



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE
BULLETIN

Volume LXXV • No. 1937 • August 9, 1976

CHANGES AND CHOICES AT THE UNITED NATIONS

Address by Assistant Secretary Lewis 189

U.S. DISCUSSES RELATIONS WITH DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
IN OPENING STATEMENT AT ECOSOC MEETING

Statement by Ambassador Scranton 201

DEPARTMENT DISCUSSES U.S. PRISONERS IN MEXICO

Statement by Deputy Assistant Secretary Luers 211

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXV, No. 1937

August 9, 1976

The Department of State BULLETIN, 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, issues 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 function of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a 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

The Secretary of State has determined that the publication of this periodical is necessary in the transaction of the public business required by law of this Department. Use of funds for printing this periodical has been approved by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget through January 31, 1981.

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.

Changes and Choices at the United Nations

Address by Samuel W. Lewis

*Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs*¹

No people understand better than the American people the need to respond creatively to the demands of rapid change. And no people have been more successful than the American people at finding practical solutions to the conflicts which change inevitably creates.

Our own history is characterized by dramatic transformation. We have grown from a small to an immense country. We developed from an agricultural society to an industrial giant. We changed from a country of homogeneous racial origins to a multiracial society of rich and diverse composition. And we have evolved from a country preoccupied with its own concerns to a nation burdened with the responsibilities of world leadership.

Beyond our borders, the world itself changes with extraordinary rapidity. We are all familiar with the revolutions of our century—in technology, in global communications, in the conflict of ideologies, in the creation of mass destruction weapons, and in the explosion of population growth. These have produced fears, hopes, ferment, and struggle—arousing new expectations in places where for centuries there was only mute suffering.

All of these changes, good and bad, inevitably create conflict. And conflict requires that we make choices. This is inescapable. If we try to avoid making choices, that is in itself a choice.

The pace of change throughout the world is nowhere more vividly exposed than at the United Nations. And because the breadth of the U.N.'s work is so central to many of our nation's purposes, I think it is vital that all of us assess realistically the choices—and their consequences—that confront us in the United Nations today.

This afternoon, then, I want to discuss with you what I believe to be the most important changes with which we must cope and the practical choices which follow from them. Our decisions can shape the world system for the rest of this century and well into the next. And our future security and prosperity are both at stake.

The Changes Confronting Us

Among the great changes of the last three decades, I would like to focus on three which I believe are especially important:

—First, the significance of a U.N. membership expanded roughly three times, from some 50 to nearly 150 sovereign nations.

—Second, the change in the role and influence of the United States.

—Third, the changes in the problems with which the world community must cope, especially at the United Nations.

When the United Nations was founded over 30 years ago, most of its original 51 members shared Western traditions of government and practiced traditional

¹ Made before the General Federation of Women's Clubs at Philadelphia, Pa., on June 17 (text from Department of State press release).

forms of diplomacy. Our main preoccupation in the early years was to contain threats from the Soviet Union and its allies. We did well in this task; most of the world, most members of the United Nations, were solidly with us.

In the 1960's dozens of new countries emerged from colonialism. We welcomed the newly independent states—indeed, we were foremost among the major powers in pressing for a rapid end to colonial empires. We did so because the right of peoples to rule themselves is one of our bed-rock beliefs, enshrined 200 years ago by Jefferson's pen here at Philadelphia. We cannot forget our own first premise. The principle of self-rule transcends the inconvenience and conflict which we and other governments have to endure as new states scramble over unfamiliar terrain on the road toward their rightful place in the family of nations.

But the consequences for the United Nations have been profound. Originally, the U.N.'s problems were those of its founding members—predominantly Western countries. Originally, we practiced diplomacy there in the traditional mode—even allowing for an occasional outburst, as when a Soviet leader once employed a shoe noisily on his table to capture the world's attention.

Today the United Nations is preoccupied with issues important to both new and older states—problems of economic links between the developing and industrial worlds or the process of completing the liquidation of colonialism and racial discrimination in southern Africa. Today, U.N. debates feature a rough-and-tumble style of diplomacy, practiced by many representatives of the newer states which have no quiet, genteel diplomatic tradition.

These changes have good and bad aspects. It is good that most of the world is now represented in the United Nations and that the world body has begun to tackle global problems of far-reaching importance to the world's peoples, problems such as food production, population

growth, threats to the global environment, or the ownership of resources found in the world's oceans. But it is bad when international institutions are misused, when impatience and passion lead to confrontation, abusive rhetoric, and illusory tests of strength.

While the United Nations has been changing, so also have the past 30 years seen fundamental alterations in the role and influence of the United States. When the United Nations was founded, many former power centers of the world had been devastated. U.S. influence and power were overwhelming. Everybody needed our help—desperately. And we gave generously of our immense wealth. This situation of almost total U.S. preponderance was, of course, reflected at the United Nations.

As we all know, the situation has changed dramatically. Europe and Japan, with our assistance, have made brilliant recoveries. The economic and military strength of the Soviet Union and its allies have increased greatly. The People's Republic of China is now a major actor on the world scene. And many of the 100 new countries have become significant participants in the world economy.

This does not mean that we have become in any sense a second-rate nation. We are still the world's strongest country, militarily and economically. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania alone has a greater production of goods and services than nine-tenths of the world's nations. And more important, America and American ideals are still a source of hope for much of the world. Our creativity and our ability to find innovative solutions to new challenges are greatly admired. But others are also important now and play vital roles along with us. This change is reflected in the United Nations. Indeed, it would be strange if it were not.

And at the very time when our own relative power to control events has lessened, we find ourselves confronted by new problems of enormous complexity—problems

which even raise questions about mankind's ability to survive into the 21st century.

Now we must work out how 4 billion human beings can better share the resources of our planet in a way that promotes global economic growth and produces more economic justice for millions who have been living at the margin of existence. Now we must devise means to preserve our environment for future generations while harnessing and adapting technology for economic development rather than destruction. And of course some of the age-old problems remain as vital, as demanding, as ever—the need to contain local conflict, to resolve disputes, and to avoid world war.

The Choices Open To Us

Changes of such vast magnitude inevitably demand choices. I would like to define them by asking three fundamental questions, all of which have particular relevance to our role in the United Nations:

—First, are we prepared to be realistic in confronting the world's problems and in recognizing our own strengths and limits?

—Second, are we prepared to commit our energies to cooperative endeavors within the framework of existing world institutions?

—Third, are we prepared to bring to bear our special blend of idealism and practicality?

These are big questions. They are well worth our honest examination; for our answers to them will essentially decide whether we play a leading, constructive role in solving world problems or whether others increasingly take actions without our participation which may or may not be in our interest.

First, can we deal realistically with our problems? This is the most fundamental choice we may ever make. For unless we look at things honestly, none of the other

choices we make are likely to do us any good. We all know this in our professional lives. One cannot manage any enterprise effectively and achieve satisfactory results unless decisions are based upon an honest appraisal of one's own capabilities—and an understanding of the interests of others.

But it has perhaps been harder for Americans to keep in mind the inescapable need for realism in the sphere of international relations. We have until recently been spared the defeats and frustrations that others in the world have had to suffer. Our country has never been laid waste by foreign war. Our people have experienced two centuries of economic growth. We have enjoyed personal freedoms about which many other societies have only dreamed.

Thus we often feel privileged—a little apart from the troubles of the rest of the world. But now our only realistic option is to accept the reality that our problems are interwoven with those of others. This is so for many reasons:

—Because local wars, as in the Middle East, can easily escalate to world wars.

—Because global conflict today can destroy the entire planet in a nuclear holocaust.

—Because our economic prosperity depends on cooperation with other countries, rich and poor.

—Because we need the raw materials and the markets of many others to continue to grow ourselves. To maintain our modern industry, for example, we need to import not only much of our energy requirements, but we are now also dependent on foreign sources for essential mineral needs, including more than half the nickel, zinc, and tungsten and more than three-fourths of the bauxite, manganese, cobalt, and tin we consume.

—And finally, our nation's destiny is linked with that of others because we could not long survive as a free and creative society if we were surrounded by a world of hostility and hatred.

These are the facts of interdependence. And our only realistic course is not to deny them, but to accept them. For otherwise we would be choosing isolation, stagnation—and the undermining of our confidence, our values, and even our freedoms.

To choose realistic options in international affairs also means that we must accept and understand the limits of our own capabilities. This is not easy for Americans. Our prestige and comparative wealth were so great after the Second World War that it seemed we could get our way on almost any issue by urging enough friendly and grateful countries to support our position. And we seemed to have virtually unlimited resources to throw at every problem. Now, however, we must learn to work in a more complex environment, knowing that we no longer have overwhelming weight.

We must also face the fact that for the foreseeable future the poor nations, impatient to improve their lot, will continue to resent the great inequalities existing under a world system which they did not create. And many will blame the rich countries who, in their eyes, were the creators of this system and are its main beneficiaries.

But let us not forget—the poor countries are trying to do something with which we Americans deeply sympathize: to improve the quality of life for their peoples. And they are struggling against nearly overwhelming odds. We should recognize that these nations vary enormously in their history, in their geography, in their cultural backgrounds. It is inevitable that many will not choose paths to nation-building that are the same as ours. Indeed, they cannot do so.

We, however, have nothing to fear from diversity. Just as it is sacred to us that diversity may flourish within our own country, so also must we accept and support diversity in the rest of the world.

Our tasks in the new world environment will not be easy. When we want others to do something in our interest, we will have

to show them that it is also in their interest. We will have to take the time and effort to explain our proposals patiently, because others will not automatically assume that we know what's best for them or that our and their interests coincide. And we will need to show genuine concern for the problems of other nations, since they cannot be forced to take a sympathetic view of our problems merely because we demand it. Reciprocity is indispensable.

