

13:
74/1907



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXIV • No. 1907 • January 12, 1976

ENERGY, RAW MATERIALS, AND DEVELOPMENT:
THE SEARCH FOR COMMON GROUND

*Statement by Secretary Kissinger and Text of Final Communiqué
of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation 37*

SECRETARY KISSINGER ATTENDS NATO MINISTERIAL MEETING 51

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXIV, No. 1907

January 12, 1976

The Department of State BULLETIN is a weekly publication issued by the Office of Media Services, Bureau of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the government with information on developments in the field of U.S. foreign relations and on the work of the Department and the Foreign Service.

The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements, addresses, and news conferences of the President and the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become party and on treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department of State, United Nations documents, and legislative material in the field of international relations are also listed.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

PRICE:

52 issues plus semiannual indexes,
domestic \$42.50, foreign \$53.15
Single copy 85 cents

Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (January 29, 1971).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated. The BULLETIN is indexed in the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature.

Energy, Raw Materials, and Development: The Search for Common Ground

The Conference on International Economic Cooperation met at Paris December 16-19. Secretary Kissinger headed the U.S. Delegation December 16-17. Following is Secretary Kissinger's statement for the opening session of the conference on December 16, together with the text of the final communique of the conference.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY KISSINGER

Press release 612 dated December 16; as prepared for delivery

The challenge of our time is to build a stable and just international structure. This task has two principal dimensions. There is the imperative of peace—the more traditional problems of building security, resolving conflicts, easing tensions. These issues dominate the agenda of relations between East and West. No less urgent is the imperative of justice—the compelling requirements of global economic progress and social advance. These are now the major issues in the relationship between North and South. They, too, carry the potential for either conflict or order. Neither the goal of peace nor that of social justice can be achieved in isolation. We must succeed in both quests or we will succeed in neither.

Social justice and economic progress are our concerns at this conference. We meet here to launch the dialogue that has been so often urged and so long awaited. The convening of this meeting should itself be a reason for hope. For we believe it represents a commitment to the path of conciliation. It demonstrates a recognition that consumer and producer, industrial and agricultural, developed and developing, rich and poor, must together address the challenges of the global economy.

The United States will work with dedication and energy for a positive outcome. We will do so in our own self-interest and in the interest of a more just and prosperous community of nations. We will do our utmost to help mobilize the world's resources and the talents of men and women everywhere in the service of economic progress and common well-being.

In the past two years we have all learned that no nation or group of nations can solve its economic problems in isolation. In a world which is becoming increasingly interdependent, we have witnessed that inflation and recession affect us all. We have seen that no country can achieve redress by exporting its economic difficulties or by exacting an exorbitant economic price from others.

But our deepest challenge is political. Economic distress magnifies the problems of government in all our countries, clouding the prospects of social peace and democratic institutions. We have seen that national economic problems thus become international; they spawn clashes of interest and protectionist pressures that strain the fabric of collaboration even among traditional friends. We have all come to understand that, if unresolved, the competing claims of developed and developing, consumer and producer, will thwart any effort to build a stable and progressive international structure.

Our future depends now not on blind economic forces, but on choices that statesmen make. The world's nations can struggle in national or ideological contention—or they can acknowledge their interdependence and act out of a sense of community. The United States has chosen the path of cooperation.

The United States, as the world's strongest economy, has demonstrated its resilience;

we are on the road to recovery. We might best survive any new round of economic warfare. But it is my country's conviction that tests of strength benefit no nation. The approach that we took at the seventh special session of the U.N. General Assembly in September reflects our vision of a more positive future.

The special session reached consensus on an impressive range of economic problems. This commitment to cooperation can become a benchmark in human affairs—if its spirit is carried forward. We owe our people solutions, not slogans. So let us set to work. Let us implement the consensus of the special session and take up its unfinished tasks. Let us make this conference a decisive step toward their achievement.

The Road to This Conference

We are here because two years ago the international structure was gravely tested by a crisis in energy. No problem on the international agenda is more crucial to the world economy. As this conference demonstrates, it has led us to a much broader consideration of the range of related issues.

The unprecedented expansion of the global economy in the decades since World War II relied upon the plentiful supply of energy at reasonable prices. It produced economic growth, fostered industrialization, and encouraged development in every quarter of the globe.

Thus the energy crisis—caused by a combination of the 1973 embargo and the fivefold increase in the price of oil—has dealt a serious blow to global stability and prosperity.

Inflation, recession, and payments balances significantly worsened in all the industrialized world and in those developing nations which had realized substantial progress toward industrialization. The poorest of the developing countries, struggling to make modest steps toward progress, were dealt the cruelest blow of all. Their hopes for growth were, and continue to be, thwarted. Their development planning has been disrupted. Even their agricultural production has been undermined by the increased cost

of petrochemical fertilizers. For the vast majority of the developing world, economic justice was poorly served.

In response to the energy crisis, the United States sought first to reach a consensus among the industrialized nations. We worked together to assure basic security against future arbitrary disruptions in oil supply and against potential oil-induced financial difficulties. We pledged ourselves to long-term cooperation in energy conservation and the development of alternative energy supplies. We agreed not to resort to protectionist measures; and we began unprecedented cooperation in our economic policies, as dramatized by the recent economic summit in Rambouillet.

These actions were not taken in a spirit of confrontation. Most are prudent steps of self-protection which have effect only if confrontation is provoked by others. Other involve an urgent program for the development of alternative sources to the benefit of all.

But the collaboration of the industrial countries has always been conceived as only part of a larger program for economic progress. From the beginning, we have foreseen an effort to develop a constructive dialogue leading to close and mutually beneficial long-term economic ties with oil-producing nations—so that our investment and technical support would contribute to their development and their prosperity would contribute to the worldwide expansion of trade and development. We recognize that the only durable basis for constructive relations is an economic system which fosters the prosperity of all. Each of us has a stake in the progress of others.

Last April, at the invitation of the President of France, we agreed to begin this discussion. The industrial nations wanted to focus on energy. The oil-producing and other developing nations wanted to give equal priority to a wider range of development issues, including prices and markets for other raw materials, and to international financial questions. The industrial nations regarded these issues as too varied and complex to be addressed effectively in a single forum.

The April preparatory conference failed to reconcile these positions.

To demonstrate its desire for a constructive and cooperative solution the United States worked closely with other participants in developing a mutually satisfactory arrangement: energy, the concerns of the less developed countries about raw materials, development, and related financial matters would be addressed as part of a discussion of global economic problems, while maintaining enough distinction between them for a fruitful dialogue.

The United States is committed to a serious and wide-ranging program of cooperation with the developing world. My country understands full well, and has shown in its many proposals, that this dialogue must encompass issues of concern to all sides—including the needs of the many nations not in attendance here. For us, this clearly requires a discussion of the effects of energy prices on the world economy. For cooperation depends on mutual respect, mutual understanding, and mutual benefit.

To this end, at the seventh special session of the U.N. General Assembly three months ago, the United States made a series of proposals in several areas:

- To insure the economic security of developing countries against shortfalls in export earnings, food shortages, and natural disasters;

- To accelerate their economic growth by improving their access to capital markets, technology, and foreign investment;

- To better the conditions of trade and investment in key commodities on which many of their economies are dependent and to set an example in the vital area of food;

- To improve the world trading system to make it better serve development goals, and to realize through the multilateral trade negotiations a strengthening of developing-country participation; and

- To address the especially urgent needs of the poorest countries devastated by current economic conditions.

The seventh special session ended on a note of conciliation and cooperation. The

spirit of the session was carried forward to the October preparatory conference in Paris, where the declaration laid the basis for our meeting today.

This will be the attitude of the United States here. Progress has been made in many areas, and this conference must move us forward.

The Work of the Commissions

The four commissions that this conference is establishing have much work before them:

- The Commission on Energy should promote an effective world balance between energy demand and supply. It should work for practical cooperation among industrialized and developing countries to develop new energy supplies. And it should lay the foundations of a mutually beneficial long-term relationship between energy producers and consumers.

- The Commission on Raw Materials should work to establish the conditions for stable longrun supplies of raw materials vital to global progress at prices that are remunerative to producers and fair to consumers.

- The Commission on Development should strive to accelerate economic development in all nations, especially the poorest. In particular, it should bring together industrial nations and oil-wealthy nations to provide financial support for the development initiatives of the U.N. special session.

- The Commission on Finance should address financial issues as they relate to the work of the other three commissions. It should seek to strengthen the sense of shared financial responsibility for the health and growth of the international economy.

With a cooperative approach, the commissions can give direction and impetus to related activity in other forums and organizations, under whose jurisdiction a number of these issues fall. They can serve as clearing-houses for information and motivate other organizations doing similar work. They can identify areas where necessary work is not

being done and devise new initiatives where needed.

The United States will support progress on a broad range of topics in the context of the four commissions. But we have a special interest in the following areas:

—First, the price of oil and the security of oil supply as they affect the international economy;

—Second, the serious balance-of-payments problems of developing countries;

—Third, the conditions of international investment;

—Fourth, the issues of key commodities, especially food;

—Fifth, the problems of trade; and

—Sixth, the urgent needs of the poorest countries.

Let me discuss each of these in turn.

Energy

First, energy. The application of science and technology to tap the vast energy potential imprisoned beneath the earth, radiated by the sun, generated by the movement of wind and water across the earth's surface, or locked in the core of matter is fundamental to the hopes of millions to pull themselves above a bare struggle for existence. For the expansion of the global economy for both developed and developing countries depends heavily on our harnessing and efficiently employing the world's energy resources.

Some nations are particularly well endowed with these resources; some have the scientific and technological expertise to explore and utilize that potential. The international flow of energy, investment capital required to produce it, and goods produced from fuels have become in effect a global energy system which sustains all our economies. Only through international cooperation can all nations benefit from these processes and can the world economy harness its energy resources most effectively.

The United States is committed to a cooperative approach. We have much to offer. We have produced more energy than any other nation in the history of mankind, our

energy science and technology are the most advanced, and we have tremendous potential for future energy development in our country and abroad. The United States also has much to gain from cooperation. Our energy needs are the world's largest; our ability to raise living standards for all our citizens depends on greater energy production and the more efficient use of energy resources.

This dialogue and this conference have these tasks:

—First, it is time to reach a common evaluation of the relationship between changes in energy prices and the stability and performance of the world economy.

The abrupt and arbitrary increase in the price of oil has been a major factor in raising inflation and unemployment unprecedented since the 1930's. It has led to serious balance-of-payments deficits, indirectly through global recession and directly through high-priced imports.

By extraordinary effort, the industrial countries, on the whole, put their payments back in balance over the last year, although at a high cost to the well-being of their peoples. Thus the immediate burden of a massive petrodollar deficit is now borne largely by the developing countries which have little or no oil resources.

Developing countries, by definition, tend to have less of a margin to reduce consumption, to restructure energy use, or to shift to alternative sources when the oil price rises. They are the most vulnerable—and the most wounded.

A lower oil price would make possible more rapid economic recovery around the globe. It would assist the developing countries by easing their enormous balance-of-payments burden and their debt burden and increasing foreign demand for their exports. A lower price, along with stability of supply, would also benefit producer nations over the long term by easing the urgency for consuming countries to develop alternative supply sources.

Conversely, any further increase in prices would seriously hamper economic recovery, retard international trade, compound the

tional difficulties of many countries, weaken the ability of the advanced nations to assist the developing, and strain the fabric of international cooperation.

It is time for a serious discussion of this issue. We are prepared to make a sustained effort to achieve understanding.

—Second, we must collaborate to find new sources of energy and intensify our conservation efforts. All consuming countries, developed and developing, must use energy more efficiently and develop more abundant supplies. Producers need to prepare their economies for the day when they will have exhausted their easily accessible oil reserves. Individually, the industrialized countries are accelerating the development of their own energy sources. The United States is developing its conventional fuels and also new sources, including nuclear power, to replace fossil fuels. We have committed massive resources to research and devoted our best talents to this effort; we expect it to result in a substantial increase in U.S. energy production. In Europe, major efforts have been launched along the same lines, with the North Sea as the most dramatic example of the potential. The development of alternative energy sources is vital.

