

October 9, 1968

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H 9691

Mr. RUMSFELD. There is another area with respect to contempt citations which has disturbed me, or at least I believe the House might pay some attention to it. It is this question where the House adjourns and a contempt citation is requested by a committee. Apparently the present precedent is that the Speaker automatically transmits that request for a contempt citation to the Justice Department. Is that correct?

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman is in error on that. There was a court decision in regard to that, holding that the Speaker did have to exercise some discretion, I believe.

Mr. RUMSFELD. So the Speaker in his discretion can send to the Justice Department a contempt citation during a period when the House is in recess.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman is getting into a difficult field here.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I do not want to take a position. I just say this is an area, it seems to me, as in regard to the previous area, which merits some attention by the House. I am pleased to see the gentleman in the well interesting himself in it.

I quite agree it is not a problem for your committee alone. Basically it is a problem for the Rules Committee. But it is an area in which the gentleman has knowledge, and he could make a contribution.

Mr. ICHORD. I believe the gentleman from Illinois and I are in substantial agreement, and I do appreciate very much his comments on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. SCHWENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A RESPONSE BY THE UNITED STATES AND A PROPOSAL BY ISRAEL BRING NEW HOPE FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, two separate actions today, one by the United States, and one by the State of Israel, have sparked new hope for peace in the Middle East with guarantees of continued sovereignty for the Israel people.

I was extremely pleased to learn that in response to a congressional resolution which I cosponsored and supported, President Johnson has today advised Secretary of State Dean Rusk to start negotiations with the Israel Government for the sale of U.S. Phantom jets to the Israel Air Force.

President Johnson made the disclosure today while signing the foreign aid authorization bill in the White House.

At the time that we here in the House adopted the amendment to the Foreign Aid Act calling for the United States to sell the Phantom jets to Israel, I made the following statement in behalf of this worthy cause:

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman on his excellent statement and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Wolff amendment. Israel today stands virtually alone in defending the entire Middle East and the African continent as well as the Mediterranean from Soviet expansion.

I know of no more important step we can take today than to assure Israel the right to obtain the very important Phantom jets she so urgently needs for her protection and survival.

Mr. Chairman, let us not ever forget that Israel's struggle for survival is in our highest interest. Thank God we have brave Israel to protect freedom's ideals in the Middle East at a time when our own resources are being tested in Vietnam.

Israel is today threatened as never before.

The Soviet Union has methodically replaced all the arms the Arab States lost during the lightning war of last June.

The free world has stood by as the Soviet Union pours arms and planes into the Arab States.

I say the United States should not permit another moment's delay in helping Israel obtain these vital Phantom fighters. They may well spell the difference between survival and destruction for Israel.

Mr. Chairman, the growing menace of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean; the continuing arms buildup by the Soviets of the Arab States, and the Soviet Union's continuing design for ultimate acquisition of the African continent may well be described as the seeds for a new world conflict.

Israel alone today stands as the vanguard against this Soviet expansion and I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is unconscionable that we should deny Israel these jet fighters any longer.

I urge adoption of the resolution.

I was also pleased to see the thoughtful proposal offered at the United Nations by Foreign Minister Abba Eban to bring peace to the Middle East.

Mr. Eban, in a speech to the United Nations, has made it very clear that his nation is willing to pull her troops back from conquered territories as soon as the Mideast borders are secure.

It was interesting to note that Foreign Minister Eban placed less importance on face-to-face negotiations with the Arab States, although he did not rule out the need for such direct negotiations to bring about lasting peace.

I am placing in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an article which appeared in today's New York Times and excerpts of Foreign Minister Eban's dramatic proposal to the United Nations.

Returning for a moment to the sale of Phantom jets to Israel, I note with some satisfaction President Johnson's statement that in light of the fact that Congress has strongly spoken out in favor of selling jets to Israel, the President has responded favorably and has ordered negotiations with the Government of Israel for the purchase of aircraft. The President ordered his aides to report back to him as quickly as possible on the details of such a sale of Phantom jets to Israel.

The President's action constitutes in my judgment, a major breakthrough in helping Israel maintain her balance of power in the Middle East. There can be no question that the sale of 50 Phantom jets to Israel would strengthen her defense establishment and also her offen-

sive capability so that the risk of another invasion by the Arab States would be considerably abated once the Arab States realize that Israel has sinews necessary for her own defense.

