 18 Senators.

It is significant to note that at least three of the announced proponents, and probably four, could not be here, understandably and for various reasons, on this occasion. Thus, a bill providing nearly 97-percent coverage would have passed by an overwhelming majority—a margin of more than 18 votes, with at least three and possibly four votes necessarily missing.

This, in my opinion, represents a basic, deeply moving change in attitude by the

American people and their Senators, and, if I may say so, a broad tribute to a bipartisan approach by decent Americans to see that this course of racism in the sale and rental of housing be banished once and for all from this country.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may use 3 minutes, or whatever time I have remaining, at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the Senate's attention the fact that 18 Republicans voted with the majority on the Democratic side for cloture, and that this represents a material increase—almost double the strength we have ever had before in respect to housing. In 1966, the maximum Republican vote was 12; on the second vote that year, it was 10. We had two announced pairs.

On this vote, half of all the Republican Senators voted for cloture on what the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] has properly described as certainly a very full coverage non-discrimination-in-housing bill.

Mr. President, it has often been argued against those of us who have sought to do something to modify rule XXII—which we claim is an amendment to the Constitution without being so qualified; and I think it is, without any question—that if a majority of the Senate really has its teeth in it, and wants something done, it will get it done.

Mr. President, a majority of the Senate does want it done, without any question. We calculate, as Senator MONDALE has said, at least 58 and probably 60 votes for this full measure. If we are frustrated now, Mr. President, the country had better take note, in such times of grave emergency, that a majority, after full, fair, and free debate, can be frustrated from doing what is elementary justice for the country. This could be a very, very dangerous thing at this time; and those who have not supported us, I think, had better think about that matter very, very seriously.

I am satisfied that we can contrive a housing measure which will get the necessary support, including cloture, by virtue of the showing we have made on this vote, which I consider to be a real victory, considering the nature of the coverage of the non-discrimination-in-housing amendment. I am prepared, with my colleagues, to move forward vigorously to effect the desired result.

As we said before, the cloture vote has been taken. We are not stiff-necked. We are confident that we can find means of accommodating our proposal to satisfy those of reasonable view so that we may seek to effect some changes in the housing package to bring us within the required goal. However, more than anything else, let me emphasize that it has always been said, and it is again attested to, that if a majority of the Senate is really determined upon something, it can effect it, and we shall continue to try to do that now.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I think

it ought to be made clear that the sponsors of this measure presented fair housing in its fullest possible coverage with one modest amendment that exempted but 2 million homes in the country.

We did so because we wanted to determine what the real and fundamental will of the Senate was. Now we know beyond any doubt that there is a strong majority in favor of this proposal, a margin of over 18 votes. And if all of the announced supporters had been present, we would have come very close to 60 votes on the strongest possible measure.

I think it is fair to say that we are now prepared to discuss possible modifications and believe we must pass some bill to implement the will of the Senate and of the people.

We have in the past 2 weeks proved the case for fair housing. And it remains to be challenged on the floor of the Senate.

I am most heartened by what I consider to be a victory today, although we have not had all the support we would have liked.

It now remains for us to discuss what form of bill will pass. I therefore urge all who supported us on the cloture motion today to assist us in a continuing fight for a modified version so that we might build on this impressive vote had today in terms of rendezvousing with our consciences and voting for the adoption of this measure in this session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, yesterday in this Chamber I said that we were on the eve of one of the most important votes that would be had in our body.

The vote has been taken. I take this opportunity to commend my colleagues in the Senate for the very strong support which was given to the cloture motion.

The amendment which was offered by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, and myself is an attempt to give to all Americans the opportunity to live in housing of their choice. It is a very important issue. Our Nation has been at war, both abroad and at home, and the most important thing before the Senate is to maintain domestic tranquillity.

I firmly believe that had we been able to get cloture today and agree to the amendment which has been well described by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, that it would have been a big step toward progress in racial relations and equal opportunity in our country. However, the Senate has seen fit on the first vote not to invoke cloture.

I hope that the Senator from Minnesota and I are able to modify our amendment, for we are not merely interested in an issue and in achieving some psychological victory, but we are also interested in obtaining legislation that will help our country. And we are agreeable to working further with our amendment with a view to presenting a modification thereon which will be acceptable to a sufficient number of our colleagues in the Senate so that we may invoke cloture.

Mr. President, we are gratified with the high percentage of votes obtained

from both the Republican and Democratic sides. Eighteen Republicans voted in favor of cloture this time, and that is twice as many Republicans as have voted in favor of the same issue before. And we must remember that the present measure is a stronger provision than has ever been presented before.

That is certainly evidence that there is bipartisan support for this Federal legislation which has been presented to the Senate.