But these concepts should be very familiar to Americans. We have been extremely successful in business enterprise—as successful as any people in history. It is the most fundamental element of realism that if you want to make a deal and have it stick, it has to be in the genuine interest of both parties.

Our second major choice is this: Are we willing to use our great energies and capabilities to work at solving vital world problems through the institutions which we took the lead in establishing? This is not simply a rhetorical question. We all know that the United Nations in recent years has been the scene of increasing confrontation. Many therefore have questioned whether it remains in our interest to stay in the United Nations or at least in some of its bodies, like the General Assembly, where confrontation has sometimes been acute. And many also ask whether we should reduce the level of our support by withholding financial contributions.

Let us examine our choices objectively. Is it a practical option to turn our back on the United Nations? Could we start over again to fashion a new organization which would serve our interests more effectively, which would avoid the contention and acrimony we find offensive?

The answer is "No."

When the United Nations was founded after the Second World War, we established a comprehensive, fair, and balanced structure. It was based on fundamental principles in which we believe. But since we no longer possess the overwhelming influence in the world state system that we

could deploy in 1945, we could not conceivably hope to create today a U.N. structure as sound or as balanced as the present one.

Moreover, other nations do not want to start all over again. Some might say that the newer nations are happy with the present system because a new majority of small countries now can control what goes on at the United Nations.

There is some truth to this, but not much. The majority of small countries does *not* control everything that goes on at the United Nations. In fact, they complain bitterly about the undue influence of the great powers—and in any charter revision would seek to reduce it. We retain a veto in the U.N.'s most sensitive and important body, the Security Council, which can take binding decisions on issues of peace and security. And actions in a great many other U.N. bodies are largely taken by consensus. In the 1975 General Assembly, for example, nearly two-thirds of all decisions were adopted in this manner.

This means that we *have* often been able to negotiate satisfactory outcomes with the new majority. The examples of traumatic confrontation are very much in the minority, even though their reverberations sometimes drown out reports on the good work done throughout the U.N. system.

But it is true that there can be, and there have been, serious abuses of procedure at the United Nations, particularly in some of the larger bodies like the General Assembly. And there have been some egregious distortions of truth and applications of a double standard of morality. But these offenses will not be solved or removed by running away from the scene of action.

If we should turn our back on the United Nations, the consequences would be:

—The organization would struggle on without us, and there would undoubtedly be more, not less, irresponsibility. World problems would be dealt with in a more ineffectual way than they are now, and less in accord with U.S. interests.

—In time the world organization would

probably collapse. It could not long survive the absence of the world's strongest and economically most advanced country.

Let there be no doubt about this fundamental point: If there ceased to be a United Nations, we would very shortly find it essential to create a new world organization. For all of us—rich and poor, large and small—would feel the need of a global institution to deal with inescapable global problems.

Although we cannot abandon the United Nations or realistically hope to negotiate a new, more satisfactory U.N. Charter, we can work strenuously to improve the effectiveness and fairness of the present system. This is the course that we are pursuing, and we believe it is a choice which warrants the support of the American people.

Let me list a few of the steps we are taking to enhance our prospects for successful diplomacy in the U.N. arena:

—First, we are engaged in a new intensive effort to work with other governments on U.N. problems throughout the year. Our purpose is to exchange views—to persuade, not to coerce.

—Second, we have begun to speak out more forcefully in U.N. forums to defend our interests and our country against unwarranted attacks.

—Third, we are making clear to others that we expect the same standards of responsibility and mutual respect in multilateral affairs which normally prevail in bilateral diplomatic relations. If a government chooses to work unremittingly against us, for example, on behalf of some abstract notion of bloc solidarity, it will know that this can have a cost in our bilateral relations.

—Fourth, we are participating energetically in a new effort at the United Nations to restructure the organization's economic work and to improve its procedures, including greater use of consensus.

—Fifth, and most important, we are taking the initiative in seeking cooperative,

practical solutions to the problems of economic interdependence which affect both rich and poor countries alike.

We believe that many nations, though not all, will eventually join us in seeking practical results rather than expending their energies in sterile polemics. Indeed, that was their response to Secretary Kissinger's comprehensive proposals at the historic seventh special session of the U.N. General Assembly last September. At that session, American initiatives provided the basis for a broad, concrete program, adopted by consensus, to promote world economic cooperation. We cannot hope to eliminate all political conflict from economic forums. But to the extent that we offer positive alternatives to the developing nations, their incentive to fall back on political confrontation can be lessened.

The last major element of choice I want to discuss today is this: Can we bring the unique American blend of idealism and practicality to bear in dealing with world problems? The United Nations was founded upon the highest ideals. After the calamitous suffering of the Second World War, people everywhere hoped that the new organization would forever spare mankind from the scourge of war. We wanted the United Nations to insure universal cooperation and justice.

After 30 years of world turmoil we know that our hopes were premature. But this does not mean that the choice before us now is whether or not to abandon these hopes in disgust. The great truths and aspirations embodied in the U.N. Charter remain valid world goals.

Our real choice is whether we can accept that in an imperfect and frustrating world we must persevere in seeking gradual gains. The accumulated burdens of centuries of misery and injustice throughout the world cannot be wiped out in a few decades.

We all know from experience that last-

ing progress to bring reality into accord with aspiration can be made only gradually. The struggle in our own country to achieve racial equality continues a century after we fought our Civil War over this principle.

Many parallels exist with our participation in world affairs. The Charter of the United Nations, like our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, expresses ideals in which we deeply believe: that the strong should not subjugate the weak, that there should be justice for all. We should sustain the same blend of idealism and patient realism in the world and in the United Nations that we have applied to advance justice within our own country.

This is not an abstract point. The challenge to blend idealism and realism is before us in many specific projects at the United Nations. If we are prepared to make realistic choices, if we are prepared to throw ourselves into the practical work of the United Nations, we can advance goals of the highest moral importance. Let me provide a few concrete illustrations:

—Working for peace, for the avoidance or halting of conflict, must be our paramount concern. The United Nations, and especially the Security Council, can help to prevent or stop conflicts that bear the seeds of world war. The Council did so in 1973 when it placed peacekeeping forces between Arab and Israeli armies. In our nuclear age, it is clear that the avoidance of world conflict—which in minutes could destroy the civilization of millennia—is a vital condition for building a world of justice.

—The United Nations can advance the search for equitable economic relations between rich and poor societies. Practical measures of international cooperation can be hammered out, and many United Nations agencies can help developing countries build more self-sufficient economies. Our country is contributing its vast ex-

perience and technological know-how. It should be a source of deep satisfaction to Americans that our efforts through the United Nations help make possible a life of more hope and decency for many whose faces we in this room shall never see.

—An urgent task requiring the practical skills mobilized by the U.N.'s Food and Agriculture Organization is to help other countries increase their production of food. Here the moral dimension is obvious. No world system can be tolerable if millions of persons periodically die of famine or cannot achieve their full human potential as a result of malnutrition.

—In the field of health, a U.N. agency also works at the boundary between practicality and morality. The World Health Organization applies modern science to combat one of the globe's most tenacious enemies: contagious disease. It is a moral imperative that Americans support the struggle to lift from mankind's shoulders the burdens of debilitating and crippling disease.

—The United Nations is sponsoring the most complex global negotiation ever attempted over the future use of more than two-thirds of our planet. The Law of the Sea Conference—now in its fourth year—is dealing directly with urgent issues of practicality and equity. The welfare and livelihood of millions will be affected by the details of arrangements worked out regarding fishing, mining, energy extraction, pollution, scientific research, and many other areas. But the solutions must be accepted as fair and just by all participants if they are to be enduring. The alternative is chaos and strife.

—The U.N. Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights set high standards for the world's governments in the field of human rights, goals with which Americans especially can identify. We are disappointed at the slowness of progress, the difficulty in achieving acceptance of solid measures to protect fundamental hu-

man rights. But the United Nations provides an opportunity to raise our voice in behalf of goals we know to be indestructible.

—And I would note one final area in which the United Nations has recently taken the lead. In the establishment of an International Women's Year, the United Nations has now begun to marshal forces to realize the full rights and potential of half the world's people. Moral considerations are paramount. But there is also a practical necessity. To achieve its great promise, our civilization must use to the fullest the capabilities of women—their creativity, their strength, and their compassion.

These are only a few illustrations of how moral goals and practical tasks intersect. Let us recognize that the United Nations provides a unique opportunity to pursue goals in a uniquely American way: idealism combined with practicality.

Advancing U.S. Ideals on a Global Scale

I have spoken bluntly today about choices confronting the United States. It seems to me that it is especially important in our country—one of the world's greatest democracies—that we discuss realistically what we are up against in the world and what our opportunities are. For it is the essence of our democratic process that our citizens participate in the making of choices.

But our right and our ability to make choices must also impose responsibilities. We have a duty to look at the facts squarely. We have a duty to assess the long-range as well as the immediate consequences of our choices. And we have a duty to be true to our traditions.

One of our strongest traditions has been dedication to the pursuit of great moral goals in a practical way. I feel privileged to have discussed this theme in this 200th anniversary year before a group of Ameri-

cans from all over the country meeting here in Philadelphia, the birthplace of our nation.

When our forebears here in this city signed the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, they gave life to exalted and ennobling concepts. They proclaimed our conviction that men and women can arrange their affairs in ways that protect the deepest aspiration of all people: the search for a life of dignity and justice.

That also is what the United Nations is all about. It was conceived to realize mankind's most enduring dreams—to supplant intimidation and subjugation with persuasion and accommodation—to dissipate fear, misery, injustice and to put in their place self-fulfillment and respect for human rights.