In the near future, the industrial countries will take the first steps toward welding these national programs into a coherent cooperative program. These programs are designed to promote conservation and to accelerate the development of alternative energy supplies through large-scale joint projects and cooperation in research and development. We will demonstrate our commitment to the maximum development of new energy by agreeing not to permit imported oil to be sold in our internal markets below a common minimum safeguard price.

This effort will bring a better balance to the world energy market. But as it gathers support, it will bring important benefits to developing as well as industrial countries. The programs that the industrial countries are undertaking, and those that many developing countries have within their potential to undertake, can lead to additional and more secure supplies of energy, which can

be a spur to their prosperity and development. All nations will have access to a larger pool of energy resources, and there will be less competition for oil. The efforts of developing countries to increase their own production of energy, if supported, can be the single most important step they take to secure their development for future generations.

At the seventh special session of the General Assembly, the United States proposed an International Energy Institute. Through such an organization, the developed countries and OPEC countries [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries] can assist poorer developing nations to utilize energy more efficiently, increase their own production, and improve allocation and distribution of existing resources. It could identify current or new energy technologies most relevant to their special needs. The institute can help oil-producing countries to improve the use of their own energy.

Using the most advanced techniques of analysis, the institute could help assess all countries' energy resources and requirements. Staffed by experts drawn from government, industry, and academic life in both industrialized and developing countries, it could provide training for local and regional technicians or specialists in energy problems. It could become a central point of contact where policymakers and experts could exchange ideas on plans and programs.

We see the institute as a first bridge between the massive effort the industrialized countries have now launched to develop alternative sources of energy and the effort which the developing countries must now undertake.

In addition, the United States has suggested a number of other means by which the talents and experience of the developed nations, collectively and individually, can assist developing states to find and exploit new energy sources and conserve their national patrimony. We will advance these proposals in the Energy Commission. We anticipate a full exchange of views on their scope and substance.

Oil producers and nations with the tech-

nology to help develop oil resources share an interest in cooperation on conservation and exploration. But this cooperation will be easier to forge in a stable energy market with a more appropriate structure of energy prices.

—Third, the United States seeks a greater participation and contribution of the oil-producing countries in the international economy. With the extraordinary transfer of wealth that has taken place, it is in the common interest that the oil-producing nations be constructive members, not challengers, of the world economic system, that investment and the latest technology be made available to them on a reimbursable basis for their development programs, and that the flow of goods and services be enhanced between producing and consuming countries.

We believe that these three issues—a better understanding of the effects of oil price increases on the world economy; cooperation on conservation and new production; and the orderly integration of OPEC economies into the global economy—are priority tasks for the energy forum.

Balance of Payments

The balance-of-payments problems of developing countries are an immediate and urgent task for this conference to address, closely related to the energy issue. Current projections indicate that the developing world in 1976 will be collectively in deficit by about \$35 billion. Bilateral and multilateral aid, along with direct investment, will finance roughly \$25 billion of this. The question is whether borrowing from international capital markets can again this year make up the remainder. If not, some countries will be forced to reduce imports, cut back development programs, and further mortgage their future. The deficits of the developing countries thus could endanger not only their own well-being but also the stability of the international trade and financial system.

A multitude of ideas and proposals are already before us. Let us address steps that can be taken now.

—First, the members of the IMF [International Monetary Fund] should promptly agree on the details of the Trust Fund which the United States has proposed to furnish concessional financing for the poorest countries. It would provide these countries an additional resources of \$1–\$2 billion a year using the profits from IMF gold sales as well as national contributions. We are well on the way to resolving outstanding issues on IMF gold; let us take final action on the Trust Fund in January.

—Second, the members of the IMF should complete negotiations next month on the new development security facility. The United States made this major proposal to provide more substantial financing to countries facing temporary shortfalls in export earnings due to the world business cycle or commodity fluctuations. We proposed this on September 1; its realization in January would be an impressive demonstration of international resolve and responsiveness.

—Third, the IMF should approve a third increase in member quotas, thus expanding its potential financing for all members.

Final approval can and must be taken on each of these proposals at the meeting of the IMF Interim Committee in Jamaica in early January. Together with substantial unused regular drawings still available to developing countries, these measures will add significantly to the capacity of developing countries to sustain their needed imports and their development programs.

But however substantial these facilities they may not be enough. Once the Trust Fund and these other proposals have been implemented in January, we must determine how best to respond to the remaining balance-of-payments problems of the developing countries. The United States is committed to finding a constructive solution.

Our specific response will depend in part on whether there is a general across-the-board financing problem or one concentrating on a few countries. One promising approach would be to expand the credit that developing countries can draw from the IMF by liberalizing the rules governing access

regular IMF resources. The IMF Board could, for example, increase the size of each credit drawing, base them on expanded new quotas, or add a new drawing beyond those now available. Decisions on such proposals will need to be based on close analysis of their effect on the financial integrity of the IMF. Secretary [of the Treasury William E.] Simon will present our analysis and proposals for increased use of the IMF at the Interim Committee meeting.

We cannot emphasize enough the need for immediate action in this area to supplement the long-term proposals which have already been made. The responsibility does not lie with the industrialized countries alone. We cannot be expected to bear the major burdens for remedying balance-of-payments problems in which the actions of others play such a significant role. There is a collective obligation to act; there must be a joint program involving the industrialized as well as the oil-producing countries.

Investment and Technology for Development

The balance-of-payments deficits of the developing countries will perhaps moderate as the global economy recovers from recession. But sustained economic growth requires the continuous application of capital, technology, and management skills to development needs.

Private investment has always been a major factor in the growth of the global economy. My own country has benefited from foreign investment throughout its history. Today more than ever, the developing countries need this capital in addition to the limited supply of official development assistance.

To make this possible, governments of developing countries need better access to world capital markets. The United States has urged that technical assistance and expertise be provided to developing countries that are ready to enter long-term private capital markets for the first time. We have proposed a major expansion of the resources of the World Bank's International Finance Corporation (IFC) to strengthen the private

sector in developing countries and to enhance their international competitiveness for private capital. We have recommended creation of an international investment trust to mobilize private portfolio capital for investment in local enterprises. And we are contributing to the work of the IMF-World Bank Development Committee to assist in removing impediments to developing countries' access to capital markets.

But we also believe that one of the most important vehicles for transferring capital, technology, and management skills to where they are most needed is private enterprise. There simply is not enough governmental capital available. Because of ideological considerations, these private enterprises operate in an investment climate increasingly clouded by unpredictable national legislation and uncertain rules of the game.

In this environment everybody suffers. Host countries are deprived of the capital resources, technology, and management which these enterprises uniquely provide, as well as a source of tax revenue. Home countries are deprived of the overseas markets, investment income, and the new ideas and techniques which come with foreign contact. And the enterprises themselves are squeezed at both ends, making overseas investment less worthwhile for them and reducing their contribution to home and host country alike and to the global product.

The United States has taken an active part in international efforts to facilitate international investment on a basis that serves the interests of all parties. We are willing to explore voluntary guidelines for the behavior of both transnational enterprises and governments. At the United Nations I stated four basic principles that should be included:

—Transnational enterprises must obey local law and refrain from unlawful intervention in the domestic affairs of host countries.

—Host governments must treat these enterprises equitably, without discrimination among them, and in accordance with international law.

—Both governments and businesses must

respect the contractual obligations they freely undertake.

—Principles for transnational enterprises should apply to domestic enterprises where relevant.

But efforts should not be limited to general guidelines for investment. Other remedial measures are possible.

Taxation is one such area. Because they operate in multiple jurisdictions, transnational enterprises may sometimes be subject to either double taxation or inappropriate tax incentives. The result in either case is that investment patterns are distorted. We must find ways to enable both host and home countries to coordinate their tax policies and make them more equitable to each other and to productive enterprises.

A second area for improvement is inter-governmental consultation on investment disputes. This is especially important to developing countries whose progress is dependent on a climate conducive to an adequate flow of investment. It is time to develop generally accepted international rules for the settlement of investment disputes and the arbitration of differences and other guidelines for dealing with problems arising between governments and enterprises. The United States recommends that the World Bank's International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes be given a greater role in solving important investment controversies.

International assistance for development must also focus on the advancement, selection, and application of modern technology. Many countries in the developing world are already on the path of industrialization. They have proved their capacity to take advantage of the vast storehouse of modern technology. The United States encourages this endeavor. We have long been in the forefront of the effort to train more managers, technicians, and researchers in the developing countries to carry this forward.

Most technology transfer takes place through international investment and the operations of transnational enterprises on a licensing, equity, or contract basis. The United States understands the concern of

many developing countries not to become the repository of obsolescent technology. Technology must be suited to local needs, the terms and conditions must be mutually acceptable, and it must be effectively managed and utilized. Developing countries must be enabled to make their own informed choices of foreign or domestic technology, to adapt it to their own needs and conditions, and to manage its application skillfully. This technology transfer requires the development of human capabilities—the management and skills that constitute the infrastructure of technological development.

People—their training and their placement in a country's management systems—are the key to making technology a producing resource. International cooperation can make no greater contribution to development than to foster the training of a corps of specialists in each country competent to select, bargain for, and manage technologies. We see this requirement as an important topic for consideration by the Commission on Development, and we will make concrete proposals to this end.

Commodities

A healthy global economy requires that both producers and consumers find protection against the cycle of raw materials surplus and shortage which chokes growth and disrupts planning. We must insure more reliable supplies of vital commodities on terms fair to all.

The problem is most urgent in food, mankind's most critical need. The cycles of feast and famine, widely fluctuating prices of basic foodstuffs, and breakdowns in the system of storage and transportation continue to afflict mankind. These show few signs of abating. And in the long run, growth in demand for food threatens to outrun the expansion of supply.

As the world's largest producer and exporter of food, the United States recognizes its special responsibility. At home, we have been committed to policies of maximum food production and have removed all production restraints; internationally, we have proposed a system of grain reserves to help moderate

fluctuations in world prices and supplies.

We believe that our grain reserves proposal can be a model for cooperation on other commodity problems. It takes into account the interests of producers and consumers. It makes special provision for the concerns of developing countries. Its reliance on buffer stocks minimizes the distortion of trade and improves the efficiency of the market. We now await the cooperation and commitment of others to help implement this proposal.

Most importantly, we are increasing our assistance to developing countries—not merely for short-term relief but to help them boost their own agricultural production. Our bilateral aid programs in this area have been expanded greatly. We also strongly support the proposal first made by oil-exporting countries for an International Fund for Agricultural Development. We have announced our willingness to make a contribution of \$200 million, or one-fifth of the worldwide goal of \$1 billion.

Other commodities are of critical importance to many countries, either as producers or consumers. Many developing countries depend crucially on earnings from commodity exports to lift their people above subsistence levels, to support basic social programs, and to finance the beginnings of industrialization. The solution to commodity issues will affect not only the developing countries but also the industrial countries—who are in fact the largest producers, consumers, and exporters of commodities. The economies of all countries are affected by the instabilities of the market—the vulnerability of agricultural commodities to the vagaries of weather and shifts in world demand, the sensitivity of agricultural and mineral markets to fluctuations in the business cycle in industrial countries, and the higher prices of critical energy imports.

At the seventh special session a consensus was achieved that commodity issues should be approached cooperatively. The U.S. position is that a realistic and constructive approach will require that we:

- Establish producer-consumer forums or discussions of key commodities;
- Reduce obstacles to producers' access to

markets and to consumers' access to supplies;

—Rely more on buffer stocks, where feasible and necessary, in preference to restrictions on trade and production;

—Improve the productivity and marketability of agricultural raw materials; and

—Expand worldwide production capacity in other key commodities.