I am particularly pleased that the President is carrying out the section of our resolution, which reads:

It is a sense of the Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this section, to negotiate an agreement with the government of Israel providing for the sale by the United States of such number of supersonic planes as may be necessary to provide Israel with an adequate deterrent force capable of preventing future Arab aggression by offsetting sophisticated weapons received by the Arab States and to replace losses suffered by Israel in the 1967 conflict.

We can no longer delay the sale of these supersonic aircraft to Israel if we really want to maintain peace in the Middle East.

In a development on another front from the Israel Government itself, I believe that Foreign Minister Eban's proposal is imminently fair and should be adopted by the United Nations forthwith.

I believe Foreign Minister Eban has made an honest and sincere effort to assure the United States and the rest of the free world that Israel genuinely seeks peace just as quickly as her warring neighbors abandon their aggression and harassment of Israel.

I sincerely believe there can be no meaningful peace in this world so long as Israel's borders are threatened for, indeed, Israel today stands virtually alone as the bulwark in the Middle East against Soviet aggression.

If ever our Nation needed a strong and independent Israel adequately armed to resist aggression, we need such an Israel today with the ever-increasing menace of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean.

The United Nations should carefully study Foreign Minister Eban's proposal for, indeed, he offers a formula for lasting peace in the Middle East and for the survival of Israel which has captured the imagination of the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to include the story which appeared this morning in the New York Times about Foreign Minister Eban's proposal and I am also placing in the RECORD today excerpts from Foreign Minister Eban's speech delivered at the United Nations:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1968]
ISRAEL PRESENTS PEACE PROPOSAL—OFFERS PULLOUT—EBAN, IN U.N. SPEECH, LINKS TROOP MOVE TO SETTLING UP SECURE MIDEAST BORDERS—JARRING ROLE STRESSED—NINE-POINT PLAN PUTS LESS EMPHASIS ON NEGOTIATING DIRECTLY WITH ARABS

(By Drew Middleton)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., October 8.—Israel presented a nine-point peace plan for the Middle East today that included a promise that her forces would be withdrawn from occupied Arab territories once secure frontiers were established.

Foreign Minister Abba Eban, in an address to the General Assembly that was generously applauded, also de-emphasized, although he did not abandon, his Government's long insistence on direct, face-to-face negotiations with the Arab states.

To promise peace talks here in the coming weeks, he said, Israel is ready to exchange

"ideas or clarifications on certain matters of substance through Ambassador Jarring with any Arab Government." Dr. Gunnar V. Jarring is the representative of Secretary General Thant in the effort to bring about a settlement in the Middle East.

PHRASE IS OMITTED

Mr. Eban did not use the phrase "direct negotiations" in his speech, but referred rather to an exchange of views through Dr. Jarring. Israeli sources said their Government still believed that certain issues could not be settled without direct talks and that the United States agreed with this view.

Withdrawal of the Israeli forces has been the primary object of Arab diplomacy since the end of the war in June, 1967. In what he considered the central point of his speech, Mr. Eban declared Israel's readiness to replace cease-fire lines by "permanent, secure and recognized boundaries between Israel and each of the neighboring Arab states."

"And the disposition of forces," he continued, "will be carried out in full accordance with the boundaries under the final peace."

This disposition of forces, qualified Israeli sources said, would involve their withdrawal.

To assure the area's future security, Mr. Eban proposed that Arabs and Israelis conclude a pledge of mutual nonaggression. Israel is also prepared, qualified sources said later, to discuss the demilitarization of frontier areas.

The nine principles, Israeli sources said, would be the basic Israeli position from which she would begin negotiations if these were to open tomorrow. This explains, observers believed, why the principles emphasized broad policy objectives rather than detailed arrangements.

The motive in presenting the nine principles was to take advantage of the presence here of Ambassador Jarring and the Foreign Ministers of the United Arab Republic and Jordan. Syria, the third Arab country involved in the 1967 conflict, refused to recognize the Security Council resolution of Nov. 22, 1967, which sent Dr. Jarring to the Middle East to promote peace talks.

IMPOSED ACCORD REJECTED

Israel's blueprint rejected as unrealistic the idea of a settlement guaranteed, or in Mr. Eban's word "imposed," by the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France. The Middle East, he said, is "not an international protectorate" and the positions of the powers on the dispute have not moved any further than those of the Arabs and the Israelis.

