

UNITED STATES

U.S. Congress.



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 26

OCTOBER 9, 1973 TO OCTOBER 17, 1973

(PAGES 33229 TO 34550)

CANCELLATION OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), this is to advise the Senate that the hearings scheduled before the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs on October 17 have been canceled until further notice.

At that time the subcommittee proposed to consider the following measures:

S. 1411 and S. 1412—Sisseton-Wahpeton land transfer.

S. 1222—Paiute-Shoshone land transfer.

S. 481—Rocky Boy's mineral interest. S. 2105—Spokane land bill.

S. 1102—Keweenaw Bay Indian Community submarginal lands.

S. 1854—Cherokee Nation Land Compensation.

S. 1856—Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Cherokee Nation jurisdiction.

S. 283—Bridgeport Indian Colony lands.

S. 634—Kootenai land transfer.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PRIME MINISTER MEIR ADDRESSES ISRAEL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues Prime Minister Golda Meir's address to the Israeli nation and press conference on October 13. I believe that this statement is the best public reference to date of how the Israelis view the latest outbreak of war.

Prime Minister Meir, in a response to a question on the scale of the casualties suffered, spoke not only of Israeli casualties, but Arab suffering as well. She said:

I am not ashamed to stand before you, a Prime Minister that, if you wish, is emotional—if you wish, sentimental. With all my heart, for the sake of the Egyptian people, I wish that Sadat would become emotional and sentimental over one dead man. When that moment comes there is peace automatically. There will be more than one man. And it is a terrible price for nothing. Just to satisfy ambitions of leaders who have no hearts. And may I say one more thing. I spoke before about the aid of the Soviet Union to Syria, Egypt and Iraq. As bad and dangerous as it is for Israel, if I at least believed for one moment that this aid the Soviet Union is giving to the Arab countries is because of its love for the Arab people, I would say, its too bad, they don't like the Jews, but they like the Arabs. But that isn't true. It is for callous interests of the Soviet Union. Therefore, thousands upon thousands of Egyptians and Syrians can be killed and numbers of Israelis can be killed and they don't care. That is the most terrible aspect of the entire situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address and text of the press conference be printed in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF PRIME MINISTER GOLDA MEIR'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION AND PRESS CONFERENCE, OCTOBER 13, 1973

Citizens of Israel: When I spoke to you a few days ago I said that our situation was far

better than it had been on the day I had to inform the nation that we had once again been attacked by our neighbors.

I am sorry to say that I cannot inform the people today that the war is over and that victory is ours.

Now as then, I have no doubt that victory shall be ours, even though the war is not yet over, even though our sons and daughters, soldiers and officers, both on the northern and southern fronts are still fighting, are fighting with devotion, courage, ability, with a spirit words cannot describe. I am also happy to be able to say that the people in the rear are not falling behind our sons in the front lines. This nation's spirit is strong and ready to volunteer for any task to a far greater extent than anyone could have foreseen. We are a small people surrounded by hostile neighbors. In this war not only the armies of Egypt and Syria are fighting us, they are supported in various ways, with tanks and airplanes, by countries farther off, like Iraq and Algeria. Jordan too, has joined in with a tank force; other Arab countries are also providing support. Above all, there has been massive aid support by the Soviet Union to Syria and to Egypt by means of airlift.

The facts: We are advancing. Our road is not easy and clear. Our forces were obliged to wage a battle this morning against a tank division that arrived from Iraq. We destroyed the great majority of their tanks and our forces are pushing forward.

These are the facts. I can say our situation is better. There is no doubt in our hearts that we shall be the victors at the end of the War.

Not we started this war—but since we have been attacked, we shall fight until victory. Let us hope not too much time passes before the war ends in Israel's victory.

PRIME MINISTER'S PRESS CONFERENCE,
OCTOBER 13, 1973

Israel has again been attacked by its neighbors, and Arab countries far away, including help from Iraq, Algeria, Tunisia, and others. Above all, one of the two great powers not only provided Syria, Egypt and Iraq with all war material they could possibly integrate into their armies, but for over six years, they have been training officers and men, teaching them the theory of war, and of attack. The U.S.S.R. did not come to Egypt and Syria to teach them to prepare against attack. They knew very well Israel was not going to attack Egypt or Syria or anyone. Their thoughts, efforts, and billions of dollars worth of tanks, planes, guns, ammunition and teaching were for one purpose only: to prepare for a massive attack on Israel.