We now stand ready to cooperate in establishing producer-consumer forums to discuss copper, bauxite, and other commodities. We plan to address the question of supply and market access in the multilateral trade negotiations in the next several months. We have proposed that the IFC and the IBRD [International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)] make available increased financing for mineral development and look forward to progress in the near future. We plan to support the U.N. Revolving Fund for Natural Resources Exploration. Finally, we have proposed establishment of an organization to finance and coordinate research on nonfood tropical products to improve their productivity and competitiveness.

We look forward to additional discussion of these measures in the Raw Materials Commission of this conference.

Trade

An expanding and more open international trading system is a principal factor in the growth and development of both developed and developing nations. We are committed to the strengthening of this system so it can better serve the needs of the international community and include importantly the developing nations.

Trade enables nations to earn their own way. It is most consistent with national dignity and with the efficiency of the economic system.

Over the last five years, in a major step of international cooperation, all the major industrial nations have committed themselves to establish a generalized system of tariff preferences, giving developing countries better access to the markets of all industrial nations.

The United States will implement its generalized system of preferences in two weeks' time. Under this system we will eliminate duties on 2,724 tariff items, representing some 19 percent of dutiable non-oil imports from eligible countries in 1974. This will open up significant potential new markets for the products of developing countries in the United States.

Tropical products are a promising area of export expansion for many developing countries. The international trading system should encourage this expansion. In the multilateral trade negotiations in Geneva, work is beginning on a package of tariff concessions on tropical products for early implementation. We attach much importance to this effort.

Tariff escalation—the process by which tariffs are progressively increased on goods as they move higher on the ladder of processing—is an obstacle to the exports and industrialization of many developing countries. At the U.N. special session, we proposed that reduction, or in some cases elimination, of tariff escalation be an important goal for the multilateral trade negotiations. The effort to identify and negotiate specific changes will begin next year.

This effort, however, is related in our view to the issue of access to supply of raw materials. Consumers cannot be expected to improve access to their markets for finished products if they face restrictions on supplies of related raw materials. Thus the Geneva negotiations must also improve access to supply as well as access to markets.

Reducing or eliminating nontariff barriers to trade is another major task facing the international trading community. We will make a particular effort to negotiate special and differential treatment for developing countries in this area.

An improved and strengthened world trading system would not be complete, however, if it did not insure greater sharing by developing countries of both benefits and responsibilities. Developing countries should gradually take on the normal obligations of

reciprocity and trade rules as they progress.

The multilateral trade negotiations are the most effective forum for pursuing all these objectives.

The United States put forward proposals in many of these areas at the recent meeting of the Trade Negotiations Committee in Geneva as goals for 1976. The developing countries will also benefit from progress in all other areas of the negotiations, which we now hope will be completed in 1977.

The United States is committed to a role of leadership in the multilateral trade negotiations. We will seek rapid progress for the benefit of both developing and developed countries. I believe that this conference and its relevant commissions should endorse the work of the multilateral trade negotiations. It should provide continued support for the negotiations by monitoring and contributing ideas to the work in Geneva.

Global Poverty

Our deliberations here must address the plight of the one-quarter of mankind whose lives are overwhelmed by poverty and hunger and numbed by insecurity and despair. This group has suffered immeasurably from high prices of food and fuel. Their export revenues have been seriously undermined by global recession.

In these regions less than one person in five is literate; one baby in ten dies in childhood, and in some areas closer to one out of two; life expectancy is less than 50 years; and birth rates continue to be intolerably high. Public expenditures for education and health care are low—and their per capita income has been declining for the last four years.

And so today, alongside the Third World with its increasing power and assertiveness, there has come into being a fourth world, where human beings still struggle for bare existence.

In one international conference after another, we have all pointed to the fourth world with sincere intentions of giving im-

mediate help, providing long-term assistance, and devising special arrangements. We have agreed that this is a major test of a just international structure. It is time for all of us here to act on our words. Three areas need immediate action:

—First, many of the poorest cannot finance balance-of-payments deficits because they cannot gain access to capital markets or because of high interest rates on what little finance they can obtain. The Trust Fund which the United States proposed in the IMF to provide up to \$2 billion for emergency relief is of special benefit to them. Let us reach a consensus to create this Trust Fund at next month's IMF meeting in Jamaica.

—The second area for immediate action is food aid. No obligation is more basic than our insuring that the poorest are fed. This fiscal year the United States expects to provide more than 6 million tons of food aid—more than 60 percent of the 10-million-ton global target set by the World Food Conference and a 20 percent increase over last year's contribution. Others must donate their fair share.

—Third, the poorest countries need preferential and expanded access to official concessional financial aid. The United States will do its part. More than 70 percent of our bilateral development assistance now goes to low-income countries. The concessional financing of the international financial institutions should also be expanded. At the seventh special session, my government pledged to support the fifth IDA [International Development Association] replenishment and the regional development banks. We are making every effort to secure congressional appropriations for funds already committed. We hope that the traditional and new donors will help the poorest through financial contributions to both bilateral and multilateral programs.

Let us urgently rededicate ourselves to action on behalf of the poorest among us. Such action is the responsibility of the entire

world community—not just the industrial countries but also the more affluent in the developing world. While no one commission will be dealing with the totality of problems of the fourth world, each commission has a responsibility to be conscious of the need for special consideration for the poorest.

Conclusion

Ladies and gentlemen: The nations and economies of the world are many; our differences are great. But our reasons for pulling together are far greater. Therefore our dialogue here must be candid, but with a positive spirit and cooperative attitude. The prosperity, the progress, and indeed the security of the world may depend upon whether we succeed in finding realistic answers to the kinds of problems before us at this conference. For lasting peace around the globe will depend not only on containing conflict but mounting progress. It requires not merely the preservation of stability but the fulfillment of human aspirations.

The issues we face are often technical, but their implications could not be more profound. They go to the heart of our future. Only rarely in history does mankind consciously swing out from familiar, well-marked paths to move in new directions. Only rarely does humanity comprehend as clearly as we do today that change is imminent and that the direction to be taken is subject to human decision. The nations of the world face such an opportunity now.

We have the possibility of forging international relationships that will govern world affairs for the next several decades. We can bring together developed and developing, producer and consumer, in common endeavors—or we can go our separate ways, with every one of us paying the price for a lack of vision in lower standards of living and increased international tensions. Mutual interest should bring us together; only blindness can keep us apart.

The American people have always believed in a world of conciliation rather than a world

ruled by intimidation, pressure, or force. My country, in spite of its own strengths and advantages, has chosen the path of cooperation. We will remain committed to that path. But we cannot travel it alone; others will have to join us. All of us here must base our policies on the reality that we have a practical and moral stake in each other's well-being.

I am confident of our cooperation and of our success. The result will be a fair and prosperous world economy of benefit to all nations, and with it new hope, opportunity, and justice for all peoples.

TEXT OF FINAL COMMUNIQUE ¹

1. The Conference on International Economic Cooperation met in Paris at ministerial level, from December 16 to December 19. Representatives of the following 27 members of the Conference took part: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Canada, EEC [European Economic Community], Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia. The ministerial representatives who attended the conference welcomed the presence of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

2. The work of the Conference was opened by H. E. the President of the French Republic, Mr. Valéry Giscard d'Estaing.

3. The Hon. Allan J. MacEachen, Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada, and Dr. Manuel Perez-Guerrero, Minister of State for International Economic Affairs of Venezuela, co-chairmen of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation, presided at the ministerial meeting.

4. The ministerial representatives at the Conference expressed their views with regard to the international economic situation. They made suggestions as to how the problems which they had identified might be resolved. Attention was drawn to the plight of the most seriously affected countries. They recognized that the Conference on International Economic Cooperation provides a unique opportunity to address these problems and to further international economic cooperation for the benefit of all countries and peoples.

5. The Conference decided to initiate an intensified

international dialogue. To this end, it established four Commissions (on energy, raw materials, development and financial affairs) which will meet periodically through the coming year. It was agreed that each of the four Commissions would consist of fifteen members, ten of them representing developing countries, five of them representing industrialized countries.

6. The Commissions shall start their work on February 11, 1976. Preparation for the work of the four commissions shall be reviewed at a meeting of the co-chairmen of the Conference and of the four Commissions after consultation with the other participants in the Conference. This meeting will take place on January 26, 1976 within the framework of the general guidelines contained in paragraphs 10-1 of the final declaration of the Second Preparatory Meeting which are approved by the Conference.²

7. The Conference agreed that the following participants should serve on the Commissions:

—Energy: Algeria, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, EEC, India, Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Saudi Arabia, Switzerland, United States, Venezuela, Zaïre.

—Raw materials: Argentina, Australia, Cameroon, EEC, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, Spain, United States, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaïre, Zambia.

—Development: Algeria, Argentina, Cameroon, Canada, EEC, India, Jamaica, Japan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Peru, Sweden, United States, Yugoslavia, Zaïre.

—Finance: Brazil, EEC, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Switzerland, United States, Zambia.

The co-chairmen of the Commissions will be:

—Energy: Saudi Arabia and United States.

—Raw materials: Japan and Peru.

—Development: Algeria and EEC.

—Finance: EEC and Iran.

Joint meetings of the co-chairmen of the Conference and of the Commissions may be held if the need arises.

8. It was agreed that members of the Conference who wish to follow the work of a Commission which they do not belong should be entitled to appoint a representative in the capacity of auditor without the right to speak.

9. The Conference decided that a number of intergovernmental functional organizations which are directly concerned with the problems to be considered would be able to make a useful contribution to the consideration. It therefore invited these organizations (United Nations Secretariat, OPEC, IEA, UNCTAD, OECD, FAO, GATT, UNDP, UNIDO, IMF, IBRD)

¹ Issued at Paris on Dec. 19 (unofficial text).

² For text of the final declaration of the second preparatory meeting issued at Paris on Oct. 16, 1975, see BULLETIN of Nov. 10, 1975, p. 668.

SELA)³ to be represented on a permanent basis in the relevant commissions. Their observers will have the right to speak but not the right to vote and hence will not participate in the formation of a consensus. Each commission may, in addition, invite appropriate intergovernmental functional organizations to participate as observers ad hoc in the examination of specific questions.

10. The Conference decided to establish an international secretariat with an exclusively administrative and technical function on the basis of proposals put forward by the two co-chairmen. It named Mr. Bernard Guillon [of France] as head of the secretariat and approved plans for its organization and operational procedures. The financial costs arising from the establishment of the secretariat and from future meetings of the Conference will be borne by members of the Conference on the basis of a formula agreed by the Conference.

11. It was agreed that the four Commissions should meet in Paris. Subsequent meetings of the commissions will be convened by their co-chairmen.

12. One or several meetings of the Conference at the level of government officials may be held at least six months after this ministerial meeting. The ministerial Conference agreed to meet again at ministerial level in about twelve months time.

13. The Conference adopted the rules of procedure recommended by the Preparatory Meeting which are based on the principle of consensus, according to which decisions and recommendations are adopted when the chair has established that no member delegation has made any objection. English, Arabic, Spanish and French are the official and working languages of the Conference. The rules of procedure apply to all the bodies of the Conference.

14. The Conference took note of the resolution of the General Assembly entitled "Conference on International Economic Cooperation" (Resolution 3515 (XXX)) and agreed to make reports available to the 31st session of the U.N. General Assembly.

15. The members of the Conference paid special tribute to President Giscard d'Estaing for the action he had taken to bring about the dialogue which is now engaged and expressed their warm appreciation to the Government of France for its hospitality and for the efforts and obligations it had undertaken in order to make the Ministerial Conference a success.

³Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries; International Energy Agency; United Nations Conference on Trade and Development; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; Food and Agriculture Organization; General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade; United Nations Development Program; United Nations Industrial Development Organization; International Monetary Fund; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Latin America Economic System.

The Common Challenge in the Search for an Enduring Peace

Following are remarks made by Secretary Kissinger at Fuerth, Federal Republic of Germany, on December 15 upon accepting Fuerth's Gold Medal for Distinguished Native Citizens.