If we are to be realistic, and we must be, we will admit to ourselves that the United Nations is far from perfect. Indeed, it has a great many imperfections, as do all large political institutions.

But if we are realistic, we will also understand that the United Nations, with all its imperfections, represents our best framework—the *only* worldwide framework—for building a safer, more equitable, more humane world. We must strengthen and improve the United Nations. We cannot afford to weaken or abandon it.

I have faith, as an American celebrating our 200th anniversary along with other Americans, that our country will make the right choices, the responsible choices, about our participation in the only world organization. And when we do so, we will know that we are advancing on a global scale those same ideals which were proclaimed here in this city two centuries ago.

Let me close with the words of Thomas Jefferson, who declared: "I believe . . . that morality, compassion, generosity, are innate elements of the human constitution . . . that justice is the fundamental law of society . . ." "I hope and firmly believe that the whole world will, sooner or later, feel benefit from the issue of our assertion of the rights of man."

Queen Elizabeth II Makes State Visit to the United States

Queen Elizabeth II of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a state visit to the United States July 6-11. Following is an exchange of remarks between President Ford and Queen Elizabeth at a welcoming ceremony on the South Lawn of the White House on July 7.¹

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated July 12

PRESIDENT FORD

Your Majesty, Your Royal Highness, ladies and gentlemen: On behalf of the American people, I am delighted to welcome you and your party to the United States and to the White House.

Your first state visit to America in 1957 marked the 350th anniversary of the settlement of Jamestown, the first permanent British colony in this new land. You honor us again by coming to share our Bicentennial observance in the new spirit of optimism and cooperation generated by this great occasion.

During the 169 years between the first settlement of Jamestown and our independence, 13 colonies prospered, protected by the British Navy, enjoying the advantage of British commerce and adopting British concepts of representative self-government. In declaring independence in 1776, we looked for guidance to our British heritage of representative government—representative government as well as law. As a sovereign nation, we have kept and nurtured the most durable bond of all—the bond of idealism in which our new nation was conceived.

Your Majesty's visit symbolizes our deep and continuing commitment to the common values of an Anglo-American civilization. Your Majesty, for generations our peoples

¹ For an exchange of toasts between President Ford and Queen Elizabeth II at a White House dinner that evening, see Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated July 12, 1976, p. 1142.

have worked together, and fought together, side by side. As democracies, we continue our quest for peace and justice.

The challenges we now face are different from those that we have confronted together and overcome in the past. At stake is the future of the industrialized democracies which have sustained their destiny in common for more than a generation.

At stake is the further extension of the blessings of liberty to all humanity in the creation of a better world. As new nations and old, each set their political course to achieve these aims. The principles of human dignity and individual rights set forth in the Magna Carta and our own Declaration of Independence remain truly revolutionary landmarks.

Your Majesty, the wounds of our parting in 1776 healed long ago. Americans admire the United Kingdom as one of our truest allies and best friends. There could be no more convincing evidence of that friendship than the splendid British contributions and participation on the occasion of our Bicentennial.

Last month, I had the privilege and honor to welcome to the White House Rose Garden the distinguished delegation of the British Parliament who escorted an historic copy of the Magna Carta to America. The loan of this document for our Bicentennial is a gesture that will bring pleasure and inspiration to all who view it.

Yesterday, in Philadelphia, Your Majesty inaugurated the new Bicentennial bell, a gift from the people of Britain to the people of the United States, inscribed "Let Freedom Ring." It will hang in the Bell Tower in Independence National Historical Park. When I was in Philadelphia on the Fourth of July, I thought what a perfect complement the new bell will be to our own Liberty Bell and the Centennial bell in Independence Hall.

For these gifts and for many others which Britain has honored our historic celebration, the American people are deeply grateful. Above all, we appreciate the personal honor you have so graciously

demonstrated by visiting our shores at this special moment in our history.

During your visit, you will travel to hallowed American landmarks. You will observe many changes since you were last here. But as you travel throughout our land, I trust that you will find something else in the United States, a new sense of unity, of friendship, of purpose, and tranquillity.

Something wonderful happened to America this past weekend. A spirit of unity and togetherness deep within the American soul sprang to the surface in a way that we had almost forgotten. People showed again that they care, that they want to live in peace and harmony with their neighbors, that they want to pull together for the good of the nation and for the good of mankind.

This weekend we had a marvelous reaffirmation of the American spirit. In the days ahead, we would like very much to share that spirit with you.

During your visit in 1957, President Eisenhower remarked that America's respect for Britain was symbolized in our affection for the royal family. It is in this spirit we welcome Your Majesty's visit as a happy occasion for reaffirming our joint dedication to freedom, to peace, democracy, and the well-being of our people.

Your Majesty, America bids you, Prince Philip, and your party a most cordial and heartfelt welcome.

QUEEN ELIZABETH

Mr. President: Thank you for your welcome to us. We are very pleased to be with you and the American people in this most important week of your Bicentennial year.

Our countries have a great deal in common. The early British settlers created here a society that owes much to its origins across the ocean. For nearly 170 years there was a formal constitutional link between us. Your Declaration of Independence broke that link, but it did not for long break our friendship.

John Adams, America's first Ambassador, said to my ancestor King George III that it was his desire to help with the restoration of "the old good nature and the old good humor between our peoples."

That restoration has long been made, and the links of language, tradition, and personal contact have maintained it.

Yesterday, Prince Philip and I were deeply moved by the welcome we were given in Philadelphia. And now we are looking forward to our time in Washington and to our visits to New York and Boston and to the home of Thomas Jefferson at Monticello. We shall have visited the four cities that were at the center of events 200 years ago. We also hope to see something of America of 1976 and of the young people who will be taking this country forward into its third century.

Mr. President, the British and American people are as close today as two peoples have ever been. We see you as our strong and trusted friend, and we believe that you, in turn, will find us as ready as ever to bear our full share in defending the values in which we both believe.

That is why we are so happy to be here.

President Signs Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act

*Statement by President Ford*¹

I have signed into law H.R. 13680, the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976. This measure authorizes appropriations to carry out security assistance and other programs in the fiscal years 1976 and 1977, and makes extensive changes in the methods, organization, and procedures through which those programs are carried out.

On May 7, 1976, I returned to the Congress without my approval S. 2662, the

predecessor of the bill which I am signing today. I did so because that bill contained numerous provisions which would have seriously undermined the constitutional responsibility of the President for the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States. That bill embodied a variety of restrictions that would have seriously inhibited my ability to implement a coherent and consistent foreign policy, and some which raised fundamental constitutional difficulties as well.

The present bill, H.R. 13680, imposes new requirements, restrictions, and limitations on the implementation of security assistance programs. Many of these new requirements are based on congressional desires to increase the flow of information regarding the scope and direction of security assistance programs worldwide. Others impose new substantive restrictions reflecting new policies, or policies not heretofore expressed in law.

Most of the unacceptable features of the earlier bill have either been dropped from H.R. 13680 or have been modified into an acceptable form. I am pleased to note, for example, that this bill does not attempt to impose an arbitrary and unwieldy annual ceiling on the aggregate value of government and commercial arms sales, a ceiling which would have served to hinder, rather than foster, our efforts to seek multilateral restraints on the proliferation of conventional weaponry, and which could have prevented us from meeting the legitimate security needs of our allies and other friendly countries. In addition, the provisions on discrimination and on human rights in this bill go far toward recognizing that diplomatic efforts, rather than absolute statutory sanctions, are the most effective way in which this country can seek further progress abroad in these areas of deep concern to all Americans and that the executive branch must have adequate flexibility to make these efforts bear fruit.

I am especially pleased to note that with one exception the constitutionally objectionable features of S. 2662, whereby au-

¹ Issued on July 1 (text from White House press release); as enacted the bill is Public Law 94-329, approved June 30, 1976.

thority conferred on the President by law could be rescinded by the adoption of a concurrent resolution by the Congress, have all been deleted from H.R. 13680. The manifest incompatibility of such provisions with the express requirements of the Constitution that legislative measures having the force and effect of law be presented to the President for approval and, if disapproved, be passed by the requisite two-thirds majority of both Houses was perhaps the single most serious defect of the previous bill and one which went well beyond security assistance and foreign affairs in its implications. Moreover, such provisions would have purported to involve the Congress in the performance of day-to-day executive functions in derogation of the principle of separation of powers, resulting in the erosion of the fundamental constitutional distinction between the role of the Congress in enacting legislation and the role of the executive in carrying it out.

The one exception to this laudable action is the retention in H.R. 13680 of the legislative-veto provision regarding major governmental sales of military equipment and services. This is not a new provision but has been in the law since 1974. To date no concurrent resolution of disapproval under section 36(b) has been adopted, and the constitutional question has not been raised directly. Although I am accepting H.R. 13680 with this provision included, I reserve my position on its constitutionality if the provision should ever become operative.

In my message of May 7, I expressed my serious concern that the termination of military assistance and military assistance advisory groups after fiscal year 1977 would result in a serious impact upon our relations with other nations whose security is important to our own security and who are not yet able to bear the entire burden of their defense requirements. That concern remains. H.R. 13680 retains language recognizing that it may be necessary and desirable to maintain military assistance

programs and military assistance advisory groups in specific countries even after September 30, 1977. Accordingly, this bill will not deter the executive branch from seeking at the appropriate time the necessary authority for the continuation of such programs as the national interest of the United States may require.