We did everything possible during six years to try to convince our neighbors that bloodshed has never solved any problem between neighbors. Another war only means more dead, bloodshed, destruction, and no solution. And after all is over, there is still only one way—to negotiate. Decide there is a sincere will to live in peace, then sit down and negotiate an honorable peace. As in previous wars, this war was forced upon us. We are a very small people. There is no comparison between numbers in our army and the numbers in any of the countries fighting us, certainly no comparison with the massive armies of men of all those that joined in this war against us. We do not have the wealth of ammunition they have. But two things we have that give us an advantage over our neighbors: Hatred for war and death. That we have. Maybe it's essential that the Heads of States in the neighboring countries begin to feel that. When Sadat said war must go on, and that he is prepared to sacrifice a million men, one shudders not only at the thought of a million men giving their lives, but that the Head of a people can make this statement. We don't want dead on our side, we have no joy in causing

the death of others. But this people, small, surrounded by enemies, has decided to live. This is not a people that can give in. This people does not fear tanks and it has no fear of reality. We know that giving up means death, destruction of our sovereignty and physical destruction of our entire people. Against that, we will fight with everything we have within us.

We are confident despite difficulties. We are in a different position today than we were last Saturday or last Sunday. We have known bitter hours. But just as we go to our people and tell them that, so they believe us that there isn't a sign of doubt in our hearts that as bitter as this war is, the end again will be the same as that of other wars. We will win because we must live. Our neighbors are fighting not for their lives, nor for their sovereignty. They are fighting to destroy us. We will not be destroyed. Therefore, the spirit of our men on the front, the spirit of our people in every home, is a spirit of a people that hates war but knows that to live it must win the war that has been forced upon it.

QUESTIONS BY NEWSMEN AND ANSWERS BY THE PRIME MINISTER

Q. Does Israel intend to take Damascus, and if so, how long to occupy it?

A. You don't expect me to bring you the operative plan of what we are going to take, when, how long we stay and what will happen. I cannot do that.

Q. Would Israel agree to a cease-fire on the basis of lines that existed on the 5th of October?

A. There is no sense in speculating on what Israel will agree to or not as long as our neighbors—to this moment to the best of my knowledge, not our neighbor to the South nor our neighbor to the north has indicated any desire whatsoever to stop fighting. When we come to a proposition of a cease-fire we will consider it very, very seriously and decide, because our desire is, under possible conditions to stop the war as quickly as possible.

Q. Is it possible the super-powers are getting more involved in this war?

A. I know of one super-power that has sent in the last two days over 120 planes, carrying ammunition and I suppose rockets and I don't know what else to Syria, Iraq and to Egypt. That is rather some kind of an involvement I would say, but I don't know what else they want to do.

Q. Do you consider the fact that King Hussein is sending troops to defend Damascus as an act of war on his part?

A. Well, I don't think that King Hussein's troops have reached Damascus. They are quite a long distance away, but the fact that King Hussein has seen fit, after what happened in 1967, again to send in tanks and to have his army as he himself, or his government said today, on the Syrian front, I can only say I am sorry, because my predecessor, on the 5th of June 1967, sent a message to King Hussein through General Bull telling him that if he stays out nothing will happen to him. He did not stay out, and I am sure that the King must have the memory, rather a very unpleasant memory of what happened due to the fact that he came in. I am sorry that he has done that. But if any tank stands in our way, we cannot ask for identification whose tank it is. Any tank in our way will be hit.

Q. Have you asked for any material aid from the U.S., and can you reveal what kind?

A. If you people read the statement of Dr. Kissinger yesterday in answer to a question of this kind, he said that there is an ongoing relationship between the U.S. and Israel as far as military material is concerned. So it's ongoing.

Q. Has the possibility been considered or

been brought up or renewing the government of national unity in the near future?