Press release 607 dated December 15

Mr. Foreign Minister, Mr. Minister-President, Mr. Lord Mayor, distinguished guests, friends: This is not the first time in the last 35 years that I have paid a sentimental visit to Fuerth. I enjoyed a brief but warm stay in 1959. I have often exchanged letters with your distinguished Lord Mayor and his predecessor and have been encouraged and strengthened by their good wishes in many periods of my public life. When the honor I am now receiving was first offered to me, I accepted with pleasure.

I am proud to be here as the Secretary of State of perhaps the only country in the world where it is possible for an adopted son to have the opportunity for responsibility and service that I have enjoyed. I am happy to share this occasion with my family, my parents, who have never lost their attachment to this city in which they spent the greater part of their lives. I believe that my visit here exemplifies the extraordinary rebirth of friendship between the American people and the German people.

This is why the central role in this event of my colleague and friend Hans-Dietrich Genscher means so much to me. The partnership that he and I carry out every day in international affairs is given a deeper quality by the personal affection and comradeship that exists between us.

Our generation has witnessed—and has no excuse ever to forget—the dark force of brutality and raw power at large in the modern world. As I stand here today, suffering is still dominant in many parts of the globe. Of all the species on this planet, man alone has inflicted on himself the great part of his own anguish.

Yet our generation, more than any other, also has the possibility and indeed the imperative of something better. We live in a world of some 150 sovereign nations, in an era of both instant communication and ideological competition and in the shadow of nuclear cataclysm. No longer can we afford to submit to an assumed inevitability of history's tragedy. The interdependence of states links our societies, our economies, and our destinies; we will either progress together or we will decline together.

Much has happened from which we can take hope and courage. Free societies have come closer to the dream of well-being and justice than any earlier period has witnessed. Our two nations have moved from bitter conflict to peace and from peace to reconciliation and common endeavor. We have been leaders in the quest for peace—in Europe and in the world.

Our common challenge is to help build an international structure of relationships which keeps continents stable and nations secure, which ties nations to each other by bonds of mutual interest, which fosters the habits of restraint and moderation in international conduct, which gives free rein to man's striving for freedom and justice. Our goal is a peace which all—the small as well as the large—have a share of shaping; a peace that will endure because all—the strong as well as the weak—have a stake in making it last.

We know that such a peace will not come—nor can it be maintained—without effort and courage. We must be conciliatory without weakness and tolerant without moral confusion; we must temper strength with wisdom and seek justice while respecting the sense of justice of others. Posterity will not forgive either truculence or the failure to

act firmly in defense of interest and principles. Posterity will not forgive either illusions or the failure to grasp opportunities that come fleetingly and may never return.

In our search for a peaceful world we must never forget:

—That freedom must be vigilantly defended;

—That stability depends on restraint among as well as within nations;

—That no nation or group of nations can achieve satisfaction of its needs alone;

—That the best must not become the enemy of the good; and

—Above all, that every great achievement is an ideal before it becomes a reality.

Thus in its deepest sense this simple ceremony, which shows to what extent we have overcome an unhappy past, symbolizes as well the future for which we must strive—a world of nations which find pride in their reconciliations, not their power; an era in which convictions are the source of moral strength rather than of intolerance or hatred.

One of America's first and greatest leaders Benjamin Franklin, expressed a universal hope of human society:

. . . God grant that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of men, may pervade all nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface and say, "This is my country."

Human history has not yet reached this ideal. But we must persevere until what is now unfamiliar becomes natural, what is now a vision of peace becomes a reality and our legacy to our children.

In this spirit—and on behalf of my family as well—I accept your distinction and shall treasure it. I am honored and moved and grateful.

Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting

Secretary Kissinger headed the U.S. delegation to the regular ministerial meeting of the North Atlantic Council at Brussels December 11-12. Following are remarks to the press by Secretary Kissinger and Greek Foreign Minister Dimitrios Bitsios after a bilateral meeting on December 11; remarks to the press by Secretary Kissinger and Turkish Foreign Minister Ihsan Sabri Caglayangil after a bilateral meeting on December 12; an interview with Secretary Kissinger for German television conducted on December 12; a news conference held by Secretary Kissinger on December 12; and the text of a communique issued at the conclusion of the North Atlantic Council meeting on December 12.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY KISSINGER AND THE GREEK FOREIGN MINISTER

Press release 603 dated December 11

Q. [Unintelligible] on the Cyprus situation?

Secretary Kissinger: The Foreign Minister and I had a very friendly talk and reviewed the Cyprus situation and general relationships between Greece and the United States. With respect to the Cyprus situation, the United States feels that the time for negotiations is here and that there are really no further obstacles to negotiations. We strongly support resumption of the intercommunal talks between the two communities and a solution based on justice and equity and respecting the sense of dignity of both communities. And we will use all our efforts in that direction.

Q. Mr. Prime Minister, would you agree that there are no obstacles to negotiations with Turkey?

Foreign Minister Bitsios: I would say there are no more obstacles of the kind that the Turkish Government was putting forward before. You remember—elections and all of that. And I fully agree on the line which the Secretary of State took. We think that it is high time that the negotiations be resumed, for a solution. The situation cannot go on in Cyprus like that. I think the representatives of the communities must sit down for meaningful negotiations.

Q. Does that mean that you now expect meaningful negotiations to get underway?

Foreign Minister Bitsios: You must be two; that's inevitable. I explained to you our position.

Q. The Turks have been interested in enlarging the intercommunal talks. How do you regard that proposal?

Foreign Minister Bitsios: I have made a statement last Saturday.

Q. And could you repeat that statement for us today?

Foreign Minister Bitsios: I don't see any reason why we should change the existing forum.

Q. But that forms an obstacle then, because you have one position and the Turks have another.

Secretary Kissinger: I will talk to the Turkish Foreign Minister tomorrow. I believe that if the existing forum resumes, modalities can be found by which the other interested nations can be related to it. The issues seem to me sufficiently clearly defined now. A package deal is necessary, and it should not be delayed on the issue of the modalities of the negotiations, particularly

as it is my impression that one will be able to relate the various parties to it in the proper way.

REMARKS BY SECRETARY KISSINGER AND THE TURKISH FOREIGN MINISTER

Press release 604 dated December 12

Secretary Kissinger: The Foreign Minister and I had a very constructive talk in the atmosphere of friendship that characterizes the relationship between the United States and Turkey. We discussed bilateral relationships, and I am very hopeful that we will solve the question of the American bases in Turkey and the mutual defense relationship in the very near future.

With respect to the Cyprus problem, we—I am very hopeful that negotiations can be started in the near future. I believe that the differences between the parties are relatively—the procedural differences between the parties are relatively small and that a solution can be found this afternoon when the Foreign Minister of Turkey and the Foreign Minister of Greece meet to resume the communal talks in an appropriate setting. So I am very pleased with this talk.

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: [In French.] I share the opinion of my colleague. I think that we have had a very constructive negotiation, especially in bilateral relations. I hope—after having had a negotiation with my Greek colleague—that perhaps we can advance a little in our relations.

Q. Mr. Minister, do you speak English?

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: My English is very poor. I am very sorry.

Secretary Kissinger: That's a trick to give time to think while I talk. [Laughter.]

Q. Why are you confident, Mr. Secretary, about the bases question?

Secretary Kissinger: Because we reviewed the issues that divide us or that are still unsolved, and I believe that they are manageable. I am going to meet with our Ambassador to Turkey tomorrow in London, and we

will be giving him new instructions. And I have invited the Foreign Minister of Turkey to come to the United States at the end of January, and I am extremely hopeful that whatever differences remain will be solved on that occasion.

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: [Statement in Turkish.]

Secretary Kissinger: Valeriani [Richard Valeriani, NBC News], ask a question on that.

Q. In what language?

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: [Interpreter's translation from Turkish.] In relation to our bilateral relations with the United States, I join the views expressed by Secretary of State Kissinger, and I hope that in the near future we can solve these problems and find a compromise.

Q. [In French.] When do you have the meeting with the Greek Minister?

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: [In French.] Today at 3 o'clock.

Q. [In French.] Here?

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: No, at NATO.

Secretary Kissinger: Nice of you to have come.

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: Thank you.

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: [Says farewell in Turkish.]

Q. [Repeats Turkish farewell.]

Foreign Minister Caglayangil: Bravo. No need to translate.

Q. [Inaudible question on negotiations on Cyprus.]

Secretary Kissinger: I am quite confident that we can get the communal talks started again in order that some real impetus will now be given to them. It is more than just resumed.

Q. Will you be able to report back to the President, who can report to Congress that you have got real progress going now?

Secretary Kissinger: I think we have something.

INTERVIEW FOR GERMAN TELEVISION ¹

Press release 605 dated December 12

Q. The NATO states will make the offer in Vienna also to withdraw nuclear weapons from Western Europe. Isn't this a dangerous concession?

Secretary Kissinger: Let me explain it in English. I do not believe that it goes too far, because we will be offering a category of weapons of which, due to modernization, some have become dispensable, in return for withdrawal of substantial Soviet ground forces. But the United States remains firmly committed to a strong local defense in Europe, and the United States will under no circumstances participate in anything that will lead to the denuclearization either of Europe or of any part of Europe.

Q. You are just leaving the Deutschland-Lessen [Allied meeting on Berlin and Germany]. The responsibility of the Western states was underlined during that meeting. Does this hide the fear that the friendship agreement between the Soviet Union and Berlin would influence the representation of the four powers?

Secretary Kissinger: It is not directed at any particular event. It is a permanent feature of the four-power relationship that the freedom of Berlin is central to all of our policies and of course the precondition for any relaxation of tensions.

Q. One of the most important conditions to keep the alliance capable of defense is to unify weapons. What do you think of the declaration of the European states in this matter?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, we strongly favor it, and we are pleased that the Europeans will discuss the problem first among

¹ Secretary Kissinger answered in English questions posed in German. The German Foreign Minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher, was interviewed on the same program.

themselves and then will solve it in close coordination with the United States. And I think it is a significant step toward the strengthening of NATO.

Q. How serious is the offer of the United States to buy weapons in Europe?

Secretary Kissinger: It is a serious offer. It of course depends on the ability of the Europeans to rationalize their production and to produce them at comparable prices. Both should be possible.

Q. Weren't you disappointed over what came out of the Helsinki Conference?

Secretary Kissinger: Frankly, not particularly. I didn't expect too much, and I was not disappointed.

Q. What part will and has the European Community to play in world politics?

Secretary Kissinger: For the United States, the relationship between the United States and Western Europe is absolutely central. We support European integration, and we think that the relationship which is now developing between Europe and the United States is creating a community of objectives and parallel policies to which we attach great importance. We think that security and progress in the world requires a strong, unified, and economically developing Europe.

SECRETARY KISSINGER'S NEWS CONFERENCE AFTER NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL MEETING

Press release 606 dated December 12

Secretary Kissinger: Ladies and gentlemen, the U.S. delegation considers this meeting to have been very successful. It was conducted in the spirit of friendship and close consultation which characterizes the relationship in the North Atlantic community. The communique speaks for itself, and therefore I will go straight to your questions.

Q. There are reports in both the New York Times and Washington Post today of U.S. contributions of \$50 million to Angola in

recent months. Could you respond to those reports?

Secretary Kissinger: I have not had the privilege of reading either of these distinguished newspapers today, and I will not go into any details. I have stated—the other day—that the United States cannot be indifferent to massive Soviet supplies of arms and is in contact with other interested African countries.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on that point, could you amplify this aspect of it? Do you have any concern that there will develop in Angola, if there is not already, a war of proxy between the major powers? And in addition to that, how would you distinguish between the degree of major-power involvement in Angola and the Viet-Nam situation, the Viet-Nam history?

Secretary Kissinger: The United States wishes that the situation in Angola be handled as an African problem, and it would support a solution in which no outside power participates and in which the Organization of African Unity will cooperate with the parties inside Angola to find an African solution.