H.R. 13680 will require that many changes be made in present practices and policies regarding the implementation of security assistance programs. Some of these new requirements I welcome as distinct improvements over existing law. There are others for which the desirability and need is less clear. Nevertheless, I shall endeavor to carry out the provisions of this bill in a manner which will give effect to the intent of the Congress in enacting them. As time goes by and experience is gained, both the executive and the Congress will come to know which of the provisions of this bill will be effective and workable and which others require modification or repeal.

This bill recognizes that security assistance has been and remains a most important instrument of U.S. foreign policy. My approval of H.R. 13680 will enable us to go forward with important programs in the Middle East, in Africa, and elsewhere in the world aimed at achieving our goal of international peace and stability.

Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act Signed Into Law

*Statement by President Ford*¹

I have signed H.R. 12203, the Foreign Assistance and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1976 and the period ending September 30, 1976. The bill appropriates funds for a variety of programs in support of U.S. foreign policy objectives, most im-

¹ Issued on July 1 (text from White House press release); as enacted, the bill is Public Law 94-330, approved June 30, 1976.

portantly our pursuit of a peaceful solution to the problems of the Middle East.

Nevertheless, I have serious reservations regarding one element of the bill and believe it is necessary to comment on why I have signed the bill notwithstanding my objections to it.

Title I of the bill contains a provision which conditions the availability of appropriated funds, in certain instances, upon the acquiescence of the Appropriations Committees of each House of Congress. This requirement violates the fundamental constitutional doctrine of separation of powers. While similar provisions have been included in congressional enactments and have been found objectionable on these grounds, this particular requirement is especially onerous in that it intrudes upon the execution of programs in 19 different appropriation categories.

Since I view this provision as severable from what is an otherwise valid exercise of legislative authority, and because it is presented for my signature in the last week of the fiscal year, I am not withholding my approval. We shall continue to work with the Appropriations Committees, as with all committees of the Congress, in a spirit of cooperation. We shall continue to keep the Congress fully informed on a current basis on the execution of the laws. However, we shall not concur in a delegation of the powers of appropriation to two committees of Congress.

Summary Reports of Closed Meetings of Advisory Committees Available

Press release 340 dated July 6

Pursuant to Public Law 92-463 and the Office of Management and Budget Circular A-63 (March 27, 1974), this notice is to advise that summary reports have been prepared covering advisory committee meetings or sessions of meetings which were closed to the public under 5 U.S.C. 552(b) (1).

The advisory committees of the Department of State required to file summary reports for 1975 are:

Advisory Committee on "Foreign Relations of the United States"
Advisory Committee on the Law of the Sea
Advisory Committee to the United States Section
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission
Advisory Panel on International Law
Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Advisory Committee
Ocean Affairs Advisory Committee
United States Advisory Commission on International
Educational and Cultural Affairs

The reports summarizing the committees' discussions are available for inspection and/or copying at the Library of Congress. Anyone interested in these reports should contact the Rare Book Room, Second Floor, Main Building, Library of Congress, 10 First Street, SE., Washington, D.C. 20540, or write or telephone the Advisory Committee Management Officer, Department of State, Washington, D.C. 20520, (area code 202) 632-2297.

U.S. Discusses Relations With Developing Countries in Opening Statement at ECOSOC Meeting

*Text of Statement by William W. Scranton
U.S. Representative to the United Nations¹*

On behalf of the Government and the people of the United States, I would like to express to you, to His Excellency President Houphouet-Boigny, and to the Government and people of the Ivory Coast our sincere appreciation for your country's most generous offer to act as host to the Economic and Social Council, for the magnificent facilities which you have made available, and for the wonderful hospitality which has been extended to us. Such a friendly atmosphere cannot fail to facilitate our deliberations.

It is fitting that, in 1976, the Economic and Social Council should be holding its first meeting in Africa. When the United Nations was created, virtually all of Africa and many areas of Asia were under colonial administration. We have witnessed the process of decolonization over the past 30 years. This has nowhere been more evident than in Africa. The membership of the United Nations has almost tripled in this process, and African states now represent almost a third of its total membership. Indeed, I wish to welcome on behalf of my government the entry of the Seychelles to the community of nations this very week.

But the importance of Africa is not a question of numbers. This continent, with all its diversity, symbolizes the challenges and the hopes of all of us—to remove those last vestiges of colonialism so that all nations and peoples can choose their own destiny; to overcome the burdens of economic disadvantage so as to permit the full development of human and natural resources; and to fashion a pattern of cooperation which will permit peoples to maintain their respective traditions and principles, but to work together in pursuit of a common overriding goal of a better life for all people.

The growing importance of independent Africa on the international scene, the justice of its cause, and the political, economic, and cultural ties that link it to the United States and other countries have underscored the need for us to maintain close ties with African governments.

This perception found expression in Secretary Kissinger's visit to Africa in April and May of this year. The visit came at a time of growing crises in southern Africa and provided an opportunity for the Secretary to enunciate at Lusaka our southern African policy. He made clear our nation's unequivocal support for racial justice and self-determination.

The policy of the United States is based on the recognition that the movement of Africa to full freedom and human dignity will not be complete until racial equality is

¹Read before the 61st session of the U.N. Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) at Abidjan on June 30 by Jacob M. Myerson, U.S. Representative to the Economic and Social Council (text from USUN press release 74 dated July 1). The 61st session of ECOSOC met at Abidjan June 30–July 9 and resumed at Geneva July 12.

fully established throughout the continent.

The recent tragic and deplorable events in South Africa underline the urgency of the situation and the total unacceptability of the system of legalized racial discrimination that prevails in South Africa. Equally, we recognize that the process will not be complete until majority rule is fully established throughout the African Continent. The United States is pledged to support these goals by all appropriate and peaceful means.

In his Lusaka statement, Secretary Kissinger set forth specific proposals aimed at helping solve the pressing problems of the region. He indicated our willingness to play a more active role in concert with African governments.

In this regard, the advice of African leaders has been of particular importance in developing our initiatives on southern Africa, including the recent meeting of Secretary Kissinger and Prime Minister Vorster [of South Africa]. On these and other matters, we shall continue close and useful consultation with African governments.

During his African tour, the Secretary made two other statements to which we attach major importance. In Dakar, he called for the creation of an international consortium to undertake a systematic and comprehensive attack on the development problems of the Sahel region. And in Nairobi at the fourth session of the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development [UNCTAD IV], he set forth our policy on the major North-South development issues.

I will talk about this in greater detail later. But I wish to emphasize now the two major themes in our approach to Africa—to assist African efforts for liberation and for human and economic development. I underscore the words "to assist" because the basic strategy and the basic effort for progress in Africa should and must remain in the hands of Africans themselves.

Just before coming to this conference I had the opportunity—and the pleasure—of visiting several countries in Africa. This trip was undertaken at the suggestion of

President Ford and Secretary Kissinger, to continue our dialogue with African leaders. It was of a necessity a series of rapid visits to 11 countries and certainly does not qualify me as an expert. But I would like to share with you some of my impressions, because I think that they are pertinent to the deliberations of this Council.

African Priorities and Goals

First, I was most impressed with the priorities of the national development programs of the countries visited. They emphasized:

—Agricultural development aimed at insuring sufficient food for their people.

—Health services to reduce infant mortality, to provide better care throughout their citizens' lives, and to increase life expectancy.

—Education, both general education for all and in the technical vocational fields, a necessity for countries to realize and to manage their potential.

—Social development to preserve basic traditions and so that all citizens may better understand and participate effectively in the development of their countries.

These are priorities directed not toward the preservation of a system or simply the promotion of an ideology but, much more importantly, at improving and enhancing the quality of life. As such it is development for the highest purpose—for humanity.

And what about the development of resources in Africa? This is my second point. One very clear impression is that the simple transfer of money is no guarantee of purposeful development—in fact, this could lead to an international misallocation of resources. What is critical is aid to specific projects, especially self-help projects, which will in fact contribute to national development. In this connection, we—both developed and developing countries—must clarify the conceptual confusion which exists between exploitation and development. Whether in Africa or elsewhere, exploita-

tion is wrong. It should not and must not be the pattern for the future. The developed and the developing nations must now work together on a resource program aimed at increasing the standard of living for people in the countries concerned. This is not a one-way street. It is to the mutual advantage of developed countries as well as developing countries, for it produces better markets for products and a healthier international economy.

Thirdly, Mr. President, talks in the countries I have just visited underlined the absolute necessity for a rapid speedup in the liberation of all Africa—first and foremost because of our humanitarian concern but also because the present situation represents a basic deterrent to the economic development of the region.

Finally, Mr. President, I cannot speak of my visit to Africa without paying tribute to the hospitality of governments and people wherever we went, to the vision and commitment of the leaders with whom we talked, and to their willingness to share with us their thinking.

Our talks were characterized by a common dedication to peace, cooperation, and the betterment of mankind's condition. Our areas of agreement are substantial and outweigh any differences of perception or policy. This is a "continent of hope," with great potential. A way of life for Africans in freedom and self-fulfillment is near on the horizon. It is within man's grasp.

Progress in the North-South Dialogue

Mr. President, one of the basic purposes of the United Nations as set forth in the charter is "to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character." Our recent efforts in this respect have focused primarily on the problems of development—those matters embraced by the North-South dialogue.

One milestone in this dialogue was the seventh special session of the General Assembly. On that occasion developed and developing nations put aside confrontation

and declared their common purpose of moving forward cooperatively in accordance with an agreed agenda for action. True, there was hard bargaining, but it achieved consensus acceptable to all. The principles and programs outlined there remain the cornerstone of my government's efforts to assist developing nations and to strengthen ties of cooperation with them.

In accordance with the consensus reached at the seventh special session, significant and practical steps have been undertaken or are underway in various U.N. and other international forums or through the actions of individual countries. The actions cover the wide range of problems confronting us—compensatory financing, funding of international development institutions, commodities, trade, technology transfer, agricultural production, bilateral aid programs, and so on.