A. I have not heard about this, and I do not know why a government should have to be changed in war time.

Q. In view of the events of last week do you consider the 1967 cease-fire lines as a viable frontier and a safe boundary for Israel?

A. The 1967 cease-fire lines are certainly the best lines that we could have. Every line can be attacked, naturally. But can you imagine what would have happened to us had we moved back to the June 4, 1967 lines, had this attack on us took place, not when we are on the Canal but on those lines? Maybe—I hope at any rate—that people throughout the world that did not exactly go along with us when we said we will not go back to the pre-67 borders, that we must have borders that are safer, more defensible—I hope that they will now realize it is not that we wanted more sand in the Sinai desert, or more land anywhere else, but that we wanted borders that will prevent war. And even if these borders did not prevent war, how much more terrible it would have been for Israel had we consented, at the advice of some of our best friends, to go back where we came from.

Q. Do you regret not having launched a pre-emptive strike?

A. Yes and No. Yes, because had we done that, no doubt that position would have been much better and I can say frankly that probably quite a few lives would have been saved. No, because at least we don't have that argument with the world. It is a sad comment, but the truth: We took that decision with our eyes open. And we hoped to the last minute that maybe, despite what happened to us in 1967 when we tried to get people to prevent that war—we thought maybe this time it would succeed. So it isn't by chance we took this decision. We knew what we were doing. We knew even that we would have to pay for it. But I do not regret, despite all this, that we took that decision.

Q. You said that your forces had been through very bitter hours since Saturday or Sunday. Could you outline a bit more specifically exactly what the military situation is on the two fronts and what progress your forces have made during the weekend.

A. On the Syrian border, the Golan Heights is back, every inch of it, in our hands. The people of the various settlements are back in their settlements. Our forces are across the border and on the road that leads to Damascus. That is quite a change, to be on the Golan Heights or to be on the other side of the border. Of course, there is a battle going on all the time in the north. In the south, there is fighting now, and there probably will be for a few days to come. I wouldn't like to say anything more about the southern front.

Q. Can you tell us more about the implications of Hussein's decision to send his troops into Syria, the implications on your present eastern frontier; the bridges across the Jordan, are they open now? We were told early in the week there wasn't a full mobilization of Jordan coming into the war. Today anybody listening to the radio knows that more troops were mobilized. Was it for this contingency today?

A. We would have been more foolish than we are, if a neighbor so close geographically to us sends part of his troops, even if not too many, to aid a country fighting us, that we shouldn't take into account a possibility that if he does something more from across the borders we should be prepared to meet him. As far as the bridges are concerned, if King Hussein hasn't closed them yet, they are closed today because on the Sabbath they are always closed. On Yom Kippur too.

Q. Your reaction to the British decision to cut off arms to fighting nations?

A. I must say people, decent people, and decent governments, when they come to a point where, if you say it bluntly "A plaque on both your houses" or when you say it more gently, "We are neutral", that is, the one that attacks and the victim of the attack are exactly in the same position. Somehow, maybe I am not sensitive enough to the feeling of justice and equality, when a government like Great Britain adopts a position of this kind—in addition to being bad for us, it is painful to think that a government can do something of that kind.

Q. Would you say that to them?

A. Maybe I will meet them someday and then I will say it to them.

Q. There is a considerable ghetto of Jews in Syria. What is your knowledge of the situation concerning these Jews, and your intentions?

A. There is no doubt that the Jews in the ghetto in Syria are treated in the most terrible, miserable way. And we certainly will see to it, try at any rate, that when the war is over and whether there is a cease-fire agreement or some other kind of agreement, we will ask these Jews be taken out the same way as we will ask for an exchange of prisoners. *These Jews are prisoners that didn't even fight in the war and we will do everything in our power to see that these Jews are brought out from Syria.*

Q. I know Israel's enemies have been counting on the assumption that supplies are going to run out and that Israel cannot fight a long war. I also know that Israel's friends abroad are concerned about the possibility that supplies may not be sufficient. Could you explain whether these problems are real or imagined.