The Soviet Union and France have advocated a guarantee. Britain favors a four-power declaration accepting the peace settlement. The United States opposes any arrangement that would give the appearance of an imposed settlement.

"The hour is ripe for the creative adventure of peace," Mr. Eban declared in presenting his Government's peace proposals. "Lest the Arab Governments be tempted out of sheer routine to rush into impulsive rejection, let me suggest that tragedy is not what men suffer but what they miss," he said.

The initial Arab reaction to the nine principles was negative.

George J. Tomah, Syria's permanent representative, said they contained nothing new but were "a repetition of things already said year after year" by Israeli spokesmen.

"What are the secure boundaries he keeps talking about?" asked Hashid Mourad, the representative of the Arab League. "He never once used the word 'withdrawal,' which comes at the top of the Security Council resolution."

The essence of a settlement, Mr. Eban emphasized, is that peace commits all parties to the proposition that the 20-year conflict in the Middle East is at an end. This means, he added in explaining his first point, not only that the state of belligerency with Israel that

the Arabs have maintained since 1948 is at an end, but also that the peace structure must be built from the bottom up.

Secure and recognized boundaries were Mr. Eban's second and central point. By establishing them and redeploying the troops, he said, the focal purpose of the Security Council resolution would be fulfilled. This led to his third principle, the discussion of security arrangements, including a nonaggression pact.

REFUGEE WORK NOTED

The fourth principle was the maintenance of freedom of movement throughout the area, especially across the frontiers of Jordan and Israel.

Mr. Eban suggested that the Foreign Minister of the United Arab Republic join him in a declaration that the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba are international waterways where all states have equal rights of passage.

Israel proposed a conference of Middle Eastern states and other Governments and agencies to chart a five-year plan for the solution of the refugee problem. This was the first of three proposals offered by the Foreign Minister to deal with the refugee problem as Israel's sixth principle.

He also proposed a Joint Refugee Commission to approve projects for refugee integration.

Israel, he noted, has as an interim measure decided to intensify and accelerate work to unite refugee families and to speed the processing of "hardship cases" among the refugees who crossed from the west bank to the east bank of the Jordan River during and after the fighting.

Jerusalem the third holy city of Islam, has been a focal point in the diplomatic dispute. Mr. Eban sought to mollify Arab critics.

He declared that his Government did not seek to "exercise unilateral jurisdiction" over Moslem and Christian holy places in Jerusalem and was willing to "work out a status" under which they would come under the responsibility of representatives of the two religions.

Arab sources said this was no advance on what Mr. Eban has said in the past on this point. Their goal is the return of the Jordanian section of the city, annexed by Israel, to Jordan.

The Foreign Minister's eighth point was the acknowledgment and recognition of the sovereignty, integrity and right to national life of Israel through "specific contractual engagements" to be made by the Government of Israel and the Arab states "to each other—by name."

Finally, he advocated a common approach by both Arabs and Israelis to "some" of the resources and means of communication in the Middle East in an effort to lay the groundwork for "a Middle East community of sovereign states."

Many delegations were encouraged by Mr. Eban's address because Israel appeared to be trying to get things moving on a Middle East settlement and end an explosive crisis.

A number of diplomats from Mediterranean countries were especially pleased by Israel's rejection of suggestions for a four-power guarantee of a settlement. They felt that any guarantee involving the Soviet Union would legitimize the establishment by the Soviet Union of air and naval bases in Syria, the United Arab Republic and Morocco.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 9, 1968]

EXCERPTS FROM OCTOBER 8 ADDRESS BY EBAN TO U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

There is no such thing as peace by incantation. Peace cannot be advanced by recitations accompanied by refusal to negotiate viable agreements. The Security Council's resolution has not been used as an instrument for peace. It has been invoked as an obstacle and alibi to prevent the attainment of peace.

In these conditions my Government has given intensive consideration to the steps that we should now take. Our conclusion is this. Past disappointment should not lead to present despair. The stakes are too high.

While the cease-fire agreements offer important security against large-scale hostilities, they do not represent a final state of peace. They must of course be maintained and respected until there is peace. They must be safeguarded against erosion by military assault and murderous incursion.

But we should not be content with this. The exploration of a lasting peace should be constant, unremitting, resilient and, above all, sincere.

NEW EFFORT AT COOPERATION

My Government deems the circumstances and atmosphere afforded by our presence here as congenial for a new attempt. We for our part intend to make a new effort in the coming weeks to cooperate with Ambassador Jarring in his task of promoting agreement on the establishment of peace.

