

*U.S. Congress. Congressional record.*

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 92<sup>nd</sup> CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 117—PART 29

OCTOBER 26, 1971 TO NOVEMBER 1, 1971

(PAGES 37451 TO 38678)

state of no war and no peace. While we would like to deter war the Arabs insist on deterring peace. Yet, in spite of the uninterrupted menace of war, the thing which makes us proud is the fact that liberty prevailed. Whatever one may say about the State of Israel, it is a free country, intensely democratic, cherishing the same values which the United States introduced so vividly to modern life: institutions of freedom as a source of national strength. As a matter of fact, in one aspect we are a little ahead of you: while you have just two parties, we have nine—more than you could have experienced and more than we can afford.

It is our decision to maintain a complete democracy and a self-defense posture between the Jordan River and the Mediterranean Sea. In order to achieve this we must have (A) an understanding with the Arabs who are our immediate neighbors; (B) negotiations with the Arab states; (C) a deterrent against Russian involvement and intervention; (D) a full understanding with the United States of America.

(A) Never before in the history of the Jewish people or in the events of the Middle East were there so many Jewish people and Arab people living together under the very same roof. Can't we co-exist in an atmosphere of difference and mutual respect? As time passes on, more than 4 years since the 6 Day War it appears more and more that the answer to this question is becoming a positive one. There are 600,000 Arabs living on the West Bank; 300,000 in the Gaza Strip; and 70,000 in Jerusalem. There is a state of full employment. Arabs have the right to move freely in Israel and there are open bridges over the Jordan River. They have freedom of speech and they can, as they do, maintain full contact with the Arab world. As a matter of fact, we had over 100,000 visitors from Arab countries spending their summer vacation in the West Bank. And we hope to create a society based on two assumptions: (a) every citizen, no matter whether Arabic or Jewish, has the right to be equal; (b) each community be it Arabic or Jewish has the right to be different—worshipping its own Lord, speaking its own language, cultivating its own tradition and remaining true to its rich past and modern destiny. My dear friends, may I say, that this development is probably the most promising step toward a permanent peace in the Middle East, because peace, like justice, begins at home.

(B) As far as the Arab states are concerned, there are different options for them as well as for us. Theoretically, one may say that there is an option for a full peace or for partial peace; for a full-fledged war or for a war of attrition. The chances for complete peace are very dim for the moment. The Egyptians would like us to withdraw completely from the territories we have taken in the 6 Day War without them retreating from their policies of belligerence, which they have maintained from the very first day the State of Israel was created to this day. The Arabs accuse us of being expansionists but they tend to forget that the army of Israel was already at the Suez Canal in 1956; retreating completely three months later against the promise that the Straits of Tiran would remain open. But then, they have blockaded the Straits again in 1967 for no good reason. Is it too much for us to ask that this time a guarantee for free navigation in the Straits of Tiran be based not just upon a promise, but also upon a strip of land which will enable Israel to guard free passage in the Straits, while the Egyptians will control the Suez Canal?

Another Arab demand is that Jerusalem, now completely united, be re-divided into two parts, guarded by two hostile armies facing each other at pistol range. Ladies and gentlemen, Jerusalem is the heart of Israel, and may I say, in the words of Robert Frost: "The land was ours before we were the

land's." Jerusalem guarded the fate and destinies of the Jewish people even while dispersed in the four corners of the world. The Jordanian army conquered a part of the old city because they had the upper hand in the War of Independence. Their rule of Jerusalem was never recognized by the international community. In the 6 Day War, the Jordanian army decided to participate in the Egyptian campaign and they lost and Jerusalem was re-united under Israel. Fortunately enough, there is no real suggestion for the internationalization of Jerusalem, which means combining Western and Russian control and putting the capital of Israel under their uncertain rule. So Jerusalem will remain unified and people of different faiths—Christians, Moslems and Jews—will have free access to and complete protection of their holy places.

They say that Israel is intransigent because we refuse to accept a dictate which may lead again to blockade and division without any real peace. The Arab nations are preparing themselves for the renewal of war. May I say rather briefly and clearly that the only deterrent to such a possibility is to maintain the strength of the Israeli army—and that is what we are trying to do. Secretary Rogers, who addressed you yesterday, came out in favor of an interim solution. Israel has accepted this initiative and on that point we are in full accord with the Secretary's view. The time has come to "stop shooting" and "start talking." The shooting was stopped but the talking has not yet begun. We would like to see the continuation of the cease-fire and the commencement of a real dialogue between the Arab states and the State of Israel. And we don't think that such a dialogue should really start by the Egyptian army crossing the Suez Canal. I'm afraid that there is a reason why the Arabs are refusing such a dialogue and this leads me to the 3rd point—which is Russian involvement in the Middle East.

(C) Apart from the Iron Curtain countries, never before has Soviet Russia sent military personnel abroad except now to Egypt. There are close to 15,000 Russian officers and soldiers on Egyptian soil. They run their air force units in Egypt and they command a sizeable naval strength in the waters of the Mediterranean as Admiral McCain pointed out last night. It is a departure from communist ideology to a long-lived Russian dream. It's not an army of destiny, but an army of appetite. Since the Russians have discovered the potential of the oceans and gained the feeling of a new military might, their strategy has expanded from the protection of the Iron Curtain to the threatening of the independence of other nations.

