

sequences for the world could be disastrous.

In this connection, it would seem that the United Nations, to which the United States contributes 32.52 percent of the total annual general budget, should be more effective than has been the case during the years of tension. I am fully aware that member nations always put their major national interests ahead of their responsibilities as members of the U.N. and that reality is one which renders agreed solutions to international problems extremely difficult, if not impossible. Nevertheless, it disturbs me that the prestige and efficacy of the world body is so lightly regarded that it has so far been unable to inject its presence to fill the gap between the Egyptian demand for full Israeli withdrawal from territory formerly held by Egypt and the Israeli position of partial cession.

A case in point is the Sinai Peninsula, which, until the 6-day war, had been Egyptian territory since 1906. No general agreement between Israel and Egypt is possible without disposition of the Sinai satisfactory to both sides. Israel has indicated a willingness to surrender the bulk of the Sinai, provided that its forces remain in Sharm el Sheikh to insure free passage of ships bound for Elath and provided these forces are connected to Israel by the coastal road Israel has built. However reasonable this may seem, it has the serious flaw that no Egyptian Government can accept a cession of territory that was Egyptian for more than half a century as a bargaining condition without incurring the fierce enmity of its own people. So we have an impasse, that lacking resolution, makes general agreement between the parties out of the question.

Nevertheless, if the saber rattling being heard on both sides of the Suez is to be stilled, a workable formula has to be found. Unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral diplomacy appears to have made no impression—the antipathies are as strong today as they were 17 years ago. It troubles me that the United Nations seems unable to make any practical contribution other than to have had that admittedly able diplomat, Dr. Gunnar Jarring, as its special representative on the scene for 4 years. I would not advo-

cate the United Nations should wield a big stick—even if it had one. I am fully aware of the organization's limitations when it is faced by recalcitrant member nations whose interests are diametrically opposed. But it seems to me, Mr. President, that the vast amounts of money contributed to the U.N. by the American taxpayer over the past quarter century give these taxpayers the right to ask whether they can reasonably expect a return on their investment in terms of an effective peacekeeping instrument.

This statement should not be interpreted as an attack on the United Nations or as a conclusion that it has outlived its usefulness. I am just as convinced as is any Member of this distinguished body that some kind of an international forum is a necessity in this heterogeneous world of sharply conflicting interests and ideologies. If, however, Israel and Egypt will not settle the Middle East crisis between themselves and multilateral diplomacy by other nations is ineffective, what else do we have? The claims of Israel and Egypt both have some historical and legal tenability; it seems to me most unfortunate that what we might reasonably expect to be the best diplomatic brains in the world at the United Nations are unable to reconcile these claims and come up with a peaceful solution acceptable to both sides.

It is sad to contemplate, but perhaps we should resign ourselves to the conclusion that a political solution of the problem is unrealistic and fall back on the frequently effective method of deterrence. Though words and actions on both sides have frequently been provocative, the most recent bellicosity came from Egyptian Premier Anwar Sadat when he told the Egyptian forces that a negotiated settlement was now impossible and they would have to fight to restore our land, honor, and dignity."

It is more probable than possible that the Premier's speech was strictly for home consumption, but in case it had some substance, this might be an opportune time to consider sending to Israel the Phantom jets she has long wanted from the United States. Unless emotion and indiscretion totally overcome prudence, it is unlikely that Premier Sadat's bellicosity would be translated into action if Israel's deterrent power were increasingly obvious.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, having received word from the able Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) that he would like to have the order vacated, I ask unanimous consent that the order be vacated and that I be recognized in his stead.

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

THE U.N. ROLE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, according to recent reports, the situation in the Middle East has come to a point where Egypt and Israel are practically poised for battle. It would appear that the diplomatic efforts of the United States and other interested countries have failed to produce a climate other than distrust and hostility between the rival states. The distinct impression is given that the differences are irreconcilable. If this is, indeed, true, the con-