A. If our neighbors dealt with realities, instead of dreams, maybe there would be peace a long time ago. Israel does not face the danger of lack of supplies. Israel is going to fight this war to the very end as long as our neighbors insist upon it. We can take everything necessary to fight this war until the war is ended with the victory of Israel. There are difficulties, difficulties in supplies, in many other things, but our people can take it. They have been tried before, they are wonderful today more than they ever were before, and we can take all the difficulties and all the hardships. If our neighbors built on that then they have lost the war before they start it.

Q. Assuming a favorable outcome, is there any way you can see now to convert this fighting into the negotiated settlement or any political settlement of the dispute that eluded you in 1967?

A. I am sorry we cannot come out every day or every week with something new. That we have to repeat the same formula which I suppose sounds monotonous to many of you. Yet this is the truth. We didn't ask for the war of 1967. It was forced upon us and we won it. No sooner was the war over than the Israeli government asked the heads of Arab States: Now, let's sit down, as equals, and negotiate a peace treaty. And the answer came back from Khartoum: No recognition, no negotiations, no peace. For six years, like parrots we have been repeating the same thing. We want to live in peace, in cooperation and in friendship. Therefore we say let's sit down, as equals, let's negotiate without any pre-conditions. We have ideas of what the borders should be, you have ideas of what the borders should be. We don't ask you to accept our ideas before we sit down to negotiate, and you can't ask us to accept your ideas before we sit down to negotiate. Now let's sit down and talk. You know what the answer was for 6 years: No negotiations, go back to the 67 borders and then maybe we will negotiate. No real cooperation and recognition of Israel, which means practically, go back to the 67 borders then or any other borders. That, of course, we couldn't agree to. We have nothing new after this

war is over. If we sit down and negotiate we can sign a treaty which will open a new era for the entire area but that depends upon them.

Q. The fact that you have been waiting for the Arab troops to attack, was that a political decision? If so, is that not in contradiction to what the Israel government earlier said that not one soldier's life would be offered for a political decision? And thirdly, will this political decision have any impact or implications on the situation internally in Israel?

A. It was a political decision, I don't think it has any relevance to what you say is the Israel government's policy not to sacrifice lives for political decisions. During a war, several times a day various political decisions have to be taken. In a war, to my great sorrow, people lose lives. Sometimes you take one decision, and you think maybe you can save lives in that way, and it turns out the other way. So there is no guarantee for political decisions to save lives. No, I don't see any implications whatsoever.

Q. Is the immigration of Soviet Jews continuing?

A. Do you mind if I don't answer that?

Q. What do you think of the project of the French mediation?

A. That is because France is very neutral, I suppose. France has even overstepped the claim for neutrality. I want to make myself clear. Mediation that we are prepared to accept and will be ready to accept at any time is either by an individual or a government that decides its aid should be limited to one thing and one thing only, which is a very important step, and that is to help the parties get together. Therefore, it is not arbitration, and no mediator who thinks he knows better than the parties what is good for them. Therefore, when this was attempted in the past, it failed. If it will be attempted in the future, it will fail. It is these two peoples whose sons met in battle over and over and over again, the governments of these two peoples must meet at the negotiating table and not have somebody from faraway whose life and independence and sovereignty are not at stake—it is these peoples in this area that have everything to win and everything to lose. Therefore it is these peoples that must do it. Nothing can save the leaders of the Arab countries from taking this responsibility for the fate of their people in their own hands and not to build ideas and castles in the air—someday Brezhnev can save them, the next day President Nixon before elections or after elections, before the summit meeting, after the summit meeting—all these are gimmicks that did not work in the past, will not work in the future. President Sadat, President Assad, King Hussein and all the others who have so much courage, why do they not have the courage to meet us at the negotiating table? If they are not satisfied they can always get up from the table and leave, but not even to try to sit down with us, in order to come to a peace treaty which will end all wars—that courage they are lacking, that somebody must do for them. Therefore, not France nor any other country can do that for them, and should not take it upon themselves to do it for them. Every country, every government that encourages them not to meet us at the negotiating table, everyone that encourages them in their intransigence and in their hope that somebody, somehow will solve their problems for them, is I think doing a disservice not only to Israel but to the Arabs and to peace.