The United States did not become concerned until there had already taken place substantial Soviet involvement and the introduction of massive outside equipment and later the introduction of Cuban forces.

I think, as I have pointed out repeatedly, there should not be a war by proxy of the great powers. I do not think it is a situation analogous to Viet-Nam, because in Viet-Nam the conflict had a much longer and more complicated history; but the United States cannot be indifferent to what is going on in Angola.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you frequently say that the United States should not be indifferent. But in what manner would the United States respond? Can you tell us what sort of countermeasures the United States might take in this situation?

Secretary Kissinger: The United States favors a solution in which all of the parties

in Angola can negotiate with each other free of outside interference and in which the problem of Angola is handled as an African issue. The United States will support any solution in this direction. Failing that, the United States will try to prevent one party by means of massive introduction of outside equipment from achieving dominance.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on a previous occasion you mentioned the possibility that the Angolan involvement of the Soviet Union couldn't help but affect other aspects of the Soviet-American relationship. Do you see it at any point as endangering the entire policy of détente?

Secretary Kissinger: Incidentally, I ought to make one thing clear. The press report yesterday gave the impression that all of the afternoon session was devoted to Angola. The afternoon session yesterday was devoted to East-West relations, in which Angola played a relatively minor role. So, this is a NATO meeting. This is not a meeting of African problems, and I think this should be clearly understood.

It cannot but affect relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, as I stated publicly before, if the Soviet Union engages in a military operation or massively supports a military operation thousands of miles from Soviet territory in an area where there are no historic Russian interests and where it is therefore a new projection of Soviet power and Soviet interests.

But again let me emphasize to you, ladies and gentlemen, that this was a NATO meeting, in which Angola played a relatively insignificant role and was used only as an illustration of more general problems.

Q. Mr. Secretary General [sic], did you talk about Spain, or did you propose bringing Spain closer to NATO?

Secretary Kissinger: We did not have an opportunity to go into the problem of Spain and the future relationship of Spain in any formal sense. The United States favors a closer relationship of Spain both to the Atlantic organization as well as to Western Europe.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I wonder if you could expand a bit, amplify this extreme concern the United States has over Angola. Why is this situation so different? You referred to distance, but after all the Soviet Union has massively armed many countries in the world and I don't remember this type of strong talk from the United States. What is it about Angola—

Secretary Kissinger: Should I point out again to you, ladies and gentlemen, that this was a NATO meeting? You may have received certain briefings yesterday. The subject was not Angola. The subject was the Western alliance, and while I am glad to answer questions on Angola, I want to point out that it is being raised by you, ladies and gentlemen, much more acutely than it was raised by us.

Q. This has continued as a process now of several weeks where the United States has been extremely concerned publicly.

Secretary Kissinger: It makes a difference whether the Soviet Union is arming a country or whether it is arming a faction in a country. It makes a difference whether the Soviet Union is operating in an area of traditional relationships or whether it is attempting to establish a new pattern of dominance.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the last time you attended a NATO meeting, just before it you expressed your conviction that Portugal could not easily remain a member of the alliance because it was going Communist. What is your assessment now? What has been Soviet behavior with respect to Portugal, and what does that mean in terms of Angola?

Secretary Kissinger: I hope that the non-American members here noted the single-mindedness with which the American press pursues its obsessions. Now, first let me make clear I did not say the last time that Portugal could not easily remain a member of NATO because it was going Communist. I said it the other way around. I said if Portugal went Communist, it could not easily remain a member of NATO.

I believe that, on the whole, the situation in

Portugal has improved. The danger of Portugal going Communist seems less. The possibility of a pluralistic evolution seems better. So, therefore, this particular danger which I referred to last time is not as acute as it was then.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you didn't answer about the Soviet Union's role in Portugal.

Secretary Kissinger: I think that the Soviet Union's role in Portugal is not as acute as its role in Angola.

Q. Will the U.S. bases in Turkey reopen? And when? And to what extent do you consider them inoperative ever since they were closed?

Secretary Kissinger: Closed bases are generally inoperative. But I had a very good talk with the Foreign Minister of Turkey this morning. I expect that the negotiations about the bases will soon be given a new impetus, and I have invited the Foreign Minister to come to Washington by the end of January. I hope that we will be able to conclude the negotiations by then.

Q. Mr. Secretary, I assume that you mentioned the Middle East in your discussion. If this is correct, are you happy about the state of affairs in the Middle East now as a result of your step-by-step diplomacy? Isn't there any change of heart from the part of the United States regarding the Palestinians and the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] to accelerate the process of peace in the Middle East?

Secretary Kissinger: I don't think the Middle East was designed to inspire happiness, and therefore I cannot say I have reached that state of contentment with it.

With respect to the Palestinians, I have not repeated the American position for 48 hours and never in Brussels. So let me say that the United States cannot change its position until the Palestinians recognize the existence of Israel and until they accept the Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. At that point we will look at our position again.

Q. Do they have to recognize Israel before Israel recognizes them, or must this come simultaneously? For you cannot ask the Palestinians. It's fair enough that both of them recognize each other at the same time, isn't it?

Secretary Kissinger: It is in the context that the United States can look at its position, but not under present circumstances—in the context that I have given.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you think that the stands of Greece and Turkey are more conciliatory now for the solution of the problems between the two countries and that of Cyprus?

Secretary Kissinger: Having talked to the Foreign Ministers of both Greece and Turkey, I have the impression that the conditions for a resumption of the communal talks are good. Of course, they will meet each other this afternoon, and it would be a rash man who would predict what happens when an actual interaction occurs between Greek and Turkish representatives.

My impression is that the conditions for a resumption of communal talks are good and that both Foreign Ministers recognize the importance of making rapid progress toward a settlement. We believe that a package deal is necessary and that it should take into account the sense of dignity of both communities. We will use our influence in that direction.

Q. Mr. Secretary, have you got any new evidence from the Soviet Union which makes you confident that you will be ready to go in four or five weeks, as you had said you would, on SALT? Also, what assurance is there that the conflicts within the U.S. Government on SALT will be resolved within four or five weeks?

Secretary Kissinger: I wouldn't describe the discussions in the American Government as "conflict." The issues are technically complicated and require careful study. I am confident that we will come up with a solution that will have support of all the agencies.

As I have pointed out, going to Moscow is based on the presupposition that both sides will be prepared to modify their positions; and therefore it is based on the assumption, indeed on the knowledge, that the Soviet Union, as well as we, will be prepared to modify the last positions which each side took. I'm quite confident that the date that has been indicated, or the approximate date, will be maintained.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said that Angola was a minor issue in the discussion and the main topic was East-West relations. So, after this discussion, what is your assessment of the present status of East-West relations?

Secretary Kissinger: There are worrying elements such as Angola. There remains, nevertheless, the necessity to attempt to improve relations between East and West on the basis of reciprocity, and there is a recognition on the part of all allies that the process of improvement of relations requires an undiminished concern for Western security.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said yesterday that the United States supports the resumption of the intercommunal talks, but you also mentioned something about a way of relating other interested parties to it at a later state. What would you envisage by that?

Secretary Kissinger: The most interested parties, of course, are the Governments of Greece and Turkey, and this is a question that the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey will deal with this afternoon. It is my impression, having talked to both of them, that they are approaching a consensus on this, and I expect that this problem will be solved. But I'd leave it up to them to announce the details.

Q. Yesterday you expressed your concern about the Communist pressure on the southern countries of the alliance. What is your opinion on the Italian situation and also, in your opinion, what would be the consequences for the alliance of having participation of the Italian Communists in the government, which, as you know very well, is not terribly improbable for the future?

Secretary Kissinger: I did not yesterday express any opinion on the questions which you raised. Of course, we consider the Italian domestic situation a matter for Italians to decide—all the more so as our advice is likely to have the opposite effect from the one we wish to bring about. But if I were forming a government in Italy, which is unlikely, I would not move in the direction of a "historic compromise."

The press: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

TEXT OF NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL COMMUNIQUE ²

1. The North Atlantic Council met in Ministerial session in Brussels on 11 and 12 December, 1975.

2. Ministers noted that there had been encouraging features in the development of East-West relations during recent months. They reaffirmed their determination to persevere in their efforts to place relations with the USSR and other Warsaw Pact countries on a more stable basis.

At the same time they noted that the beneficial effects of détente can develop only in so far as all the countries concerned do their best to reduce the risk of confrontation in both the political and military fields.

In the political sphere, détente requires tolerance and mutual understanding, and accordingly demands that the natural contest of political and social ideas should not be conducted in a manner incompatible with the letter and spirit of the Final Act of Helsinki. Furthermore, Ministers considered that attempts to take advantage of tension in any part of the world could have a negative impact on détente.

In the military sphere, Ministers viewed with concern, as on previous occasions, the continued rapid growth of the power of the land, air and naval forces of the Warsaw Pact, which exceeds its apparent defensive needs. They emphasized that détente and security are closely linked. In these circumstances they stressed the need to preserve the defensive strength of the Alliance which is important as a deterrent not only against military aggression but also against political pressure.

Ministers reaffirmed that the solidarity of the Alliance and the security which it provides are essential conditions for the improvement of East-West relations, and they restated the determination of their Governments, expressed in the Ottawa Declaration, to maintain and improve the efficiency of their forces.

3. Ministers welcomed the adoption of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe [CSCE] which provides guidelines for an evolution of relations between the participating states and between their peoples towards greater understanding and cooperation. They noted the fact that the results of the Conference apply throughout Europe, including, subject to Quadripartite rights and responsibilities, Berlin. The Allies attach high priority to the full implementation of the Final Act by all signatories in improving relations between states, in applying confidence building measures, in encouraging closer economic cooperation, and in lowering barriers between people. Noting that only a short time had elapsed since Helsinki, Ministers hoped that substantial progress would be seen during the coming months.

In accordance with the provisions of the Final Act, the Allies concerned have already notified all CSCE participants of a number of military maneuvers and have invited observers. The Allies look for the implementation of such measures also by the members of the Warsaw Pact.

4. Ministers heard a report from the United States Secretary of State on the continuing U.S. efforts towards the further limitation of strategic offensive arms. The Ministers expressed satisfaction with the substantial progress made since the Vladivostok Summit towards a SALT II Agreement. They expressed the hope that further efforts would lead to the conclusion of a satisfactory agreement. The Ministers also expressed appreciation for continuing consultations within the Alliance with respect to strategic arms limitation.

5. Ministers of the participating countries reviewed the state of the negotiations in Vienna on Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions. They recalled that it is the aim of these negotiations to contribute to a more stable relationship and to strengthening of peace and security in Europe.

These Ministers stressed again that the existing disparities in ground force manpower and tanks are the most destabilizing factor in Central Europe and that any agreement must deal adequately with these disparities. They reconfirmed, therefore, the Allied proposal to establish in the area of reductions approximate parity in ground forces in the form of a common collective ceiling for ground force manpower on each side. A first phase reductions agreement concerning United States and Soviet ground forces as proposed by the participating Allies would be an important and practical step towards this goal.

With a view to achieving these objectives, they approved important additional proposals and authorized their presentation at the appropriate moment in Vienna.

These Ministers reiterated their resolve to pursue vigorously all the Allied objectives in order to assure undiminished security for all parties. They proceeded on the premise that the additional proposals will lead to the achievement of these objectives.

²Issued at Brussels on Dec. 12 (text from press release 608 dated Dec. 15).

These Ministers noted with satisfaction that Allied solidarity has continued to prove itself in these negotiations. They reaffirmed the principle that NATO forces should not be reduced except in the context of a Mutual and Balanced Force Reductions agreement with the East.

6. The Ministers took note of the Declaration made by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States on 14 October, 1975, that the rights and responsibilities of the Four Powers for Berlin and Germany as a whole remain unaffected by the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance concluded by the USSR and the GDR on the 7 October, 1975. They shared the view of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that its policy to work for a state of peace in Europe in which the German nation will regain its unity through free self-determination, is fully consistent with the Final Act of Helsinki.