I come to enumerate the nine principles by which peace can be achieved.

First, the establishment of peace.

The situation to follow the cease-fire must be one of just and lasting peace, duly negotiated and contractually expressed.

Peace is not a mere absence of fighting. It is a positive and clearly defined relationship with far-reaching political, practical and juridical consequences. We propose that the peace settlement be embodied in treaty form. It should lay down the precise conditions of our coexistence, including an agreed map of the secure and recognized boundary. The essence of peace is that it commits both parties to the proposition and the conscientiousness that their 20-year-old conflict is at a permanent end.

Peace is more than what is called "non-belligerency." The elimination of belligerency is one of several conditions which compose the establishment of a just and lasting peace. If there had previously been peace between the states of our area and temporary hostilities had erupted, it might have been sufficient to terminate belligerency and to return to the status quo ante bellum—to have previously existing peace.

But the Arab-Israel area has had no peace. There is nothing normal or legitimate or established to which to return. The peace structure must therefore be built from its foundations.

The second principle refers to secure and recognized boundaries.

Within the framework of peace the cease-fire lines will be replaced by permanent, secure and recognized boundaries.

Within the framework of peace the cease-fire lines will be replaced by permanent, secure and recognized boundaries between Israel and each of the neighboring Arab states, and the disposition of forces will be carried out in full accordance with the boundaries under the final peace.

It is possible to work out a boundary settlement compatible with the security of Israel and with the honor of the Arab states. After 20 years it is time that Middle Eastern states ceased to live in temporary "demarcation lines" without the precision and permanence which can only come from the definitive agreement of the states concerned.

The new peace structure in the Middle East, including the secure and recognized boundaries, must be built by Arab and Israeli hands.

The third principle is security agreements.

In addition to the establishment of agreed territorial boundaries, we should discuss other agreed security arrangements designed to avoid the kind of vulnerable situation which caused a breakdown of the peace in the summer of 1967. The instrument establishing peace should contain a pledge of mutual nonaggression.

The fourth principle is the principle on an open frontier.

When agreement is reached on the establishment of peace with permanent boundaries, the freedom of movement now existing in the area, especially in the Israel-Jordan sectors, should be maintained and developed.

The fifth principle concerns navigation. Interference with navigation in the international waterways in the area has been the symbol of the state of war and, more than once, an immediate cause of hostilities. The arrangements for guaranteeing freedom of navigation should be unreserved, precise, concrete and founded on absolute equality of rights and obligations between Israel and other littoral states and indeed all members of the maritime community.

Sixthly, refugees. The problem of displaced populations was caused by war and can be solved by peace. On this problem I propose:

A conference of Middle Eastern states should be convened, together with the Government's contributing to refugee relief and the specialized agencies of the United Nations, in order to chart a five-year plan for the solution of the refugee problem in the framework of a lasting peace and the integration of refugees into productive life. This conference can be called in advance of peace negotiations.

Under the peace settlement, joint refugee integration and rehabilitation commissions should be established.

The seventh principle refers to Jerusalem. Israel does not seek to exercise unilateral jurisdiction in the holy places of Christianity and Islam. We are willing in each case to work out a status to give effect to their universal character. We would like to discuss appropriate agreements with those traditionally concerned. Our policy is that the Christian and Moslem holy places should come under the responsibility of those who hold them in reverence.

RIGHT TO NATIONAL LIFE

The eighth principle refers to the acknowledgement and recognition of sovereignty, integrity and right to national life.

This principle, inherent in the Charter and expressed in the Security Council resolution of November, 1967, is of immense importance. It should be fulfilled through specific contractual engagements to be made by the Government of Israel and of each Arab state to each other—by name. It follows logically that Arab Governments would withdraw all the reservations which they have expressed on adhering to international conventions, about the nonapplicability of their signatures to their relations with Israel, or about the nonexistence of Israel itself.

Ninth, regional cooperation. The peace discussion should include an examination of a common approach to some of the resources and means of communication in the region in an effort to lay foundations of a Middle Eastern community of sovereign states.

The prospect of exploring peace terms should follow normal precedents. There is no case in history in which conflicts have been liquidated or a transition effected from a state of war to a state of peace on the basis of a stubborn refusal by one state to meet another for negotiation.