Mr. President, I commend my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota, and all other Members on the Democratic side as well as on the Republican side who saw fit to vote in favor of the cloture motion.

We hope that we will all be given another opportunity to vote.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it was my pleasure some years ago to observe and know the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts as a fellow member of the National Association of Attorneys General, and in which association we each represented the legal offices of our respective States.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts and I had an opportunity to work together on similar matters in that association. And it has been one of the most fulfilling experiences to renew our friendship in the Senate and to have the opportunity to share in the leadership and foresight of the Senator from Massachusetts and to work with him once again on some of these measures that are basic and fundamental to the conscience of our country.

I have no doubt that we will succeed. One of the fundamental reasons for my belief is that the Senator from Massachusetts is providing great leadership and tireless devotion to this and to many other issues involving conscience which come before the Senate.

I am flattered by what the Senator said, but I think he is most modest. I believe that one of the unique reasons for the vote we have had and the strength that has been shown is the great contribution that has been made by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very kind and generous words. He knows of the high esteem in which I hold him both in our past association as attorneys general and in our present association as Members of the Senate.

Although it would be immodest for me to agree with the Senator on everything he said, I certainly agree with the Senator in that portion of his remarks in which he said that he has great optimism for victory on the important measure we are sponsoring on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclu-

sion of the morning business tomorrow, I may be recognized.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, it is my intention, along with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], at that time to make a motion to table the pending Mondale amendment. I shall give my reasons tomorrow when I am recognized as to why I think it is the best course of action at this particular time.

It is then my intention, after the tabling motion has been disposed of, to file another cloture motion.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the 1 day but 1-day-and-1-hour rule, the vote on the second cloture motion take place not on Friday next, but on Monday next. I make that request because of the prior notice that was given to each Member of the Senate, stating that there would be no business on Washington's Birthday.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is my understanding that a number of Senators on that day will be in Bermuda attending a parliamentary conference. I do not know who they are, but I ask the Senator if that will not make a difference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Any day we choose will cause an inconvenience to the prior schedules of some Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I personally express my appreciation to the distinguished majority leader for his graciousness and concern for the rights of those who sponsor the fair housing proposal.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will not concur in the motion to table which the Senator from Montana will make tomorrow.

I believe that the vote which was just concluded shows remarkable strength for the fair housing proposal, a strong majority in favor of the strongest possible measure; and we are hopeful, in the next day or two, through a modified version, to develop the additional strength we need to invoke cloture and to adopt the worker protection proposal and a significant fair housing proposal.

Thus, I appeal to my colleagues to join with me and with Senator HARR and others in defeating the motion when it comes before the Senate tomorrow. I do so reluctantly, because no Member of the Senate is more committed to the objective of fair housing and civil rights than the Senator from Montana. The difference between us is one of a practical appraisal of the possibilities of adoption of this measure. I believe the possibilities are strong, and I hope that situation will continue, through the sup-

port of the Senate, to carry on this battle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in order to clarify the unanimous-consent request, is it understood that on Monday next, 1 hour after the Senate convenes, after a quorum call, the Senate will vote on the petition for cloture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Without objection, that is the understanding.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the President in submitting his 1969 budget referred to it as a "tight budget." Today I wish to discuss a specific example wherein this "tight budget" could be reduced by at least \$200,000.

The Subversive Activities Control Board, with its 17 employees, has had absolutely no work to perform for the past 2 years, during which time its five executive officers each were drawing \$26,000 a year. In the 1969 budget they are asking for an increase in appropriation of \$130,000, from \$295,000 in 1968 to \$425,000 for 1969, for the stated purpose of hiring five more employees.

On numerous occasions I tried to suspend the salaries of these men on the basis that the American taxpayers could not afford \$295,000 in salaries for five high-paid executives and their 12 assistants who frankly admitted they had no official duties. Each time I was defeated in this effort, and it was not until the latter part of 1967 that Congress finally enacted a law assigning some duties to this Board.

Now that work has been assigned to this previously inactive Board, they are asking for \$130,000 additional appropriations, the purpose of which is to hire five more employees, apparently to perform the duties which have now been assigned to the Board under the above referred to legislation. Evidently, this will enable the other employees to keep on loafing.

A breakdown of the new employees requested and their salary scales is as follows:

They are asking for one additional employee grade GS-16, at a salary between \$20,982 and \$26,574; one additional GS-13, with a salary range of between \$13,507 and \$17,557; one GS-7, with a salary range of between \$6,734 and \$8,759; one extra GS-6, with a salary range of between \$6,137 and \$7,982; and one GS-5, with a salary range of between \$5,565 and \$7,239.

Mr. President, for 2 years these five Board members with their \$26,000 salaries—now \$28,000—drew their paychecks and performed absolutely no functions whatever. The same is true of their 12 assistants, two of whom have been drawing approximately \$20,000 per year.