Ministers underlined the essential connection between the situation relating to Berlin and détente, security and cooperation throughout Europe.

They emphasized in particular, that traffic and ties between Western sectors of Berlin and the Federal Republic of Germany and the representation abroad of the interests of those sectors by the Federal Republic of Germany continue to be important elements of the viability of the city.

7. Ministers reviewed developments in the Mediterranean area since their last meeting. They expressed concern at the possible dangers of new tensions that could affect the balance of forces in this region. They reaffirmed the importance they attach to the continuation of efforts designed to achieve an overall settlement resulting in a just and durable peace in the Middle East.

Ministers took note of the report on the situation in the Mediterranean prepared on their instructions. They requested the Council to keep this question under review and to report back to them again at the next meeting.

8. The issue of the present fisheries dispute between Iceland and the United Kingdom was raised and discussed.

9. Ministers discussed various aspects of problems related to armaments and standardization with the aim of improving the military capability of the Alliance and of making more effective use of available resources, especially in view of the increasing pressures in national budgets. They agreed that the examination of these questions would be pursued by the Council and the other competent bodies of the Alliance in accordance with established procedures. They agreed to form for a limited time an *ad hoc* committee under the Council to prepare a specific program of action covering the interoperability of military equipment.

10. Ministers took note of the progress achieved by the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS). They endorsed resolutions on coastal water pollution and oil spills, noting the determination of the member countries to continue to combat pollution of the seas and to enhance the quality of the marine environment. Ministers noted and endorsed the initiation of a pilot study open to interested nations on the relationship between food and health, and the continuation of other studies relating to the environment and to energy. They noted the important contribution of the CCMS to effective international cooperation in areas of major concern to our societies.

11. Ministers reaffirmed the attachment of their nations to the democratic principles on which their free institutions are founded. They expressed their confidence in the ability of their countries to surmount the problems of our time. They considered the cohesion and vitality of the Alliance to be a sure source of mutual support and solidarity.

12. The next Ministerial session of the North Atlantic Council will be held in Oslo on 20 and 21 May, 1976.

U.S.-Canada Joint Statement Issued at Paris

Following is the text of a joint statement by Secretary Kissinger and Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs Allan MacEachen issued at the conclusion of a bilateral meeting at Paris on December 17

Press release 619 dated December 17

The United States and Canada have a long history of friendship and cooperation. Both of our Governments have the intention to continue the process of consultation and negotiation which enables us to surmount the inevitable economic strains that arise from time to time between these two major economies. The recent meetings in Ottawa between the two Foreign Ministers and the excellent relations between President Ford and Prime Minister Trudeau give the highest confidence that our relations will continue to be managed in a way that will strengthen even further our friendship and cooperation

First Progress Report on Cyprus Submitted to the Congress

*Message From President Ford*¹

To the Congress of the United States:

I am submitting, pursuant to Public Law 94-104, the first of a series of reports on efforts this Administration is making to help resolve the Cyprus problem. Subsequent progress reports, as required by this legislation, will be forwarded to you at sixty-day intervals.

In his speech before the U.N. General Assembly on September 25 [22], 1975, the Secretary of State outlined the Administration's policy on the complex Cyprus problem as follows:

The details of a Cyprus settlement are for the two communities themselves to decide. However, in keeping with U.N. resolutions which the United States has fully supported, the following principles are essential:

A settlement must preserve the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Cyprus;

It must insure that both the Greek-Cypriot and the Turkish-Cypriot communities can live in freedom and have a large voice in their own affairs;

The present dividing lines cannot be permanent. There must be agreed territorial arrangements which reflect the economic requirements of the Greek-Cypriot community and take account of its self-respect;

There must be provisions for the withdrawal of foreign military forces other than those present under the authority of international agreements; and,

There must be security for all Cypriots; the needs and wishes of the refugees who have been the principal victims and whose tragic plight touches us all must be dealt with speedily and with compassion.

These elements, which we consider essential to a settlement, are consistent with the aspirations of the overwhelming majority

of the people of Cyprus. Beyond that, only the Cypriot people can decide how to rebuild and preserve their sovereign, independent nation so it may again serve the interests of all its citizens.

With this appreciation of both the opportunities and limitations of U.S. action, I declared immediately following enactment of P.L. 94-104 on October 6 that the United States would make a major effort to encourage a resumption of the Cyprus negotiations and to facilitate progress by all the parties involved—Greece, Turkey and Cyprus—toward a peaceful and equitable solution. I also stated that the United States would undertake whatever role the parties themselves wanted us to play in achieving a settlement.

Immediately thereafter, we took a number of steps through diplomatic channels aimed at helping the parties find a basis for resuming the intercommunal talks under the aegis of U.N. Secretary General Waldheim. As a first step, I wrote directly to the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey to stress the importance the United States attaches to the resumption of the intercommunal Cyprus talks and to emphasize our wish that the Cyprus problem be removed as a source of instability in the Eastern Mediterranean. My letters were followed by a series of communications from Secretary Kissinger to the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey and to President Makarios of Cyprus. In each of these communications, an effort was made to define the differences as we saw them between the negotiating positions of the other parties and to urge that an effort be made to narrow the gap.

The Secretary of State, during the past sixty days, also has consulted extensively with several of our major European allies who have engaged in corresponding and complementary initiatives with the Greek,

¹ Transmitted on Dec. 8 (text from White House press release).

Turkish and Cypriot governments. Parallel initiatives also were undertaken during this period by the European Community.

These initiatives have not produced a major breakthrough; but taken together they have advanced prospects for a negotiated settlement. A new appreciation now exists in Athens, Ankara, and Nicosia that delay in resuming the intercommunal talks will harden attitudes and make future progress more difficult. In each capital, there is a desire to begin anew an earnest search for a solution. Each party also has a realistic understanding of what it must do to make progress possible.

In Ankara, the Turkish Foreign Minister announced on October 21, shortly after the Turkish senatorial elections, that the time was opportune to search for a solution and that all aspects for a settlement could be discussed at the intercommunal talks. Turkey has also indicated that it would encourage the Turkish Cypriots to engage in meaningful negotiations within the intercommunal framework. There is also a recognition in Ankara that a discussion of their position on territory is essential once the intercommunal talks have been resumed and that troop reductions as well as steps to resolve the refugee issue are essential ingredients to any Cyprus settlement.

Similar meaningful changes have occurred in the Greek and Greek-Cypriot negotiating positions with respect to such subjects as the organization of the future central government and the division of responsibilities and delegation of authority to the future regional administrations.

In sum, we have seen, as have our principal Western allies, a narrowing of differences on most of the key issues necessary to negotiate a Cyprus solution. The range of disagreement between the parties now seems to us surmountable. Under such circumstances, it should have been possible in November to bring the parties back to the negotiating table. However, once a date had been scheduled in New York for the Cyprus debate at the U.N. General Assembly, the parties felt

compelled to await the outcome before sitting down with the U.N. Secretary General to resume actual negotiations.

Now that the United Nations has completed its consideration of the Cyprus question and passed a new resolution calling for intercommunal negotiations, efforts to schedule new talks are underway. We have consulted U.N. Secretary General Waldheim and the Governments of Greece, Turkey, and Cyprus. Our common interest is to have renewed negotiations of sufficient depth and duration to allow full discussion of all key substantive issues. There is every reason to believe this kind of negotiation will begin in the very near future. To facilitate this effort, I have asked the Secretary of State to give special emphasis to the subject of Cyprus negotiations when he meets with the Turkish and Greek Foreign Minister during the NATO Ministerial meeting in Brussels in the second week of December.

We now find ourselves at an important juncture in the search for a Cyprus settlement. The negotiating framework which has emerged finally should allow early and orderly discussion of the most serious substantive issues, including refugees which hold the key to a final settlement. We have succeeded in moving to this point in large part because, since early October, the United States has been free to resume an active evenhanded role among all the parties. The outcome of the resumed Cyprus negotiations may depend upon our ability to maintain this role in the months ahead.

An important beginning has been made in the past sixty days toward the elusive goal of a peaceful, equitable, and enduring Cyprus solution. In the days ahead, I believe our efforts will bring results if we continue to have the support and understanding of the Congress. I intend to review with you in subsequent reports the progress that has been made in the common quest to restore peace and stability to the island of Cyprus.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 8, 1975.

President Reaffirms Recommendations for Assistance to Greece

Following is the text of identical letters dated December 8 from President Ford to Speaker of the House Carl Albert, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations John L. McClellan, and Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations John Sparkman.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

Pursuant to Section 2(b)(2) of P.L. 94-104, I am pleased to submit to the Congress my recommendations for economic and military assistance to Greece for fiscal year 1976.

The bonds between the United States and Greece have historically been close and deep. Both countries were linked together as allies in World War II. They later cooperated in defeating the communist guerrilla movement in Greece in the late 1940's. Subsequently, Greece sent a military force to Korea to assist the United Nations' effort against the communist aggression. In 1952, Greece joined NATO. The bonds between our two nations are not only political, but ethical and cultural as well. The peoples of Greece and the United States cherish a common heritage and a common belief in freedom and human dignity.

My Administration has worked with the new Greek Government in this spirit of friendship and alliance to identify areas in which we might be of assistance and, thereby, advance our common interests. Following consultations with the Greek Government, we began consideration of a program aimed at assisting Greece economically. We supported increased financial assistance for Greece at the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. For fiscal year 1975, we also raised the level of military credit assistance to Greece from \$71 million to \$86 million. In addition, to increase the amount of Export-Import Bank lending to Greece, the Bank Chairman visited Athens last spring to discuss with Greek businessmen

and officials ways in which Greece could take better advantage of the Bank's programs. This visit was followed by a further Export-Import Bank mission in November.

The Greek Government itself has moved vigorously to confront its most serious problems. It has dramatically reduced the level of inflation. It has reversed the decline in its Gross National Product. In addition, it has moved to restore public confidence in the military establishment as a non-political force capable of defending Greece's security interests.

At the same time, the government in Athens has made clear to this Administration its need for increased levels of assistance for the current fiscal year. Based on that request and in keeping with the spirit of Congressional debate preceding passage of P.L. 94-104, I sent an expert team to Athens from the Department of State and the Agency for International Development in October to consult with senior Greek officials on that Nation's most urgent needs for economic and military assistance.

The team of experts concluded that Greece, faced with continued domestic economic difficulties and a need to modernize its military establishment, merited increased U.S. support for fiscal year 1976. Based on Greek requests and the findings of our own experts, I submitted to the Congress on October 30, 1975, a request for fiscal year 1976 for \$50 million in grant military aid, \$90 million in FMS credit and \$65 million as a supporting assistance loan. This latter loan is designed specifically to ease Greece's temporary balance of payment difficulties.

This package of assistance is justified on three grounds. First, it will help strengthen the foundation of representative democracy in Greece. Second, it will demonstrate our interest in modernizing and improving the Greek armed forces, and will be consistent with our stated desire that Greece return at an early date to a full participation within the NATO Alliance. Finally, it will assist the Greek Government and the Greek people in a moment of critical economic need.

Based on my review of Greece's need as well as our overall budgetary situation, I have concluded that my proposals of October 30 are appropriate for this fiscal year. I strongly urge the Congress to give them early and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

President Ford Reports to Congress on Turkish Opium Poppy Control

Following is the text of identical letters dated December 8 from President Ford to Speaker of the House Carl Albert, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations John L. McClellan, and Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations John Sparkman.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated December 15

Pursuant to Public Law 94-104, discussions have been held with the Government of Turkey on effective means of preventing diversion of the Turkish opium poppy crop into illicit channels. These discussions continue long-standing consultations between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of Turkey on suppression of the illegal international traffic in narcotics.

The Government of Turkey is aware of our concern and that of other nations of the world regarding the terrible plight of drug abuse. This concern has been made known to successive Governments of Turkey by this and previous Administrations, by many other governments, and by the United Nations.