There would be nothing new in the experience of the Middle East or in the relationship of Israel and the Arab states for them to meet officially to effect a transition in their relationships. They have done so before. What is new and unprecedented is President Nasser's principle of "no negotiation."

EARLIER STAGE ACCEPTABLE

But in the meantime we continue to be ready to exchange ideas and clarifications on certain matters of substance through Ambassador Jarring with any Arab Government

willing to establish a just and lasting peace with Israel. There can be a preliminary stage.

Lest Arab Governments be tempted out of sheer routine to rush into impulsive rejection, let me suggest that tragedy is not what men suffer but what they miss. Time and again these Governments have rejected proposals today—and longed for them tomorrow. The fatal pattern is drawn across the whole period since 1947—and before.

It may seem ambitious to talk of a peaceful Middle Eastern design at this moment of tension and rancor. But there is such a thing in physics as fusion at high temperatures. In political experience, too, the very intensity of peril often brings about a thaw in frozen situations.

In the long run nations can prosper only by recognizing what their common interest demands. The hour is ripe for the creative adventure of peace.

Thank you, Mr. President.

SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BEVILL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days, a presidential candidate and a vice-presidential candidate have made statements about my State of Alabama that are filled with political overtones and are very misleading. I would like to set the record straight at this time.

These candidates, by singling out certain statistics, have stated that Alabama's crime rate is the highest of any State in the Nation. As far as the overall crime rate is concerned, this is completely false. We all know that anyone can take statistics out of context and apply them to any given situation in any State.

But the fact is that Alabama's total crime index per 100,000 is almost one-third lower than the national average. The total of all crimes committed in the United States in 1967, according to the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports of 1967, averaged 1,921.7 crimes for each 100,000 people. Alabama's total crime index per 100,000 was 1,313.9, much lower, as you can see, than the average.

Yet, certain candidates have singled out statistics in order to make Alabama's overall crime picture look bad, when in reality, our crime rate is much lower than average.

Yes, I am happy to say that in Alabama, men, women, and children can walk the streets of our cities at night without fear. There are no so-called peaceful demonstrations creating death, destruction, and looting. There are no draft card burners and there are no flag burners. I look forward to the day when many of the other cities over this great country will be equally safe and patriotic.

It is a matter of common knowledge over the Nation that former Gov. George Wallace is a serious candidate for the presidency of the United States. This being the case, I know that many statements are politically motivated, but I resent this obvious effort to label Alabama with these unfair, untrue statements.

George Wallace has taken a firm, positive stand against crime and violence. This, I am sure, has a great deal to do with these recent statements by these candidates. But when we deal in statistics, let us look at all the figures so we can get a true picture of the situation.

There have also been some statements made which indicate that Alabama is against the working man. Here again, let us examine the facts:

In 1965-66, Alabama led all the Southern States in attracting new and expanded industry. More than 100,000 jobs have been created in the past 5 years. The unemployment rate is considerably below the national average, and per capita income has increased 60 percent.

Recent press statements seek to show that George Wallace does not have the support of local labor unions and labor leaders. At this point, I would like to have included in my remarks some of the locals which have endorsed former Gov. George Wallace for President:

Alabama Pipe Trades Association, AFL-CIO, R. H. McConnell, Sec.-Treas., P.O. Box 275, Tuscaloosa, Alabama.

Building and Construction Trades Council of Jefferson County and Vicinity, 19 Affiliated Local Unions, 2520 Seventh Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35203, Wallace A. Withers, Secretary.

Jefferson County and Vicinity Carpenters, District Council, 9 Affiliated Local Unions, 1810 Seventh Avenue North, Birmingham, Alabama 35203, R. D. Rogers, Recording Secretary.

Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local No. 2354, Childersburg, Alabama, E. G. Cleckler, Recording Secretary.

Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, Local No. 151, P.O. Box 151, Anniston, Alabama 36201, Fred Vann, Business Representative.

United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada, Local No. 52, Montgomery, Alabama, W. C. Williamson, Business Agent.

International Association of Heat and Frost Insulation Asbestos Workers, Local No. 78, 221 North 95th Street, Birmingham, Alabama, James O. Goff.

United Glass and Ceramic Workers of North America, AFL-CIO, Local No. 150, Gadsden, Alabama, Wilburn Ward, President.

Brick Layers International Union, Local No. 1, Birmingham, Alabama, W. W. McDuffie, Secretary.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 505, 2244 Halls Mill Road, Mobile, Alabama 36606, Robert H. Dawson, Business Manager.