Let's make it clear, the Russian presence in Egypt is not because of Egyptian reasons but because of Russian interests. It seems that the Russians have decided to make the Middle East a chapter in the glories of Russian history. It is because of this Russian presence that Egypt is looking for victories in the military field instead of agreements in the political domain. It wasn't an easy experience for us, back in 1955, when Russian involvement began. Yet we didn't lose heart. We feel, in the final analysis, that we can maintain our independence and liberty because for us the place we live in is the most important matter we have. For the Russians it is, after all, a secondary consideration.

We would not provoke the Russians, yet we will not give in. We won in two wars in spite of the fact that the Russians were already in Egypt. And even today, while we maintain a watchful eye on Russian maneuvers in the Middle East, our aim is to secure peace through agreed boundaries with the Arab countries—achieved in direct negotiations and not because of a Russian threat. We can cope with the total Arab strength; we can cope with the present Russian involvement limited in size and scope, provided the Rus-

sians are deterred from the sort of intervention which is not essential to their own national security nor should it become as a foregone conclusion in the global relationship between West and East. And this leads me to my last, but not least, point and this is the American posture in the Middle East.

(D) May I start by saying that we are deeply grateful to the American people and its administrations: From the very first day of our independence to this day, you have helped us in many ways. First in the understanding that the American people, by and large has shown to the State of Israel. You were the first to recognize our independence and you provided us with the necessary tools to make our self defense possible. You helped us politically and economically. I hope that we did not misuse your generosity—nor shall we ever forget it.

We don't ask American boys to fight for us, nor do we expect an American military involvement in the Middle East because of us. But, we do hope that America won't escape its world responsibility of deterring Russia from becoming too dangerous to the existence of smaller nations in maintaining their independence and liberty. I do believe that Israel is an example which fits like a glove in the Nixon doctrine which is based upon the assumption that regional conflicts must remain localized and not drag in the major powers: that the American deterrent posture coupled with American assistance to maintain a balance of power will enable smaller nations to protect their life and freedom. The American administration has recognized the importance of maintaining a balance of power which may serve as a deterrent against the renewal of war. We hope that this understanding will remain intact and that we shall be provided with the necessary equipment, not personnel, so that we shall be able to prevent or deter a renewal of hostilities. There is no hope for small nations to remain free unless the largest democratic state makes it clear that each state is entitled to decide its own destiny without a massive Russian threat.

We don't have in mind to give in to any Russian pressure. We do have in mind to arrive at an agreement with the Arabs: a permanent solution if possible; a partial solution if necessary. We don't think the way to agreement must pass through Moscow. The road to peace can be as direct as possible between Jerusalem and Cairo. We hope that we shall be able to achieve it—basically with our own efforts, yet we feel that as a democratic nation we are a unit in the formation of freedom, a strength in the armies of the light. We hope to maintain our strength in order to remain free and we are convinced that freedom is the real source of strength.

#### EXPULSION OF NATIONALIST CHINA FROM UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, in the wake of the diplomatic fiasco over the China question at the United Nations, we are now hearing the inevitable talk about retaliation.

This is understandable. Even if we recognize—as we should—that the expulsion of Nationalist China was in large measure a result of our own myopic and heavy-handed diplomacy, the sting of defeat and injustice is still very real.

I deplore the action of the General Assembly as much as anyone else, and I would hope that when tempers have cooled we might still find a way to bring the people of Taiwan back to the representation they deserve in the U.N. The administration should devote no less energy to that task than they are now de-

voting to the President's plans to visit Peking.

But it is simply uninformed, and self-defeating, to follow the administration's defeat in New York with the further folly of the Senate cutting U.N. funds.

Amid all the talk about the U.N. living beyond its means, let us ask specifically just who will be living so high on the \$141 million proposed for our voluntary contributions for United Nations programs.

Just what so-called fat do we cut?

Is it the \$100 million for the United Nations development program, the focal point of the entire U.N. effort to help developing countries? Is that the way we encourage multilateral efforts and burden sharing in foreign assistance?

Or do we cut the \$13 million proposed for UNICEF? Why do we not ask the children of Biafra, who were saved by UNICEF milk, to tell us how much fat there is in this program?

Or do we cut the \$7 million proposed for the U.N. population program? Do we think that \$7 million is an excessive investment to try to help other nations stem the tide of population growth that could so relentlessly devour every other advance in education and health and jobs? If population continues to grow at its present pace in some countries in Latin America, they could invest their entire gross national product in nothing but schools for the next 30 years and still not have enough classrooms. Is this \$7 million what the Secretary of State means by taking a hard look at U.N. spending?

And of course there is a number of other smaller programs we could cut. We could cut our \$2 million contribution to the U.N. drug abuse program. But I need not describe the absurdity of that at a time when we are locked in a life or death battle against the international traffic in narcotics.