I have been encouraged by reports from our Embassy in Ankara, from the Drug Enforcement Administration and from the United Nations, indicating the Government of Turkey's efforts to keep poppy cultivation under effective control thus far have been successful. I have received no evidence to date that there has been any illicit diversion of the current Turkish crop.

When Turkey permitted the resumption of poppy cultivation in 1974, the production of opium gum was forbidden and the poppy

straw harvesting process was adopted instead. At the same time, Turkey implemented stringent inspections and controls of the poppy crop. The poppy straw process makes control of the crop much easier. It has been used successfully in several countries to facilitate efforts to prevent illicit diversion from legal opium poppy growing areas. Turkey has reissued the same control decree to cover next year's crop. We expect the controls to be as effective as before, because of the introduction of more modern communications and surveillance equipment and more experience in administering the controls.

The United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control has provided Turkey with technical assistance in meeting the requirements of the poppy straw process. I believe the United States should continue to support the good work of the United Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control in its assistance to Turkey and other countries in combating the diversion of legally produced opiates from legitimate pharmaceutical uses.

I also share the views of the majority in the Congress that close bilateral cooperation with Turkey is essential to prevent illicit diversion of poppy crops. In July of this year at our meeting in Helsinki, I discussed with Prime Minister Demirel my continuing deep concern about the ravages of drug abuse and the need to suppress diversion of opiates into illicit channels. Prime Minister Demirel strongly concurred in my views and affirmed his personal commitment to the prevention of illicit diversion of opiates from his country.

On October 29, following enactment of Public Law 94-104, I sent a letter to the Prime Minister of Turkey urging that a ready existing discussions between our two governments on opium poppy controls be intensified in the period ahead. On November 28, Prime Minister Demirel sent me a very positive response confirming his earlier assurance that he fully supports continuing effective poppy controls and maintaining dialogue between the two governments on this vital subject.

Since the passage of Public Law 94-10

discussion and meetings on poppy controls have been held with Turkish Government officials at many levels. Ambassador Macomber has reviewed the issue with the Turkish Prime Minister. Additionally, the Deputy Chief of Mission and the Embassy Narcotics Control Coordinator have met with the Turkish Foreign Ministry's Director of Narcotics Control Affairs. The U.S. AID poppy specialist in Ankara has held consultations with Turkish Soils Product Office and Agriculture Ministry officials in Ankara, Izmir, and in the poppy growing areas. In addition, the Regional Director of the Drug Enforcement Administration in Ankara has been in continuing contact with high Turkish law enforcement officials. Our Ambassador and his staff will continue these meetings and discussions on poppy controls.

I believe the desire of the Congress that meaningful discussions be conducted with the Government of Turkey on insuring continued effective poppy controls have been met by the actions described above.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 1st Session

International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, together with supplemental views, to accompany H.R. 9005; S. Rept. 94-406; October 1, 1975; 80 pp. Report of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to accompany H.R. 9005; S. Rept. 94-434; October 28, 1975; 90 pp.

Military Construction Appropriation Bill, 1976. Report of the House Committee on Appropriations, together with separate views, to accompany H.R. 10029. H. Rept. 94-530. October 3, 1975. 67 pp.

Protecting the Ability of the United States To Trade Abroad. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Trade of the Senate Committee on Finance. October 6, 1975. 71 pp.

Peace Corps Authorization for Fiscal Year 1976 and the Transition Quarter. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany H.R. 6334. S. Rept. 94-412. October 7, 1975. 10 pp.

Magnuson Fisheries Management and Conservation Act. Report of the Senate Committee on Commerce to accompany S. 961. S. Rept. 94-416. October 7, 1975. 66 pp.

U.S. Gives Views on Cyprus in General Assembly Debate

Following are statements made in plenary session of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., on November 14 and by U.S. Representative Albert W. Sherer, Jr., on November 20, together with the text of a resolution adopted by the Assembly on November 20.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR BENNETT, NOVEMBER 14

USUN prcss release 147 dated November 14

The events of the year since the General Assembly last debated the question of Cyprus have much to tell us of the stubborn complexities of this issue as they have been measured against the capabilities of our organization. The parties to the Cyprus question are deeply and sincerely committed. They remain deeply and sincerely divided as well, despite the persistent and dedicated efforts of this organization. The past year has witnessed acts of understanding, hope, and statesmanship. It has also witnessed acts of prejudice, of fear, and of recalcitrance.

The United States remains committed to intercommunal negotiations under Resolution 3212 as by far the best method for reaching a settlement which will be permanently acceptable to both communities on Cyprus. It is important, as we see it, that both communities exercise the flexibility and statesmanship necessary to resume these negotiations at the earliest possible moment. We recognize the difficulties which all parties have encountered in the past in participating, and in making progress, in these talks. Some of these difficulties have now been overcome. As to the other difficulties, we emphasize that the parties have an obligation to set them aside and proceed with seri-

ous negotiations. This is an obligation of the parties both to each other and to the international community which has devoted the time, resources, and manpower of this organization to assisting them.

The United States admires and appreciates the patience, persistence, and skill which the Secretary General and his personal representatives on Cyprus have exercised in their work with all the parties in furtherance of the intercommunal talks. We also salute the gallantry, devotion, and imaginative use of resources shown by Commander Prem Chand and the men of UNFICYP [United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus] in their dedicated service to the reduction of tension and the support of humanitarian activities in this difficult year on Cyprus.

Mr. President, the United States hopes and will do its full share to insure that this debate and its outcome bring home to all the parties concerned their obligation—calmly, constructively, but unmistakably. The responsibility which these U.N. members have under the charter for the peaceful settlement of disputes has in this case been made more specific and more demanding by the continuing efforts of the United Nations and particularly of the Secretary General. The United States looks forward to supporting what we hope will be a unanimous resolution of this Assembly asserting its conviction that the intercommunal talks must reconvene at once and must move promptly toward the settlement for which all the suffering people of Cyprus and we here have waited long enough.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR SHERER, NOVEMBER 20

USUN press release 155 dated November 20

The United States greatly regrets that the Assembly was unable to write a resolution on Cyprus acceptable to all the parties concerned. We believe that such a resolution would have provided an appropriate basis for the negotiation of a Cyprus settlement. Since no resolution was acceptable to all of

the parties, we abstained on draft resolution A/L.775.

However, we note that the resolution adopted today refers to General Assembly Resolution 3212. Under that resolution, and under Security Council Resolutions 370 and 367, the Secretary General retains a clear mandate from both bodies to continue his mission of good offices to the parties and particularly to encourage them to proceed with the intercommunal talks.

We sincerely hope, and urge, that the representatives of the two communities will cooperate fully and effectively with the Secretary General in achieving progress toward a just settlement of the Cyprus issue. Such a settlement has been asked for by the United Nations, is ardently desired by the American people, and has been awaited all too long by the people of Cyprus.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION ¹

The General Assembly,

Having considered the question of Cyprus,

Having heard the statements in the debate and taking note of the report of the Special Political Committee,²

Noting with concern that four rounds of talks between the representatives of the two communities in pursuance of Security Council resolution 367 (1975) of 12 March 1975 have not yet led to a mutually acceptable settlement,

Deeply concerned at the continuation of the crisis in Cyprus,

Mindful of the need to solve the Cyprus crisis without further delay by peaceful means in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations,

1. *Reaffirms* the urgent need for continued efforts for the effective implementation in all its parts of General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX) of 1 November 1974 endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 365 (1974) of 13 December 1974 and, to that end;

2. *Calls once again upon* all States to respect the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus and to refrain from all acts and interventions directed against it;

¹ U.N. doc. A/RES/3395 (XXX) (A/L.775); adopted by the Assembly on Nov. 20 by a vote of 117 to 1 (Turkey), with 9 abstentions (U.S.).

² U.N. doc. A/10352. [Footnote in original.]

3. *Demands* the withdrawal without further delay of all foreign armed forces and foreign military presence and personnel from the Republic of Cyprus, and the cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs;

4. *Calls upon* the parties concerned to undertake urgent measures to facilitate the voluntary return of all refugees to their homes in safety and to settle all other aspects of the refugee problem;

5. *Calls* for the immediate resumption in a meaningful and constructive manner of the negotiations between the representatives of the two communities, under the auspices of the Secretary-General, to be conducted freely on an equal footing with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable agreement based on their fundamental and legitimate rights;

6. *Urges* all parties to refrain from unilateral actions in contravention of resolution 3212 (XXIX), including changes in the demographic structure of Cyprus;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue his role in the negotiations between the representatives of the two communities;

8. *Also requests* the Secretary-General to bring the present resolution to the attention of the Security Council and to report on its implementation as soon as appropriate and not later than 31 March 1976;

9. *Calls upon* all parties to continue to co-operate fully with the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus;

10. *Decides* to remain seized of this question.

U.S. Supports Continuation of U.N. Force in Cyprus

Following is a statement made in the U.N. Security Council by U.S. Representative Albert W. Sherer, Jr., on December 13, together with the text of a resolution adopted by the Council that day.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR SHERER

USUN press release 186 dated December 13

In the consultations which have preceded this meeting, the United States has stressed two views.

First, we agree with the Secretary-General that the renewal of UNFICYP [U.N. Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus] is essential. UNFICYP remains a vital factor in the preservation of stability on the island. With-

out stability the direct negotiations between the parties, which we consider indispensable, cannot be expected to progress.

Secondly, we recognize that the agreement of the concerned parties to the resolution by which UNFICYP is renewed is important both to those negotiations and to the continuance of UNFICYP's effectiveness.

We are accordingly particularly pleased that in the course of the long and skillful consultations conducted by the Security Council President and the Secretary General, the parties most directly concerned, whatever their difficulties, have accepted the resolution which we have just adopted. We urge that this spirit be continued and that the parties will not only provide effective cooperation with UNFICYP in Cyprus but also will contribute to the speedy resumption and progress of the intercommunal negotiations.

We have had occasion to remark here before that the question of Cyprus is one which has placed particularly great demands upon the time and resources of the United Nations. The arduous consultations which have preceded this meeting have now given the members of this Council a direct experience of the nature of the extended efforts which the Secretary General has repeatedly made to further understanding and negotiations among the parties.

Speaking from our own experience, I would like to say once again that the United States deeply appreciates the skillful and painstaking thought and action which the Secretary General has given to this issue. He has our full support for the further actions which he has informed the Council that he intends to take.

In this connection, I wish also to reaffirm the respect and admiration which my government feels for the dedication and gallantry of the commander and men of UNFICYP. As the Secretary General's report makes unmistakably clear, the operations of the Force in all parts of Cyprus have again done honor to the high tradition and standing of U.N. peacekeeping.