Q. Do I detect a slightly different tone in your remarks about the events on the southern front? Does Israel categorically rule out a cease-fire which includes Egyptian troops on this side of the Canal?

A. I don't know what tone you have heard before. But what I said is when we hear a suggestion for a cease-fire, the government of Israel, believe me, very seriously and with

great responsibility for everything that is concerned, will sit down and deal with it. So far, I don't hear anything about our neighbors being prepared for a cease-fire. We have so many problems on our hands that we don't want to think up problems. When a suggestion for a cease-fire will be a reality, believe me the government of Israel will not lose many minutes before it will be in session and deal with this problem.

Q. Would you be prepared that the Israel government agrees to return territories seized in 1967 for the price of stopping the bloodshed and for peace?

A. Somebody coming into this room from another planet would think that in 1967 Israel forced a war upon its neighbors in order to take the Sinai Desert, the Western Bank and the Golan Heights. But since we are all from the same planet and you not only write newspapers, you also read newspapers, this wasn't exactly the description of what happened in 1967. Israel refused to go back to the borders of 1967 because these borders were washed away in blood exactly as the 1947 borders were washed away in blood by attack by our neighbors. Exactly as now, in 1967 they washed away the lines in Syria and Jordan and the others and now they have washed away borders. I don't think that will happen after this. Our neighbors cannot take a walk of this kind, with tens of thousands of men, with thousands of tanks, with bombers, kill, destroy, and then say: Well, all right, we didn't do it this time, we will try it again next time, but please give us borders that will be easier for us to cross; so good, we are not.

Q. Do you think the United States can do anything affirmative to hasten the end of this crisis?

A. I believe the United States and the policy it has adopted, for the last two or three years, saying that the U.S. is prepared to give its services to help the parties get together and find a solution for the problem . . . the U.S. was prepared to aid the parties get together on the Suez arrangement. I think the U.S. has done, probably is doing also this moment, everything possible, and God Bless the U.S. for what it does not do and that is to try and force a solution upon any one of the parties. Therefore, I think the U.S. has certainly done everything for peace.

There has been much speculation in the country about the scale of the casualties. Could you comment on them at all?

A. No, I don't wish to comment on it, but I am sure it won't take long and the figures will be known. I want to tell you one thing. The other day on T.V. I was asked "what is the price for the victory that you are talking about?" I said, "I don't know". To me one man dead is a terrible price. This man has a mother, a father, a wife, sisters, brothers, maybe children. I am not ashamed to stand before you, a Prime Minister that, if you wish, is emotional—if you wish, sentimental. With all my heart, for the sake of the Egyptian people, I wish that Sadat would become emotional and sentimental over one dead man. When that moment comes there is peace automatically. There will be more than one man. And it is a terrible price for nothing. Just to satisfy ambitions of leaders who have no hearts. And may I say one more thing. I spoke before about the aid of the Soviet Union to Syria, Egypt and Iraq. As bad and dangerous as it is for Israel, if I at least believed for one moment that this aid the Soviet Union is giving to the Arab countries is because of its love for the Arab people, I would say, its too bad, they don't like the Jews, but they like the Arabs. But that isn't true. It is for callous interests of the Soviet Union. Therefore, thousands upon thousands of Egyptians and Syrians can be killed and numbers of Israelis can be killed and they don't care.

That is the most terrible aspect of the entire situation.

Q. It has been said that the Syrians and the Egyptians are fighting this time with a higher morale and better, among other reasons because they are fighting to get back territories which were theirs before 1967. Do you think this is correct?

A. In the first place, one has to prove that their morale is higher. Maybe it is. In the second place, whether it is for this or for other reasons one guess is as good as another. Again, you assume that these territories were taken away by a war.

In conclusion, whether they are justified, whether they are good fighters or bad fighters, to have a war instead of negotiating. . . Usually peace treaties after wars are concluded in the following way: A war is won, one side wins, the other loses. If the loser is also the attacker, then certainly the winner writes a paper of conditions and asks the other parties to sign on the dotted line. I would like to know if there is a case in history that can be quoted when there was a war, one side attacked, lost, and the other side said "Well. All right, come on, take everything. Nothing happened, only people are dead and there's destruction." I think one of the greatest things that happened after the Second World War is that Chancellor Willy Brandt told his people and then went to Poland and recognised the new border, because—he didn't fight, he was not a Nazi—he said, the German people twice have attacked. They must pay a price.