I do not propose to catalogue the specific actions now, since the Council is to review this matter later in the present session. The point that I wish to emphasize is that the United States has taken its commitments seriously and is genuinely attempting to translate the agreed principles into specific actions.

The seventh special session is only a milestone, not the end of the road. My government is committed to a continuing process of negotiation seeking practical solutions to real problems. Thus we are participating in the Paris Conference on International Economic Cooperation, one of the principal forums in which the dialogue between developed and developing countries is being carried out.

UNCTAD IV represents another milestone. There were, indeed, positive achievements at Nairobi, although the outcome failed to satisfy everyone. For example, we are aware that even though developed countries, including the United States, went further than ever before in their commitment to proceed with work on major aspects of commodity issues—not the least on buffer stock financing—some of our friends in the developing countries had hoped for more.

The United States for its part was deeply disappointed that its proposal for an International Resources Bank—presented at UNCTAD IV on behalf of all Group B countries [developed market-economy countries]—did not receive the consideration we believe it deserves. We are pursuing this proposal as one important element of any comprehensive approach to commodities problems. We trust that it will receive serious and thorough consideration.

It is in no way intended to preclude other approaches nor to compete with any other proposal. The purpose of the International Resources Bank is to facilitate the flow of essential private capital, management, and technology into the development of mineral resources in developing countries on a basis fully acceptable to such countries—one compatible with their sovereignty and their national plans.

In our view this would be of particular benefit to countries of Africa and elsewhere. We have recently presented a statement on the proposed International Resources Bank to the Paris Conference on International Economic Cooperation and will be actively following up on this matter.

In spite of these disappointments and with the perspective of a month since Nairobi, UNCTAD IV seems to us to have been more successful than many at first imagined. A number of resolutions were approved by consensus, including those on debt, technology, and the least developed countries, as well as commodities.

The United States will continue to work toward the goals it has accepted and to contribute to programs in which it has agreed to participate. We will take part in the meetings preparatory to UNCTAD's March 1977 negotiating conference on commodities. We also intend to participate fully and actively in the extensive series of meetings on the 18 specific commodities set forth in the UNCTAD IV commodities resolution. Where differences persist regarding objectives or methods, we shall be prepared to pursue a discussion with a view to reconciliation.

Mr. President, this month there have been two meetings of the industrialized countries of considerable significance for relations between developed and developing countries—the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] ministerial meeting and the Puerto Rico summit. These meetings emphasized the need for closer coordination between participating countries.

Working together, the industrialized countries seek to achieve sustained economic growth, which is directly related to the demand for the mineral, agricultural, and manufactured products of developing countries. They can seek to minimize inflation and its impact, for example, on the cost of developing-country imports. And they can better position themselves both to initiate proposals and to respond constructively to proposals by the developing countries.

Issues Before ECOSOC

Mr. President, the 61st session of ECOSOC can mark another milestone on the road to enhanced cooperation among the members of the Council and among developed and developing countries generally. The Council will have to address a broad agenda—one which will give it full opportunity to meet the responsibilities vested in it by the U.N. Charter. The U.S. delegation stands ready to play its full part.

One of the subjects we will be considering is the complex of issues related to transnational corporations. In the meeting of the Commission on Transnational Corporations in Lima last March, the United States proposed a special effort in the field of corrupt practices and payments—a problem, I should add, that goes beyond the question of transnational corporations per se.

My delegation, with the support of others, will be submitting a draft resolution on this subject at the current session of ECOSOC. We are hopeful that it will receive full and sympathetic consideration

so that an expert group may be established as soon as possible to take up this matter.

One of the significant results of the seventh special session was the decision to create the ad hoc committee to examine the restructuring of the economic and social sectors of the U.N. system. That body is now pursuing its deliberations.

An important aspect of the restructuring exercise involves efforts to revitalize the ECOSOC so that it may carry out its responsibilities more effectively. We have made some suggestions in this regard, and we shall have additional ideas to present. Meanwhile, we are convinced that the high quality of the Council's work under the distinguished Presidency of the Ivory Coast will serve to reinforce our determination in this regard.

Challenges for the Future

Looking ahead in the next decade, we face great challenges. How can we increase food production in poor countries with food deficits? When will the world finally have some assurance that economic gains will not eventually be wiped out by population increases? How can we involve the rural poor, the unemployed, the underemployed, and women in economic and social development? How can the poorer countries develop a sound economic base for continuing advancement and eventual self-reliance in an interdependent world?

In finding solutions for these problems, we in the United States have redoubled our

efforts over the past year; we have modified some positions, and we have made many new proposals. We take pride in what we have accomplished, but we will not rest on these achievements.

Mr. President, in four days the United States will be celebrating its Bicentennial. The men who wrote the Declaration of Independence assumed that the American Revolution was only the beginning of a process of liberation and that the ideals set forth were applicable to mankind in general. Thus, from its inception the United States has favored efforts of others to assure both their independence and their human dignity. As we enter our third century, we are committed to the view that independence, individual liberties, and human dignity should and must flourish everywhere.

In this session of the Economic and Social Council, therefore, let us remember that our intentions transcend the specific issues, important as each one of them is. Beyond them lies a high reality:

—A world economic system with shared interests for all its members.

—A world system characterized by fairness for the weak as well as the strong, by compassion for the poor, by the eradication of hunger, and by social and economic progress for all.

These goals can be achieved if nations recognize and accept that each bears a responsibility toward the others and toward mankind.

U.S. Discusses Progress and Challenges in Space Technology and Law in U.N. Outer Space Committee

The 19th session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space met at New York June 21-July 9. Following is a statement made in the committee by U.S. Representative Herbert K. Reis on June 22.

USUN press release 66 dated June 22

The U.S. delegation is happy to participate in this 19th session of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. Since its first session in 1962, this committee has established a record of solid achievement. It has stimulated international cooperation in space and space-related activities, educated governments on the practical applications of space technology, and helped to establish a legal regime for space activities characterized by freedom of scientific investigation and the sharing of information.

We believe it appropriate on this occasion to review the current status of the four multilateral agreements concerning outer space and space activities negotiated in the Outer Space Committee. These are the Outer Space Treaty, the Astronaut Agreement, the Liability Convention, and the Registration Convention. As you know, the United States is one of the three depositary governments for the first three of these treaties, while the Secretary General is the single depositary for the Registration Convention. The information I will give is current as of the opening of our session, June 21.

The 1967 Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, has now been ratified or acceded to by 69 states.

This represents approximately one-half the membership of the United Nations. It seems reasonable to expect this number to grow steadily in view of the increasing recognition of the practical applications of space technology.

The 1968 Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space has received 64 ratifications and accessions in all, most of them recently; in addition, the European Space Agency (ESA) has filed a declaration of acceptance under article VI of the agreement.

The 1972 Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects has been ratified or acceded to by 40 countries, but I note that of 37 members of the Outer Space Committee only 16 have so far become party to this convention.

Finally, the 1974 Convention on Registration of Objects Launched Into Outer Space was opened for signature here at the United Nations in January 1975. It has been signed by 24 countries and has been ratified by France, Bulgaria, and Sweden.

Mr. Chairman, our delegation is pleased to be able to report that the Senate of the United States yesterday gave its advice and consent to the ratification by the President of the Registration Convention. The Senate took this action unanimously by a vote of 88 in favor, with none opposed. We appreciate this action by the Senate and hope the Administration will be able shortly to deposit the U.S. instrument of ratification with the Secretary General.

We would like to suggest that the Outer Space Committee consider recommending to our governments that they review the

desirability of accepting the rights and obligations contained in these treaty instruments. While the General Assembly regularly includes a suggestion in this regard in its omnibus resolution on the annual outer space agenda item, progress may begin better "at home" in this committee. Let us encourage those of our governments which are not party to these treaties to undertake a fresh analysis of them.

U.S. Cooperative Programs and Activities

Mr. Chairman, since the last session of the committee in June 1975, there have been many significant achievements in international outer space cooperation and the exploration and use of space. One dramatic example is the Apollo-Soyuz mission, successfully completed through cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union, involving both scientific experiments and a rendezvous and docking program in July 1975.

Its many engineering and scientific achievements included the design and flight testing of a universal docking system, which will be required for the operation of any large cooperative manned systems in the future. Another main product is the establishment of an expanded rescue capability for future manned flights. A significant satellite and communications engineering feat involved relay of live television coverage of the Apollo-Soyuz mission through the ATS-6 satellite [Applications Technology Satellite] and via an earth station near Madrid to television audiences around the world.

Apart from the tangible results of Apollo-Soyuz, the participating states and the international community as a whole have enjoyed a variety of less tangible but important benefits, such as the cordial relations that have grown up among large numbers of U.S. and U.S.S.R. men and women during the preparation of the mission and the good will engendered in astronaut and cosmonaut tours following the

mission. In another cooperative venture involving several Eastern European countries, the United States contributed scientific experiments as part of a biological satellite payload (Cosmos 782) launched by the Soviet Union late last November.

The establishment of these relations and the demonstration of the feasibility of joint missions in space have laid the foundation for future operations in the interest of all countries and have contributed significantly to the implementation of the guiding theme of promoting international cooperation and understanding as set forth in article III of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty.

On August 1, 1975, the Satellite Instructional Television Experiment (SITE) was inaugurated by the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO). In 1969, NASA [National Aeronautics and Space Administration] had undertaken to make an ATS satellite available to India for four hours every day for one year in order to broadcast programs on family planning, agriculture, and public health, as well as school and adult education programs, to 5,000 Indian villages. About 2,700 of these villages received the programs on conventional television receivers augmented with a low-cost 10-foot-diameter parabolic antenna, a frequency converter, and a pre-amplifier.