Now, after 2 years of doing nothing, when a few duties are assigned to this Board, they immediately ask for additional personnel to carry out the functions.

I most respectfully suggest that Congress in approving this part of the President's 1969 budget not only consider the

complete rejection of the \$130,000 for the five additional employees but also consider reducing last year's appropriation of \$295,000 and thus eliminate some of the present excess personnel. This agency is obviously overstaffed with "chiefs" when what they really need are "working Indians."

AN APRIL FOOLS' JUNKET

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the motto of President Johnson's Great Society must be "Do as I say and not as I do."

On January 1, 1968, the President in a belated display of concern over our loss of gold, called upon the American people to revise their 1968 travel plans in order to conserve dollars. At the same time he asked Congress to impose a drastic tax upon all foreign travel.

The President even went so far as to imply that it would be unpatriotic for Americans not to cooperate with the administration by changing their travel plans.

Apparently, in issuing this call for sacrifice, he was referring to the taxpayers in general and did not mean for it to apply to members of his official family.

Secretary Freeman is now sending out invitations to Members of Congress, congressional staff members, Governors, farm leaders, and wives to join him on a junket to the Far East. This junket is scheduled to leave Washington in the Presidential jet April 3 and return April 14. The excuse for this vacation to the Far East is that this will be a trade mission, but as the Chicago Tribune editor asked, "How many genuine foreign trade experts will there be among this plane load of Congressmen, Governors, and farm leaders, not to mention their wives?"

Mr. President, such a grandiose junket, sponsored by a member of the President's own Cabinet, in the face of his January first plea to all Americans, merely shows the contempt that this administration has for the American taxpayers.

I most respectfully suggest that this political junket be cancelled. If a trade mission is required, let it be confined strictly to those officials who will be conducting negotiations.

If not cancelled or revised, I suggest that Secretary Freeman schedule his departing date for April 1—April Fools' Day would be more appropriate.

I ask unanimous consent that the recent editorial that appeared in the Chicago Tribune, criticizing this junket, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JUNKETING POLITICIANS

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has invited a number of congressmen, governors, and farm leaders to bring their wives and accompany him in a Presidential jet plane on a "trade promotion and fact finding" tour of the far east. The invitation was issued hardly more than two weeks after President Johnson appealed to American citizens not to travel outside the western hemisphere in order to help reduce the serious balance of payments deficit.

The Presidential jet, which can accommodate about 100 passengers, will leave Washington April 3 and return April 14. The travelers are to participate in the opening of a United States food and agriculture exhibit in Tokyo and make one-day stops in South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and the Philippines. A 24-hour "rest stop" in Honolulu is scheduled on the return flight.

The invitations mention nothing about the guests paying their own expenses; so apparently the government is footing the entire bill. Regardless of that, in view of the President's appeal it is apropos to ask if the trip is necessary. How many genuine foreign trade experts will there be among this plane load of congressmen, governors, and farm leaders, not to mention their wives? How much serious effort can be devoted to trade promotion and fact finding in the short time allotted for each stop?

It makes more sense to view this as a junket designed to butter up certain politicians and farm leaders in preparation for the legislative and political battles ahead in an election year. Viewed in that light, it reflects the arrogance and cynicism of an administration which doesn't hesitate to send a plane load of V. I. P.s on a pleasure trip half way around the world, while telling the taxpayers who have to pay for it to stay home and see America first.

PRESIDENT'S ADVISORY PANEL ON INSURANCE IN RIOT-AFFECTED AREAS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have just received a notice of some comments by Mr. T. Lawrence Jones, president of the American Insurance Association, about the recommendation of the President's Advisory Panel on Insurance in Riot-Affected Areas.

I was pleased to note that Mr. Jones pointed out that only through Government-industry cooperation could the insurance needs of inner city property owners be properly met. This is the kind of approach, Mr. President, that the chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Subcommittee on Small Business, under the leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], have recommended.

Indeed, the subcommittee has already approved a bill along these lines to help assure the availability of adequate insurance against crime losses for small businesses located in the central cities.

I look forward to receiving the legislative proposals designed to implement the recommendations of the President's Insurance Panel. They, along with the subcommittee's work, will provide a sound basis upon which we may help to build an effective and workable program involving in appropriate ways the talent and resources of both Government and industry.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement entitled "Insurance Spokesman Commends Report of President's Insurance Study Panel," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

INSURANCE SPOKESMAN COMMENDS REPORT OF PRESIDENT'S INSURANCE STUDY PANEL

NEW YORK, January 29.—T. Lawrence Jones, president of the American Insurance Association, today commended the President's