Q. A few days ago Mr. Yariv said it would not be a short war. You talked about Sinai and said it would last another few days. Is that different . . .

A. No, I didn't say another few days. With all that has happened to us, we are accustomed to short wars. Believe me, I wouldn't care a bit and neither would Yariv if we were proven wrong. If both say this will not be a short war as the others we have known—I'm not thinking of the War of Liberation. . . I did not say a couple of days, I don't know. We have been fighting for a week. How many more days I wouldn't dare prophesy.

Q. Would Israel accept a cease-fire while the Egyptians are on this side of the Canal?

A. I have already answered this question. I said when anyone proposes a cease-fire and any of our neighbors, preferably both, are prepared to enter into discussion of a cease-fire agreement, Israel will not lag behind. Within a few minutes we will be at the conference table and making our decision. There is no sense in speculating now, since we have no indication whatsoever that our neighbors are prepared for a ceasefire.

Q. You are obviously confident of victory. How confident? Are you disappointed that it has taken more than Six Days?

A. No, I am not disappointed. I am sorry, but I can't say I am disappointed. Israel has been involved in many wars. It never fought a war under similar conditions. When we have to fight on two fronts, when we have not taken the pre-emptive step, when we knew exactly what a wealth of armament the Arab armies had; from the very beginning, we didn't fool ourselves and we didn't see this as a short war. I am sorry. I wish we had been proven wrong, but this is it.

CENTENNIAL OF THE KANSAS STATE GRANGE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, next week marks the centennial celebration in Lawrence, Kans., of the Kansas State Grange. This organization is not just a farm organization—but a growing group of people interested in all aspects of rural America, not just agriculture.

Since the founding of the National

Grange in 1867, the organization has devoted itself to helping rural residents help themselves. During my 8 years in the House of Representatives and the past 5 years in the Senate, I have worked closely with Grange representatives and appreciate their programs and policies. These policies have been practical and helpful in the determination of my responsibility to constituents on all matters of Government.

And I must say that the primary objective of the Grange is similar to mine—that Government programs should provide maximum freedom and equitable opportunities with a minimum of Federal controls.

With leaders like Jim Ingwerson and John Scott, along with others I have worked with over the years, I have come to respect their advice and judgment on agricultural matters.

In recent years we have worked closely in the drafting and refinement—and passage—of environmental improvement legislation, rural disaster relief legislation, farm legislation, and rural development legislation.

Of particular importance at the present time is consideration of export controls. I commend the Grange on its policies and recommendations. Agriculture and industry cannot be separated. The economic interests of the Nation cannot be fractionated or categorized. Improvements in balance of payments in recent years are definitely attributable to agricultural exports. However, the ability of importing nations to purchase these agricultural products might be related to past industrial exports or trade in other commodities.

False price adjustments or protective tariffs cannot provide equity to our producers nor to foreign producers. Improvement of trade relations throughout the world will improve rural America. Freedom of trade and freedom in pricing will prove the most efficient method to put the supplies where the demand is located—and the citizens of both rural and urban America will benefit in such a competitive situation.

I have been impressed with the Grange's overall attitude toward rural America. That attitude is important in the rural revitalization of the Nation. We have found that the metropolitan centers are not the answer for everyone—finally, we are trying to stop the flow from farm to urban centers. Utilization of the same time and energy—not to mention the costs—in improvement of rural areas will encourage rural residents to live in rural communities and halt the outmigration that has continued the past four decades.

In its 100-year history, the Grange has continued one particular approach which I single out today—and that is its recognition and acceptance of youth. The Grange has always attracted the youth through their inclusion in Grange activities. With the increased pace of life today, those of us concerned with the future of rural America know that the future lies in the hands of young Americans. Stability and improvement of rural America is certainly assured through the efforts of the Grange.