India has had full responsibility for the design, development, operation, and maintenance of the ground receiving and transmitting equipment and for the programing of SITE broadcasts. ISRO will also evaluate the social impact of the experiment. The Administrator of NASA recently confirmed on his return from a tour in India that the programs are arousing great interest in the villages, and the experiment appears to be highly successful.

Since the committee's 18th session last year, NASA has launched two Viking automated spacecraft to orbit and place a lander on Mars. The first of these two craft entered Martian orbit on June 19.

A primary objective of the mission is to

determine whether there are or have been living microorganisms either on or below the Martian surface. The initial lander, which is expected to descend to the Martian surface during the first week of July, is also intended to provide a spatial and spectral characterization of the landing site and the surrounding atmosphere. Among other experiments, it will make geological, biological, and meteorological analyses. Several non-U.S. scientists will be using data from Viking for scientific studies of Mars.

Another international cooperative program of major significance during the past year has involved the successful launching by NASA of the Canadian Communications Technology Satellite (CTS) in January 1976. This is an advanced experimental communication satellite designed to transmit at substantially higher power levels than standard communication satellites and thereby permit the use of smaller receiving stations in isolated communities and for governmental and industrial operations in northern Canada. In addition, a Canadian program to contribute a remote manipulator system for use on the NASA space shuttle continues on schedule.

The development by the European Space Agency of the Spacelab to be launched in the space shuttle is proceeding on schedule. The experimental objectives of the first Spacelab flight, scheduled for 1980, have been selected jointly by ESA and NASA.

Moreover, under the Helios Cooperative Solar Probe Project carried out with the Federal Republic of Germany, NASA successfully launched Helios-2 in January 1976. Helios-1, which was launched in 1975, has already discovered unexpected characteristics of the solar wind as well as particle fluxes and cosmic dust concentrations in hitherto unexplored areas in proximity to the Sun. Helios-2 will be working with its predecessor to extend and correlate those investigations in space and time.

Other cooperative projects under study or development and involving the United States are an Infrared Astronomy Satellite with the Netherlands, an X-ray satellite of the Explorer class with the United Kingdom, a space telescope project with the European Space Agency, and an out-of-the-ecliptic probe with ESA designed to examine the astronomical region beyond the principal plane of the solar system.

The past year has also seen marked progress in the field of satellite remote sensing of the natural phenomena and environment of the Earth, a subject of principal concern to both the Scientific and Technical and the Legal Subcommittees at their recent sessions.

Facilities for direct reception of Landsat data are currently in operation in Brazil, Canada, Italy, and the United States. Chile, Iran, and Zaïre have also concluded agreements with NASA under which they will fund the construction of Landsat ground facilities in their countries, and a number of other countries are actively considering establishing such stations in 1977 and 1978. The United States intends to continue to be responsive to the growing interest in this network.

Although not exhaustive, these various projects illustrate the advances that are being made for the benefit of mankind as a whole. In addition, many other countries, developed and developing alike, are becoming increasingly capable of exploiting space technology for their own purposes.

In the 10-year period 1965-75 NASA conducted more than 40 international reimbursable launches in addition to cooperative programs in which funds are not exchanged. Five such international reimbursable launches will be conducted in 1976 and 11 more are scheduled for 1977. This level of activity is a clear index to the improved capacity of states to benefit from space technology.

The U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has made a major contribution to these achievements by

creating a climate of international cooperation in which space science, exploration, and applications have been able to flourish.

Work of the Subcommittees

As the scientists and technicians of the world are making impressive progress in the exploration of outer space, the members of this committee, through their representatives in the Scientific and Technical and the Legal Subcommittees, have also been hard at work trying to assess the future technical potential and the organizational and legal needs of the international community in this area.

Each of the subcommittees devoted a considerable amount of time this year to the subject of remote sensing. The work of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee in particular was assisted by a series of detailed and most useful studies written and compiled by the Secretariat.

Although many different aspects of remote sensing were examined by the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee, one of the most important results of its review was the emerging consensus in support of regional cooperation for the reception, processing, and analysis of data. Building on the recommendation of its 12th session in 1975 that training facilities should be combined with such regional centers, the subcommittee noted the expanding number of training opportunities being offered by states and international organizations in order to increase the capability of all countries to share in the benefits derived from remote sensing of the earth. The subcommittee specifically noted that "International cooperation was needed as this was the only cost-effective approach for acquiring the benefits of satellite remote sensing for the majority of countries."¹

The subcommittee also "reaffirmed the

view that a regional, international and national approach would be preferable for reception of remote sensing data from satellites." The subcommittee cited three examples of regional arrangements including "(i) a station encompassing a geographic zone within a given nation; (ii) a station jointly owned and operated by several nations; (iii) a national station that may serve the needs of several States under appropriate bilateral or multilateral arrangements between those States."

In the view of the United States, the practical experience which the international community has gained thus far through current experimental programs strongly supports the desirability of a cooperative international approach to the reception, development, and sharing of benefits from remote-sensing data.

We also believe that the United Nations can play a most valuable role in the dissemination of information about the technical aspects of remote sensing, about the potential benefits in which all countries may share, and about how scientists and other experts in all countries may apply those benefits to their own development programs.

Our delegation has read with considerable attention the note from the Permanent Mission of India concerning a possible regional ground station for remote sensing which might be established in India contained in document A/AC.105/174. We await with interest a fuller exposition of this matter by the delegation of India.

For its part the Legal Subcommittee has begun a careful and useful analysis of the legal implications of remote sensing. This analysis includes the drafting of guiding principles in areas where common elements have been identified through the discussion of legal implications. Five such principles have been developed and additional common elements identified.²

¹For the report of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee on the work of its 13th session, see U.N. doc. A/AC.105/170.

²For texts of the draft principles, see annex III to U.N. doc. A/AC.105/171, report of the Legal Subcommittee on the work of its 15th session.

As we continue this work, we believe that the most constructive progress can be made through careful attention to the interdisciplinary aspects of remote sensing and to the need to integrate legal, technical, and organizational considerations in the development of additional principles.

We believe it is worth noting that in the body of the five principles so far developed, the single paragraph unburdened by brackets reinforces the regional cooperation theme. The paragraph reads: "In order to maximize the availability of benefits from such remote sensing data, States are encouraged to consider agreements for the establishment of shared regional facilities."

The Legal Subcommittee also made substantial progress in drafting principles to guide broadcasting authorities planning the conduct of direct television broadcasting by satellite. Although certain issues remain to be resolved, the discussions at the May session of the subcommittee have been useful and productive.

It may well tax our collective ingenuity to develop mutually acceptable solutions to the remaining issues, for there are fundamental values involved which require very considerable discussion and analysis. For the United States as for many other countries, the principle of the free and open exchange of information and ideas is central. Nevertheless, the Outer Space Committee has faced difficult issues in the past and will do so again in the future. We hope that in the course of time we will be able to develop a consensus in this matter as well.

We also hope the Legal Subcommittee will be able to complete its work on the draft Moon treaty and add this agreement to the growing list of successful products of the subcommittee to be approved by the Outer Space Committee and endorsed by the General Assembly.

A topic of increasing interest to governments is the matter of energy development programs. We have heard interesting and stimulating comments in this area by several speakers, including our distinguished chairman, Ambassador Janko-

witsch [Peter Jankowitsch, of Austria]; and there are two papers on the subject before the committee at the current session. There is, of course, a great deal of work which could be done in this area.

While it is desirable to employ a certain caution as to the scope of a possible study by the Outer Space Committee, it may be helpful for governments to be asked to present at the next session of the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee a survey of work in progress or planned in each country in the area of developing energy resources or systems in space.

The agenda of each subcommittee continues to be full. Each has important and difficult questions of interest to all of our governments. The tenor of our work has been notably constructive. The U.S. delegation looks forward to continuing to join in the collective effort to explore the many important aspects of the peaceful uses of outer space.

United Nations Documents: A Selected Bibliography

Mimeographed or processed documents (such as those listed below) may be consulted at depository libraries in the United States. U.N. printed publications may be purchased from the Sales Section of the United Nations, United Nations Plaza, N.Y. 10017.

General Assembly

- Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space:
Report of the United Nations Expert on Space Applications to the Scientific and Technical Subcommittee. A/AC.105/163. January 20, 1976. 10 pp.
- Coordination of outer space activities within the United Nations system. Report of the Secretary General. A/AC.105/166. February 5, 1976. 18 pp.
- Review of national and cooperative international space activities for the calendar year 1975. A/AC.105/167; February 20, 1976; 139 pp.
- A/AC.105/167/Add.1; March 11, 1976; 22 pp.

Economic and Social Council

- The establishment of an international research and training group for the advancement of women. Report of the Secretary General. E/5772. March 29, 1976. 9 pp.

Department Discusses U.S. Prisoners in Mexico

Statement by William H. Luers

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs¹

I am happy to have the opportunity to report to the subcommittee on the status of Americans arrested and imprisoned in Mexican jails. We consider this a serious problem and one which your subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, has played an important and constructive role in pursuing. Public exchanges between the executive and legislative branches on problems of this type are essential to airing openly for the American people the policy problems and progress on matters of such critical importance. These hearings have also, quite frankly, provided impetus, ideas, and support for our own efforts.

Since our January report to you there have been a number of real areas of improvement in conditions for Americans in Mexican jails. There has also been a promising new initiative. But although there has been progress, there are other areas where we must state frankly no meaningful improvement can be reported.