International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local No. 733, Pascagoula, Mississippi 39567, F. B. Porter, Business Manager.

Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local No. 441, Mobile, Alabama 36602, C. A. Rettig, Business Manager.

Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Local No. 48, 725 North 25th Street, Birmingham, Alabama 35203, Wallace A. Withers, Business Manager.

International Association of Bridge, Structural and Ornamental Iron Workers, Local No. 5, Washington, D.C., Billy Joe Walker, President.

United Steel Workers of America, Local 2122, Birmingham, Alabama.

Communication Workers of America, Local No. 3902, Birmingham, Alabama, Larry Weems, President.

Communication Workers of America, Local No. 3908, Montgomery, Alabama, G. J. Jackson, President.

H 9694

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

October 9, 1968

Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, Local, Battle Creek, Michigan, D. E. Evans, Chairman.

Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Local No. 539, Montgomery, Alabama, Robert C. Perdue.

Office and Professional Employees International Union, Local No. 18, P.O. Box 404, Birmingham, Alabama 35203, Mary Ella Reavis, President.

United Automobile Aerospace Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), Local No. 737, 631 North First Street, Room 108, Nashville, Tennessee 37207, Don Corn, President.

Barbers Local Union No. 83, P.O. Box 5452, Birmingham, Alabama 35207, W. B. Smith, Sec.-Treas.

Carpenters Local No. 432, Montgomery, Alabama.

Endorsement by R. R. Wade, Former President of Alabama Federation of Labor.

Endorsement by Sam S. Douglass, Veteran Labor Leader and Past President, Alabama Federation of Labor, Birmingham, Alabama. Alabama State Building and Construction Trades Council, W. T. Thrash, President.

Capitol City Building Trades Council, Howard Hendrix, President.

International Union of Operating Engineers, Local No. 312, Birmingham, Alabama, C. O. Cargile, President.

United Association, Local Union No. 323, Columbus, Georgia.

United Association, Local Union No. 119, Mobile, Alabama.

THE MATHIAS REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, as the 90th Congress draws to a close, I would like to advise my constituents of the positions I have taken and the policies I have proposed on the questions which we have faced here in the House of Representatives. I would, therefore, like to include in the RECORD today my regular congressional report.

In order to render this annual dry fodder more palatable than the usual diet offered by the RECORD I have reduced the report to bare facts and have cast the language in the third person. The report follows:

THE MATHIAS REPORT FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mathias believes that we must restore balance and momentum to American foreign policy and exert creative, responsible statesmanship to meet the challenges of a troubled world and recapture a position of constructive international leadership.

On Vietnam, he believes that the path to a durable peace is through a political settlement, effectively enforced, coupled with social and economic advances to bring security and stability to South Vietnam. Accordingly, on September 28 he urged the President to limit U.S. bombing of North Vietnam for 30 days to the area between the 18th parallel and the demilitarized zone, thus suspending bombing between the 18th and 19th parallels. The aim of this initiative would be to encourage Hanoi to take another step toward peace on the battlefield or at the conference table.

This proposal, intended to get the peace talks moving forward, was an extension of a plan for gradual, reciprocal de-escalation which Mathias and several of his House colleagues advanced publicly in July 1967. The strategy generally proposed a series of small steps toward peace by both sides. It was this approach, as partially adopted by the Presi-

dent on March 31, that brought Hanoi to the Paris talks in May.

Mathias feels that U.S. preoccupation with Vietnam during the past few years has seriously affected our standing and policies in other parts of the globe. He has specifically criticized Administration failures in the Middle East and in Europe.

He is convinced that the U.S. must respond to Soviet advances into the Middle East, to back up our Israeli allies and protect our own interests there. He has recommended that we blend restraint and readiness by seeking to limit the Mideast arms race, but also taking all steps, such as selling Phantom jets to Israel, to maintain that nation's defenses against Arab states rearmed by the USSR.

Mathias visited the Middle East in January, as a representative of the House Judiciary Committee, to inspect and report on refugee problems. On his return, he called for new American initiatives to deal with the 20-year-old refugee dilemma, to advance plans for regional economic development projects such as de-salting plants to provide fresh water, and to promote negotiation of issues growing out of the 1967 war.