We leave this debate with a renewed sense that the unstinted response which so many

in the United Nations have made to the requirements of the Cyprus problem now places a compelling obligation on members—and most especially upon the immediate parties—to progress rapidly toward its solution. On this matter, our organization has done everything, and more, that could reasonably be asked of it. Those who have so benefited by its work can now fairly be asked to repay its efforts with their own.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION¹

The Security Council,

Noting from the report of the Secretary-General of 8 December 1975 (S/11900 and Add.1) that in existing circumstances the presence of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is still needed not only to maintain the cease-fire but also to facilitate the continued search for a peaceful settlement,

Noting from the report the conditions prevailing in the island,

Noting further that, in paragraph 68 of his report, the Secretary-General has expressed the view that in the present circumstances the best available means of making progress towards a settlement is through continued talks between the representatives of the two communities and that such talks can only be fruitful if the interlocutors are ready and authorized to engage in meaningful negotiations on all essential aspects of a settlement of the Cyprus problem,

Noting also the concurrence of the parties concerned in the recommendation by the Secretary-General that the Security Council extend the stationing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus for a further period of six months,

Noting that the Government of Cyprus has agreed that in view of the prevailing conditions in the island it is necessary to keep the Force in Cyprus beyond 15 December 1975,

Noting that General Assembly resolution 3395 (XXX) of 20 November 1975 reaffirmed the urgent need for continued efforts for the effective implementation in all its parts of General Assembly resolution 3212 (XXIX) of 1 November 1974 which was endorsed by the Security Council in its resolution 365 (1974) of 13 December 1974,

1. *Reaffirms* the provisions of resolution 186 (1964) of 4 March 1964, as well as subsequent resolutions and decisions on the establishment and maintenance of the United Nations Peace-keeping

Force in Cyprus and on other aspects of the situation in Cyprus;

2. *Reaffirms* its resolutions 365 (1974) of 13 December 1974 and 367 (1975) of 12 March 1975 and calls for their urgent and effective implementation;

3. *Urges* the parties concerned to act with the utmost restraint and to continue and accelerate determined co-operative efforts to achieve the objectives of the Security Council;

4. *Extends once more* the stationing in Cyprus of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force, established under Security Council resolution 186 (1964), for a further period ending 15 June 1976 in the expectation that by then sufficient progress towards a final solution will make possible a withdrawal or substantial reduction of the Force;

5. *Appeals again* to all parties concerned to extend their full co-operation to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in its continuing performance of its duties;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to continue the mission of good offices entrusted to him by paragraph 6 of resolution 367 (1975), to keep the Security Council informed of the progress made and to submit a report not later than 31 March 1976.

TREATY INFORMATION

United States and Poland Sign New Fisheries Agreement

Press release 613 (Corr.) dated December 16

The United States and Poland signed on December 16 in Washington a new fisheries agreement concerning Polish fishing off the Pacific coast of the United States.

The new agreement is the first bilateral transition agreement in implementation of the new U.S. fisheries initiative. The U.S. fisheries initiative was announced by Secretary Kissinger in a speech to the American Bar Association Convention in Montreal, Canada, last August. The Secretary described proposals in Congress to establish a 200-mile fishing zone by unilateral action as "extremely dangerous" and incompatible with efforts to solve fisheries problems in the Third U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea.

¹ U.N. doc. S/RES/383 (1975); adopted by the Council on Dec. 13 by a vote of 14-0, with the People's Republic of China not participating in the vote.

To conserve the fish and protect our fishing industry while the treaty is being negotiated (Secretary Kissinger said) the United States will negotiate interim arrangements with other nations to conserve the fish stocks, to insure effective enforcement, and protect the livelihood of our coastal fishermen. These agreements will be a transition to the eventual 200-mile zone.

The first step in the new initiative was successfully completed at the meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries in October. Among other things, member countries (other than the United States) that fish off the U.S. Atlantic coast agreed to reduce their catch in 1976 by 34 percent over 1975. In succeeding negotiations, the United States will continue to pursue the objectives and principles of the fisheries initiative.

The agreement with Poland includes, for the first time, principles that will govern future fishing off the Pacific coast of the United States by Polish fishermen. These principles are based on the consensus emerging from the U.N. Conference on the Law of the Sea concerning legal and jurisdictional changes in the regime of fisheries management within 200 miles of coastal countries.

The new principles are designed to adjust future Polish fishing to the new regime. Poland agrees that the United States will determine the total allowable catch for species off the Pacific coast on the basis of the best available scientific evidence. Within this total, which will be set to insure the effective conservation of the stocks, American fishermen will have a preference to that part of the total they are able to harvest. Any surplus within the total will be allocated among foreign fishermen.

In the elaboration of these principles, substantial new restrictions and controls affecting Polish fishing operations in the North Pacific, designed to protect resources off the U.S. coast and the special interests of U.S. fishermen, were agreed to by Poland.

Under terms of the former agreement, Poland harvested 42,500 metric tons of hake off the U.S. Pacific coast in 1975. Under the new agreement, Poland's hake quota has been reduced in 1976 by 39 percent, to 26,000

metric tons. Poland also agreed to reduce its fishing effort by a similar percentage in terms of numbers of days that its fishing and processing vessels will engage in the hake fishery. Under this arrangement, Poland will move its fleet seaward off the U.S. coast when it has reached its hake quota or the agreed number of vessel-days, whichever occurs first. This measure will serve to protect certain important coastal species, such as rockfish, which are taken incidentally by foreign countries while fishing for hake.

Even with the new restrictions and controls in the Polish fishery, the total harvest of Pacific hake is, however, in excess of maximum sustainable yield level since, in addition to Poland, several other foreign countries are engaged in the hake fishery. Therefore the United States will seek to reduce the catches made by other nations in future negotiations to protect the hake stock.

Poland also agreed to reduce the total number of vessels it plans to license for operation off the U.S. Pacific coast in 1976 from 15 to 12 and to reduce the number of fishing and processing vessels that will be permitted in various areas and times off the U.S. coast from 11 to 8.

A provision in the former agreement prohibiting fisheries by Poland on Pacific salmon, halibut, rockfish, blackcod, flounders and soles, Pacific mackerel, shrimp, and continental shelf resources was expanded to include Pacific herring as well in 1976.

New area and time restrictions have also been incorporated in the new agreement. For example, Poland agreed to refrain from fishing year-round from 38°30' N. latitude off the coast of northern California south to the U.S.-Mexico border to help protect rockfish and juvenile hake stocks. In the Gulf of Alaska, Poland agreed to refrain from fishing in certain areas and times, similar to provisions in the U.S. agreements with Japan and the Soviet Union, to protect halibut and other groundfish stocks and to reduce fishing gear conflicts.

In addition, Poland agreed to refrain from fishing for a nine-month period in a large area between 147° W. and 157° W. longitude

in the vicinity of Kodiak Island, Alaska.

Other restrictions and measures contained in the former agreement, including a voluntary inspection scheme, conciliation of gear loss and vessel damage claims, and the opportunity to place U.S. observers aboard Polish vessels to collect scientific data, are continued in the 1976 agreement.

The new agreement was signed on behalf of the United States by Miss Rozanne Ridgway, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Fisheries Affairs, Department of State, who headed the U.S. delegation. The Polish Charge d'Affaires a.i., Minister Jozef Wiejacz, signed for the Polish People's Republic. The agreement will be effective for one year, starting January 1, 1976.

cations and government documents between state
Adopted at Paris December 3, 1958. Entered in force May 30, 1961; for the United States June 1968. TIAS 6439.

Ratification deposited: Belgium, October 22, 197

Trade

Arrangement regarding international trade in textiles, with annexes. Done at Geneva December 2 1973. Entered into force January 1, 1974, except for article 2, paragraphs 2, 3, and 4, which entered into force April 1, 1974. TIAS 7840.

Acceptance deposited: Portugal for Macao, December 1, 1975.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 7988). Done at Washington March 25, 1975. Entered into force June 19, 1975, with respect to certain provisions and July 1, 1975, with respect to other provisions.

Ratification deposited: Ecuador, December 2 1975.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Aviation

Convention for the suppression of unlawful acts against the safety of civil aviation. Done at Montreal September 23, 1971. Entered into force January 26, 1973. TIAS 7570.

Ratification deposited: Turkey, December 23, 1975.

Energy

Agreement on an international energy program. Done at Paris November 18, 1974.¹

Notification of consent to be bound deposited: Switzerland, November 8, 1975.

Publications

Convention concerning the international exchange of publications. Adopted at Paris December 3, 1958. Entered into force November 23, 1961; for the United States June 9, 1968. TIAS 6438.

Ratification deposited: Belgium, October 22, 1975.

Convention concerning the exchange of official publi-

BILATERAL

Canada

Understanding concerning principles applying to certain rocket launches and similar experiments: Cape Perry, Northwest Territories (Operation "Periquito"). Effected by exchange of notes: Ottawa November 24 and 25, 1975. Entered into force November 25, 1975.

Iran

Memorandum of understanding relating to the provision of advisory technical assistance to Iran in organizing its civil emergency preparedness capability. Signed at Tehran November 22, 1975. Entered into force November 22, 1975.

Peru

Memorandum of understanding on an interim agreement relating to compensation for the Marcon Mining Company, with annex. Signed at Lima December 11, 1975. Entered into force December 11, 1975.

¹ Not in force.

American Principles. The Common Challenge in the Search for an Enduring Peace (Kissinger)	49
Angola. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting (Kissinger, Bitsios, Caglayangil, communique)	51
Canada. U.S.-Canada Joint Statement Issued at Paris (text)	58
Commodities. Energy, Raw Materials, and Development: The Search for Common Ground (Kissinger, text of final communique of Conference on International Economic Cooperation)	37
Congress	
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	63
First Progress Report on Cyprus Submitted to the Congress (message from President Ford)	59
President Ford Reports to Congress on Turkish Opium Poppy Control (text of letter)	62
President Reaffirms Recommendations for Assistance to Greece (text of letter)	61
Cyprus	
First Progress Report on Cyprus Submitted to the Congress (message from President Ford)	59
Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting (Kissinger, Bitsios, Caglayangil, communique)	51
S. Gives Views on Cyprus in General Assembly Debate (Bennett, Sherer, text of resolution)	63
S. Supports Continuation of U.N. Force in Cyprus (Sherer, text of resolution)	65
Developing Countries	
Energy, Raw Materials, and Development: The Search for Common Ground (Kissinger, text of final communique of Conference on International Economic Cooperation)	37
Economic Affairs. Energy, Raw Materials, and Development: The Search for Common Ground (Kissinger, text of final communique of Conference on International Economic Cooperation)	37
United States and Poland Sign New Fisheries Agreement	66
Energy. Energy, Raw Materials, and Development: The Search for Common Ground (Kissinger, text of final communique of Conference on International Economic Cooperation)	37
Foreign Aid. President Reaffirms Recommendations for Assistance to Greece (text of letter)	61
Germany. The Common Challenge in the Search for an Enduring Peace (Kissinger)	49
Greece	
President Reaffirms Recommendations for Assistance to Greece (text of letter)	61
Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting (Kissinger, Bitsios, Caglayangil, communique)	51
International Organizations and Conferences.	
Energy, Raw Materials, and Development: The Search for Common Ground (Kissinger, text of final communique of Conference on International Economic Cooperation)	37
Law of the Sea. United States and Poland Sign New Fisheries Agreement	66
Middle East. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting (Kissinger, Bitsios, Caglayangil, text of communique)	51
North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting (Kissinger, Bitsios, Caglayangil, text of communique)	51
Poland. United States and Poland Sign New Fisheries Agreement	66
Presidential Documents	
First Progress Report on Cyprus Submitted to the Congress	59
President Ford Reports to Congress on Turkish Opium Poppy Control (text of letter)	62
President Reaffirms Recommendations for Assistance to Greece (text of letter)	61
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	68
United States and Poland Sign New Fisheries Agreement	66
Turkey	
President Ford Reports to Congress on Turkish Opium Poppy Control (text of letter)	62
Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting (Kissinger, Bitsios, Caglayangil, communique)	51
U.S.S.R. Secretary Kissinger Attends NATO Ministerial Meeting (Kissinger, Bitsios, Caglayangil, text of communique)	51
United Nations	
U.S. Gives Views on Cyprus in General Assembly Debate (Bennett, Sherer, text of resolution)	63
U.S. Supports Continuation of U.N. Force in Cyprus (Sherer, text of resolution)	65

Name Index

37	Bennett, W. Tapley, Jr	63
	Bitsios, Dimitrios	51
	Caglayangil, Ihsan Sabri	51
	Ford, President	59, 61, 62
	Kissinger, Secretary	37, 49, 51
37	Sherer, Albert W., Jr.	63, 65

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: December 22-28

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of Press Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

No.	Date	Subject
*625	12/22	U.S. National Committee for the International Radio Consultative Committee, Feb. 5.
*626	12/22	Secretary's Advisory Committee on Private International Law Study Group on Negotiable Instruments, Jan. 23.
†627	12/23	Kissinger: news conference.
*628	12/24	Samuel W. Lewis sworn in as Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs (biographic data).

* Not printed.
† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.