Mr. Chairman, I would like this morning to:

—First, place the U.S.-prisoners issue in the broader context of U.S.-Mexican relations;

—Second, outline for you the Mexican Government's proposals on a possible arrangement to transfer sanctions for U.S. and Mexican prisoners;

—Third, discuss some hopeful signs that the Mexicans themselves are concerned about the prison conditions;

—Fourth, report on our continuing serious problem areas; and

—Finally, provide you a status report on our efforts to improve our guidance to consular officials and to expand our public information program to Americans traveling abroad.

U.S.-Mexican Relations

As I said at the outset, Mr. Chairman, we consider the treatment of American citizens in Mexican jails a serious problem—one to which we give the highest priority. It is important, however, when addressing the problem to place it in the context of our expanding and ever more complex relationship with our neighbor. There is no nation in the world with which we have greater human and material interaction than with Mexico. Moreover, Mexico's very proximity and involvement with the United States makes her government officials particularly sensitive to indications of U.S. encroachment on Mexican sovereignty and independence. As you recall, Mr. Chairman, I testified on this very subject just two weeks ago before your committee in another context.

¹ Made before the Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations on June 29. The complete transcript of the hearings will be published by the committee and will be available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Although Mexico has taken a forcefully independent posture in international affairs, our bilateral relations have remained excellent. Our ability to speak frankly and directly to each other has been enhanced by Mexico's heightened self-confidence and growing posture as an important spokesman for the developing world.

I need not recite here for you the statistics on trade and tourism or on our border crossings and commerce. But I think it is important to state three major areas of negotiations and collaboration:

—First, the Mexican Government has developed a bold, imaginative, and effective approach to attacking the drug flow. We commend the Mexican Government's major effort to eradicate poppies and cut back on the damaging flow of heroin in this country.

—Second, we are engaged in important negotiations with the Mexican Government on law of the sea and fisheries matters which are of considerable importance to large numbers of American citizens.

—Third, we have begun in the last year a productive series of exchanges with the Mexican Government over the complex and often emotional issue of Mexican illegal migrants in this country. We are encouraged by the tone and mutual sense of importance our two governments have brought to those discussions.

Mr. Chairman, I mention these matters not to detract from the U.S.-prisoners issue, but to put the issue in perspective. The lives and well-being of American citizens can be second to no U.S. foreign policy interest. There are actions which we can take, and have taken, to increase service to and improve the conditions of U.S. prisoners in Mexico. There are, however, aspects of the problem which involve national sovereignty. Those aspects which involve sovereignty can only be solved through discussions and negotiations between our two governments. We also wish to stress that we see no inconsistency whatsoever between our desire for continued Mexican efforts to curb the flow of heroin and our desire for fair treatment to U.S. prisoners.

New Initiatives

As the subcommittee is aware, Secretary of State Kissinger discussed the problem of the prisoners with the President and Foreign Secretary of Mexico during his visit to that country from June 10 to 12. Mexico proposed several possible remedies to the problem of the detention of American citizens in Mexican jails and of Mexican citizens in American jails. It was pointed out that incarceration in a foreign jail, deprived of the support of one's family and friends, may be more burdensome for the prisoner than it would be if he served his sentence in his home country.

Consideration is being given by both governments to the feasibility of making arrangements whereby the nationals of one country incarcerated in the other country's jails might request being transferred to their home countries to serve their sentences. Although neither the United States nor Mexico is presently a party to an arrangement of this character, the idea of such transfer is not new. In addition to the European Convention on the International Validity of Criminal Judgments, developed within the Council of Europe in 1970, there are bilateral conventions on the subject between several countries.

The Department does not believe that the fact that we have never had a treaty of this character should prevent exploring with the Mexicans the possibility of an agreement that would ameliorate the burden on citizens of both countries incarcerated abroad and relieve a problem that is an irritant in our historically friendly relations. Accordingly, we have decided to pursue the matter with the Government of Mexico.

Ambassador [Joseph J.] Jova has been instructed to present a note to the Mexicans indicating some of the issues with which an agreement would have to deal and asking for the views of the Government of Mexico on these questions. We are also asking the Government of Mexico to make suggestions with respect to other issues with which an agreement might deal.

We will study sympathetically the Mexican replies. We hope that after this written exchange of views our lawyers might meet

with their lawyers to consider what further steps should be taken. We would expect to keep the subcommittee informed of the progress of this initiative.

Hopeful Signs of Mexican Concern

In addition to the Mexican proposal on the transfer of sanctions, there are a number of other indications of growing Mexican concern with prison conditions in that country.

Foremost among these is the reform of the administration of Lecumberri Prison in Mexico City. Living conditions and corruption in this prison reached the point where the Mexicans themselves demanded rectification. The reform was triggered by the escape of four prisoners, only one of whom may have a claim to U.S. nationality. Yet it quickly became apparent that the Mexican Government was not prepared to tolerate a continuation of the elaborate web of extortion and other abuses which had made life intolerable for both Mexican and American prisoners. As a result, the commandant was removed from office and the chief of guards imprisoned on charges of corrupt practices. A new acting director, a subsecretary in the Interior Ministry, has been appointed, with the specific mandate of eliminating abuses.

The notorious "mayor" system, a prisoner hierarchy, which was the primary mechanism for intimidation and extortion of prisoners, has been abolished. Prisoners are no longer required, among other things, to pay rent for their cells or for the retention of commissioned jobs.

Furthermore, since the new prison director learned of past abuses of the commissioned-work system, he has instituted a program of review of prisoners' claims to commissioned-work credit to insure that prisoners receive the full credit to which they are entitled for work performed. The Embassy is assisting American prisoners, where possible, in this regard.

The new director has also made public statements regarding exploitation by lawyers. At this time it is too early to determine if this serious abuse has finally been corrected.

With particular understanding of the special needs of the American prisoners in his care, the new director has taken the initiative in collecting English-language books and magazines for the prisoners' use. In contrast to the limited physical exercise facilities available to most of the American prisoners under the old regime, an American-style football team has now been organized and American prisoners are encouraged to participate. Other improvements have been made to facilitate constructive communication between the prison administration and the inmates. The new administration has shown marked cooperation and willingness to work with our consular officers for the welfare of the American prisoners.

We are particularly pleased to note that these reforms at Lecumberri and the general subject of need for improvements in prison conditions have been and continue to be the subjects of widespread reporting and intense discussion in the press throughout Mexico. As an example of this concern outside of Mexico City, our consulate at Mazatlán has recently reported on a scathing article in a Culiacán, Sinaloa, newspaper describing in lurid but accurate terms the deplorable conditions existing in the notorious Mazatlán prison.

The Department believes that it is too early to judge whether this heightened Mexican concern with prison conditions as reflected in the media will eventually lead to widespread prison reform.

We should report on one case, in which two American prisoners in an outlying area were assaulted by four guards. When this incident was brought to the attention of the appropriate Mexican authorities by our consular post, the matter was investigated and the guards removed from their employment.

Continuing Problem Areas

While we have seen evidence of heightened Mexican concern with problems of treatment of inmates in some of their penal institutions, we cannot report commensurate improvement in the treatment of newly detained Americans at the hands of arresting

officers and those responsible for interrogation.

Since January 1, 1976, incidents of physical abuse in 18 percent of new arrest cases have been substantiated. We continue to have serious problems in regard to early notification of arrest of our citizens and in obtaining prompt consular access to them. We continue to believe that prompt consular access offers the best hope of effective deterrence of abuse during interrogation.

As we have indicated, we continue to protest all incidents of abuse where we can do so. Here, however, our hands are often tied by the fact that many prisoners who have suffered mistreatment decline to authorize our consular officers to make official protests or authorize protest only many months after the fact, thus severely weakening the thrust of the protest. Also, many of the protests which our Embassy has made to Mexican authorities in cases of physical abuse have merely elicited denials that such abuse has taken place.

We are most concerned about the lack of significant improvement in the treatment of U.S. citizens in the period shortly after their arrest and continue to make this concern known at all levels of the Mexican Government. We have asked for strict adherence to the granting of all human rights to U.S. prisoners guaranteed under the Mexican Constitution and by accepted international standards.

Guidance to Consuls; Information Programs

We have recently completed the drafting and editing of a new handbook on the protection of American nationals to supplement and expand upon the regulations governing arrestee and prisoner services. The handbook draws largely upon our experience in Mexico but also incorporates lessons learned all over the world. In our preliminary research for the compilation of the handbook, we soon realized that every good idea for arrestee and prisoner services, every insight, every

method of getting the job done in the best possible way, was already in existence and in use in one or more of our consular offices around the world. The handbook, for the first time, brings together and distills the ideas which could be identified as having general applicability and makes them available to all our consular officers in Mexico and elsewhere.

The first edition of the handbook is now in the process of being published. I emphasize "first edition," because we fully expect the handbook to be revised soon and often to refine further the ideas, suggestions, and requirements in it as well as to incorporate new ideas which will inevitably arise from the new, positive, inventive attitude toward prisoner services which we are now building. I would like to read you the introduction to the handbook, to give you an idea of the philosophy that went into it:

One of the basic functions of a consul has traditionally been to provide a "cultural bridge" between the host community and the consul's own compatriots traveling or residing abroad. No one needs that cultural bridge more than the individual arrested in a foreign place or imprisoned in a foreign jail.

Neither arrest nor conviction deprives a United States national of the right to the consul's best efforts in facilitating the citizen's welfare and defense or in protecting the citizen's legal and human rights. Like attorneys and social workers, consular officers are obliged to serve their clients with dedicated professional enthusiasm regardless of their opinions of the client's innocence or personal merit.

The guidelines in this handbook should not be taken as defining the limits of the consular officer's responsibility, but rather as furnishing a frame of reference for each officer's own creative approach to arrestee and prisoner services.