Regarding Europe, Mathias believes that our Western European alliances must be revitalized by expanding political and economic cooperation, strengthening NATO defenses, and seeking agreements to have our allies bear a larger share of defense costs. He believes that the Czechoslovakian crisis shows that America cannot afford to remove large numbers of troops from Europe without corresponding reductions in Warsaw Pact military strength.

In regard to Eastern Europe and Communist countries, Mathias feels that we must pursue policies of caution but should maintain contact and communication to increase U.S. diplomatic leverage and influence. He opposes trade with Communist nations, in strategic goods and articles of war, but has supported giving the executive branch the flexibility to negotiate trade in non-strategic goods when that trade would advance American national interests by strengthening the dollar, or increasing the independence of Eastern European nations from Moscow and Peking.

Mathias believes that the foreign aid program must be reformed and revitalized. He advocates increased emphasis on aid through international and private channels, and on programs which will help poorer nations develop their human resources. He has sponsored legislation to create a special Congressional panel to review the entire foreign aid program. He supports the Alliance for Progress and sensible assistance to other countries but opposes aid to those nations, such as Egypt, who engage in aggression against U.S. allies.

Mathias has called for improvements in the United Nations to strengthen its role as a forum for international discussion and as an agency for keeping the peace and overseeing international agreements.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL POLICY

Mathias has consistently advocated economic policies of prudence and foresight, to promote steady, balanced economic growth without harmful inflation or excessive pressures on any one part of the economy.

He has criticized unrealistic Federal budgeting and has insisted on clear priorities for Federal spending, urging that emphasis be placed on programs for developing human resources—education, job training, housing and health.

Troubled by the decline of the dollar, he has called for the economic self-discipline required to restore confidence in the dollar and curb inflation.

He recognized this year that, after years of huge Federal deficits, inflation and gold out-

flow, it was essential to take stern action to restore the nation to a course of fiscal sense.

He therefore voted for a combination of a strict ceiling on Federal expenditures, and a temporary tax surcharge. Earlier he had opposed a motion to restrict spending cuts to \$4 billion voted for a \$6 billion cut. He has urged that those cuts be made in accord with clear priorities, and has called for focusing cuts in areas other than human renewal programs. He has opposed, for example, sinking billions into wasteful and ineffective agricultural subsidies.

He has opposed increases in the Federal debt limit since 1962, and has repeatedly criticized Administration failures to hold down spending.

He has supported the 7% investment credit for business and has opposed making this credit a tool for day-to-day fiscal juggling. He voted against the interest equalization tax, a tax on American investment abroad which he considers an excessive control on capital and a curb to developing American markets overseas.

He has advocated American initiatives to reform international monetary policy and opposed removing the gold cover from the dollar because the Administration offered no real remedies for the balance of payments problem and tried to place excessive burdens on the private sector through unwise steps such as a tourist tax.

LAW ENFORCEMENT AND JUSTICE

Mathias knows that curbing crime and maintaining public order will require a massive, sustained effort at all levels of government:

To improve dramatically all arms of law enforcement and all agencies administering justice, to provide full and equal protection of the laws for all Americans.

To meet decisively the special problems of alcoholism, and of narcotics and dangerous drugs, to bring help to alcoholics and addicts and hope to their families.

To curb juvenile delinquency, and keep today's children from becoming tomorrow's hardened criminals.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee for eight years, he has helped to write important anti-crime legislation, particularly

The Safe Streets Act, approved this year, which provides aid to states and cities to improve police training, communications, investigative methods, riot control and other aspects of law enforcement.

Legislation to limit mail-order and interstate sales of firearms and keep guns out of the hands of minors, felons and the insane.

Title III of the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act, which prohibits wiretapping and eavesdropping except by law enforcement officers when approved and closely supervised by courts, primarily in fighting organized crime.

Mathias has called repeatedly for a stronger, more effective Federal fight against organized crime, which preys on the urban poor and undermines all respect for law. He has issued studies showing that the Justice Department's efforts lagged badly between 1964 and 1967, and that the overall Federal drive against organized crime is fragmented and poorly organized. He has introduced a legislative package to strengthen the government's hand in this vital drive.

Recognizing that crime control is basically a state and local responsibility, Mathias has advocated many improvements in community law enforcement, such as those he has worked to secure for the District of Columbia. He has also proposed creation of a Maryland Department of Justice to pull together all state anti-crime efforts and give more assistance to counties and cities.

Mathias is convinced that an effective crime control effort must be inseparable from