Or we could cut the \$1½ million we give to the World Meteorological Organization, except that we would be making a mockery of our efforts to provide international warning against climatic disasters such as the cyclone in East Pakistan, where the very lack of warning brought human suffering which cost us many millions in the end.

Perhaps we could cut the \$312,000 for the World Health Organization and further cripple its already strained efforts to fight disease and death for two-thirds of the world's people, and to control epidemics that threaten our own population.

Then there is the \$400,000 we spend for training and research, an incredibly meager investment in a program to help other people stand on their feet, and ultimately remove the very need for our foreign assistance.

And finally, there is the \$22 million we could provide for the Arab refugee program. How would this administration or Congress—who so often plead for peace in the Middle East—justify the suffocation of that program? This program is the only real alternative Arab refugee children have to the hate and despair and terrorism which undermine any hope for a just settlement in the area. Do

we punish them—and thereby all the people of the Middle East?

If the President or Members of Congress were offended at the behavior of U.N. delegates in New York when the China vote was announced, I would simply ask them to remember that a cut-off of U.N. funds would not punish those delegates. On the contrary, we would be exacting our retribution on innocent men, women, and children in every corner of the world who had no part or responsibility in Monday night's spectacle.

Those people have no time for sophomoric antics and little reason for glee, no matter what happens in the General Assembly. Most of them are consumed in a day-by-day battle just to keep themselves and their children alive.

I would not for a moment pretend that the United Nations has even begun to meet its promise, or that our membership there, and our contributions to its programs, are not in many ways an act of forbearance in the face of provocation and chronic frustration.

But we must not make the poor and sick children of the world pay the price for our diplomatic blunder in New York, for the mindless behavior of U.N. diplomats—or for an administration tactic to scuttle the foreign aid bill because it contains a provision to end the war in Vietnam.

We have already failed one great trust this week: the trust of the 14 million people of Taiwan that we would find an honorable solution to the problem of their representation.

Let us not follow that failure by breaking faith with millions more.

#### POPULATION AND INDUSTRIAL EXPANSION IN UTAH

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this week I have had the pleasure of assisting members of the Tooele County Commission and Planning Commission, who are in Washington to further the formulation of a balanced growth and planning policy for the future development of the country's human and economic resources. I wish to call attention to the outstanding and progressive leadership demonstrated by these local government officials from my home State of Utah, and for their efforts to achieve a rural-urban balance.

In preparing for the population and industrial expansion now spreading into Tooele from the bordering Salt Lake Valley, the Tooele County Commission has demonstrated remarkable energy and will to design a constructive and orderly development policy that has as its central premise the relationship of people to land, water, air, and resources, and that permits people to live in harmony with their environment.

A comprehensive county master plan is now being developed with the aid of a Government grant. Moreover, this week Tooele County officials have engaged in detailed discussions with new community planners from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and also have carefully studied the exciting new communities of Reston, Va., and Columbia, Md. In cooperation with the Federal

Government and Terracor, a Utah-based community development corporation, Tooele County also is planning the development of a pilot new community, Stansbury Park. This "new town," being developed to accommodate a population of some 40,000 people, has the ultimate goal to become a self-contained community with all the life-support systems such as housing, recreation, commercial support, and industrial development. This project can serve as a guide for community planning throughout the west.

George Willis Smith, George Buzianis, and Sterling Halladay, have compiled an impressive record of public service over the past 16 years on the Tooele County Commission. Their combined commission experience adds up to slightly over half century—51 years of service.

During this period a climate of trust and cooperation has prevailed as Tooele County government has demonstrated an honest interest in growth to excellence. For example, this year the Tooele School Board won the coveted Thom McAn award from the National Education Association for longstanding commitments to improved education.

Under the direction of the Tooele County Commission, the county presently is being considered as a primary location for NASA's Spaceport Shuttle and recovery site. The Tooele Army Depot has undergone extensive growth. The Dugway Proving Grounds has become the focus of nationwide attention. The famed Bonneville Salt Flats Speedway on Utah's unique salt flats has continued its high-quality operation. And significant new industry has been attracted into the county, including the project of National Lead Co., which seeks to extract magnesium and other valuable minerals from the saline water of Great Salt Lake.

Mr. President, I commend the leadership of Tooele County for their outstanding efforts to bring vitality into rural areas and especially for their wisdom in seeking to design an orderly growth policy.

#### FUNDING OF PUBLIC LAW 81-815

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I have this week presented to my colleagues on the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, information I have received from the Office of Education relating to the funding of Public Law 81-815. Because I know the material will be of interest to Senators, I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from these documents be printed as appendix I to my remarks.

As the senior Senator from California, I have a very direct interest in having my State secure equitable funding of this program. A review of the table appended, showing eligible, unfunded applications under sections 5 and/or 9 of Public Law 81-815, will disclose the extent to which, I feel, under current funding practices, the people of my State are being shortchanged by the Office of Management and Budget.

Public Law 81-815 was enacted in 1950. It represents a commitment on the part of Congress, the executive, and the peo-