Also, the Department of State has expanded its public information program to warn Americans of the horrendous personal consequences of becoming involved with drugs abroad. Since January, the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Mr. Leonard F. Walentynowicz, and his Deputy, Mr. Loren E. Lawrence, have personally appeared on numerous tele-

vision and radio programs to speak on this subject, and both have given a number of newspaper interviews and made personal appearances on this same theme. Further, the Department is preparing for distribution the first of a number of new pamphlets warning in detail of the terrible price to be paid for drug offenses in Mexico and elsewhere abroad. A copy of this pamphlet is available for members of the subcommittee.

In our expanded public information program it is essential that we reach as broad a base of the American populace as is possible. To this end, on July 18 singer-actor Kris Kristofferson is making a professionally prepared public-service television spot announcement on the dangers of drug use abroad. We are also having prepared a series of 30-second radio spots for use on stations oriented to young listeners, which we hope actor Warren Beatty will narrate.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, we in the Department of State have been most gratified with the concern shown by the Mexican Government in regard to prison conditions, a concern arising from Mexican sensibility to human rights. We are especially hopeful that the Mexican Government's initiative in regard to transfer of sanctions will bear fruit and thus alleviate the plight of some of the Americans now in prison in Mexico.

We are disappointed, however, that neither Mexican concern for human rights nor our vigorous protests have put an end to physical abuse of arrestees during interrogation. Naturally, we also remain dissatisfied with the fact that many of our citizens imprisoned in Mexico continue to exist in deplorable conditions.

We will not fail to bring to the attention of Mexican officials at all levels our ongoing deep concern and distress over abuses suffered by U.S. citizens arrested in Mexico. We are hopeful that our latest discussions of this problem at the highest levels of government—which we find share our concern over the allegations of abuse—will have positive results. Specifically we hope to see greater

pressure being brought to bear on the operating-level officials—those who make the arrests, question the accused, and guard the prisons—to desist from any action that is in violation of the rights granted to all arrestees, both Mexican and foreign, under the Mexican Constitution and statutes.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

94th Congress, 1st and 2d Sessions

U.S. Missile Sale to Jordan. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on S. Con. Res. 50, to express the objection of the Congress to the proposed sale of improved Hawk missiles and Redeye missiles to Jordan. July 15–21, 1975. 99 pp.

Effects of Limited Nuclear Warfare. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Organizations and Security Agreements of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on possible effects on U.S. society of nuclear attacks against U.S. military installations. September 18, 1975. 61 pp.

Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Part II. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations on H. Res. 864 and related resolutions, expressing the sense of the House on nonrecognition of the Soviet Union's annexation of the Baltic nations, and H.R. 9466 (S. 2679), to establish a Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. November 18, 1975–May 4, 1976. 191 pp.

U.S. Citizens Imprisoned in Mexico. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations. Part II. October 22, 1975–January 27, 1976. 110 pp.

94th Congress, 2d Session

United States-Canadian Relations. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs of the House Committee on International Relations. January 28, 1976. 26 pp.

Travel Program for Foreign Diplomats, Inc. Hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. March 22, 1976. 32 pp.

Western European Union. Joint meeting of the House Committee on International Relations and the General Affairs Committee of the Western European Union. April 8, 1976. 38 pp.

TREATY INFORMATION

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Oil Pollution

Amendments to the international convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, 1954, as amended (TIAS 4900, 6109). Adopted at London October 21, 1969.¹

Acceptance deposited: Algeria, June 7, 1976.

International convention relating to intervention on the high seas in cases of oil pollution casualties, with annex. Done at Brussels November 29, 1969. Entered into force May 6, 1975. TIAS 8068.

Ratification deposited: Poland, June 1, 1976.

Accession deposited: Cuba, May 5, 1976.²

International convention on civil liability for oil pollution damage. Done at Brussels November 29, 1969. Entered into force June 19, 1975.³

Ratification deposited: Yugoslavia, June 18, 1976.

Accession deposited: Japan, June 3, 1976.

Amendments to the international convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, 1954, as amended (TIAS 4900, 6109). Adopted at London October 12, 1971.¹

Acceptance deposited: Italy, June 17, 1976.

Amendments to the international convention for the prevention of pollution of the sea by oil, 1954, as amended (TIAS 4900, 6109). Adopted at London October 15, 1971.²

Acceptance deposited: Italy, June 17, 1976.

Safety at Sea

Convention on the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1972. Done at London October 20, 1972.

Ratification deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, July 14, 1976.

Enters into force: July 15, 1977.

International regulations for preventing collisions at sea. Approved by the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea held at London from May 17 to June 16, 1960. Entered into force September 1, 1965. TIAS 5813.

Acceptance deposited: Algeria, June 7, 1976.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and further extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat

agreement) 1971 (TIAS 7144, 8227). 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. *Accession deposited:* Syrian Arab Republic, July 19, 1976.

BILATERAL

African Development Bank

Grant agreement relating to a regional onchocerciasis area land satellite (Landsat) related study in Benin, Ghana, and Upper Volta, with annex. Signed at Abidjan June 30, 1976. Entered into force June 30, 1976.

Brazil

Agreement relating to the continuation of a collaborative experimental program in the field of remote sensing surveys of earth resources, with related letters. Effected by exchange of notes at Brasilia May 26, 1976. Entered into force May 26, 1976.

Egypt

Grant agreement relating to construction of a thermal power plant near Ismailia, with annex. Signed at Cairo May 30, 1976. Entered into force May 30, 1976.

Grant agreement relating to technical and feasibility studies. Signed at Cairo May 30, 1976. Entered into force May 30, 1976.

Ethiopia

Grant agreement relating to a nutrition/health early warning system project and access road construction. Signed at Addis Ababa June 30, 1976. Entered into force June 30, 1976.

Haiti

Agreement relating to the limitation of imports from Haiti of fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of cattle, goats, and sheep, except lambs, during calendar year 1976. Effected by exchange of notes at Port-au-Prince April 30 and June 29, 1976. Entered into force June 29, 1976.

Panama

Agreement relating to the limitation of imports from Panama of fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of cattle, goats, and sheep, except lambs, during calendar year 1976. Effected by exchange of notes at Panama April 26 and July 7, 1976. Entered into force July 7, 1976.

Zaire

Loan agreement to assist Zaïre in alleviating balance-of-payments problems. Signed at Kinshasa June 29, 1976. Entered into force June 29, 1976.

¹ Not in force.

² With a declaration.

³ Not in force for the United States.

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Advisory Committees. Summary Reports of Closed Meetings of Advisory Committees Available | 200 |
| Africa. U.S. Discusses Relations With Developing Countries in Opening Statement at ECOSOC Meeting (Scranton) | 201 |
| Congress | |
| Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy | 215 |
| Department Discusses U.S. Prisoners in Mexico (Luers) | 211 |
| Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act Signed Into Law (Ford) | 199 |
| President Signs Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act (Ford) | 198 |
| Consular Affairs. Department Discusses U.S. Prisoners in Mexico (Luers) | 211 |
| Developing Countries. U.S. Discusses Relations With Developing Countries in Opening Statement at ECOSOC Meeting (Scranton) | 201 |
| Economic Affairs. U.S. Discusses Relations With Developing Countries in Opening Statement at ECOSOC Meeting (Scranton) | 201 |
| Foreign Aid | |
| Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act Signed Into Law (Ford) | 199 |
| President Signs Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act (Ford) | 198 |
| Mexico. Department Discusses U.S. Prisoners in Mexico (Luers) | 211 |
| Military Affairs. President Signs Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act (Ford) | 198 |
| Presidential Documents | |
| Foreign Assistance Appropriations Act Signed Into Law | 199 |
| President Signs Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act | 198 |
| Queen Elizabeth II Makes State Visit to the United States | 196 |
| Space. U.S. Discusses Progress and Challenges in Space Technology and Law in U.N. Outer Space Committee (Reis) | 206 |
| Treaty Information. Current Actions | 216 |
| United Kingdom. Queen Elizabeth II Makes State Visit to the United States (Elizabeth II, Ford) | 196 |
| United Nations | |
| Changes and Choices at the United Nations (Lewis) | 189 |
| United Nations Documents | 210 |

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| U.S. Discusses Progress and Challenges in Space Technology and Law in U.N. Outer Space Committee (Reis) | 206 |
| U.S. Discusses Relations With Developing Countries in Opening Statement at ECOSOC Meeting (Scranton) | 201 |

Name Index

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Queen Elizabeth II | 196 |
| Ford, President | 196, 198, 199 |
| Lewis, Samuel W | 189 |
| Luers, William H | 211 |
| Reis, Herbert K | 206 |
| Scranton, William W | 201 |

**Checklist of Department of State
Press Releases: July 19-25**

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

| No. | Date | Subject |
|-------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| *349 | 7/20 | Shipping Coordinating Committee, Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea, working group on radiocommunications, Aug. 19. |
| *350 | 7/22 | Program for the official visit to Washington of Prime Minister J. Malcolm Fraser of Australia. |
| †351 | 7/22 | Kissinger: Downtown Rotary Club and Seattle Chamber of Commerce, Seattle, Wash. |
| †351A | 7/22 | Questions and answers following address, Seattle. |
| *352 | 7/22 | Munitions export license to be issued to United Technologies International for collaboration agreement on new commercial jet engine. |
| *353 | 7/22 | Kissinger: news conference, Seattle. |
| †354 | 7/22 | Kissinger: panel discussion, World Affairs Council, Portland, Oreg. |
| *355 | 7/23 | James J. Blake sworn in as Ambassador to Iceland (biographic data). |

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