



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

Volume LXXII • No. 1879 • June 30, 1975

PRESIDENT FORD VISITS WESTERN EUROPE, ATTENDS NATO MEETING,
AND MEETS WITH PRESIDENT SADAT OF EGYPT AT SALZBURG 885

SECRETARY KISSINGER'S NEWS CONFERENCES
AT BRUSSELS AND SALZBURG 907

U.S. REAFFIRMS SUPPORT FOR NONPROLIFERATION TREATY
AT REVIEW CONFERENCE

*Statement by Fred C. Iklé
and Text of Final Declaration of Conference 921*

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

For index see inside back cover

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. LXXII, No. 1879

June 30, 1975

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, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements, addresses, and news conferences of the President and the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become 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

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

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

President Ford Visits Western Europe, Attends NATO Meeting, and Meets With President Sadat of Egypt at Salzburg

President Ford left Washington May 28 for a trip to Brussels, Madrid, Salzburg, Rome, and Vatican City, returning June 4. Following are texts of President Ford's address to the North Atlantic Council and the NATO communique, together with remarks and toasts exchanged by President Ford with Chief of State Generalissimo Francisco Franco and President of Government Carlos Arias Navarro of Spain, Chancellor Bruno Kreisky of Austria, President Anwar al-Sadat of Egypt, and President Giovanni Leone of Italy.

DEPARTURE, ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE, MAY 28

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9

Mr. Vice President: Let me say at the outset that this trip to Europe has great significance not only to us but I think on a much broader basis. We live in a world today which has issues of tremendous importance, whether it's energy, the economy, diplomacy, security. And, of course, all of the answers must come not just from ourselves but from our friends throughout the world.

Our first stop on this trip will be in Brussels, where I will meet with the leaders of the North Atlantic alliance to jointly assess the state of the NATO alliance and help to plan for a better future. I want to reaffirm at this time the U.S. commitment to the North Atlantic Treaty, which is so vital to America's security and America's well-being.

In Spain I will review with Spanish leaders the expanding cooperation which is essential and as Spain assumes an increasingly important role both in the Atlantic and the Mediterranean areas.

In Austria my meetings with President Sadat of Egypt will center on Middle Eastern developments and the evolution of U.S.-Egyptian relations. American interests as well as those of our allies depend upon events that come about in the months ahead in the Middle East. Our policy in that important area of the globe is one goal—that of achieving a just peace. And I also welcome the opportunity while in Austria to meet again with Chancellor Kreisky.

Following the NATO summit in Brussels, my meetings in Rome with President Leone and other leaders of the Italian Government will permit us to review the many important interests we share as allies and as very good friends. I look forward to the opportunity to meet with His Holiness Pope Paul VI to discuss humanitarian subjects of importance to people throughout the world.

There is much work to be done on this relatively brief trip. But I feel confident that I can represent a strong and united America—an America determined, with its allies, to safeguard our vital interests. The United States is equally determined to reduce the chances of conflict, to increase cooperation, and to enhance the well-being of Americans and all peoples. I go determined to advance our common interests with our friends and allies and with great pride in our great country.

ARRIVAL, BRUSSELS, MAY 28

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9

Your Majesties, Prime Minister Tindemans, Secretary General Luns [Joseph Luns, Secretary General of NATO], ladies and gentlemen: Thank you so very much for

your warm and very gracious welcome to Brussels. It is always a great privilege and pleasure to return to the city that many know as the capital of Europe.

Thirty years ago, Western Europe was the victim of wartime devastation, facing hostile forces seeking to dominate the entire continent. The courageous leaders on both sides of the Atlantic responded by creating the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Our alliance has withstood the changes and the tests of the past 26 years. It has helped to secure freedom and prosperity for the Western world. It is fitting that the purpose of my first trip, Your Majesty, to Europe as President of the United States is to participate in a NATO summit.

I want my NATO colleagues and the people of Europe to know:

—That our great alliance remains very strong—to guarantee that vitality, we must vigorously address the problems confronting us;

—That the United States is convinced that détente with the East can only proceed on a foundation of strong and secure alliance defenses;

—That NATO is the cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and has the unwavering support of the American public and of our Congress; and

—Finally, that our commitment to this alliance will not falter.

It is in this spirit that I meet with my colleagues in NATO to discuss issues of direct concern to the peace, the security, and the prosperity of our Atlantic community.

It is also in this spirit that I respond, Your Majesty, to your very warm welcome. Belgium's hospitality as a host to NATO and to the European Communities has made it the heart of both the European and the Atlantic worlds.

Relations between the United States and Belgium remain confident and mature. I know that we will continue as close friends and warm allies.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Secretary General, members of the Council: President Truman, in 1949, transmitted the text of the North Atlantic Treaty to the Congress of the United States with his assessment of its importance.

Events of this century (he wrote) have taught us that we cannot achieve peace independently. The world has grown too small.

The security and welfare of each member of this community depends on the security and welfare of all. None of us alone can achieve economic prosperity or military security. None of us alone can assure the continuance of freedom.

So spoke President Truman. These words, describing the interdependence of the North Atlantic nations, are as accurate today as they were a quarter century ago.

On the 25th anniversary of the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, leaders of the NATO nations met here in Brussels to reaffirm the Declaration on Atlantic Relations, the fundamental purposes of an alliance that had fulfilled its promises by providing for the security, promoting the welfare, and maintaining the freedom of its members.

We meet here today to renew our commitment to the alliance. We meet to remind our citizens in the 15 member nations, by our presence, of the strength and stability of the transatlantic ties that unite us and to restate our pledge to collective self-defense.

We are assembled to address the serious problems we face and to review the steps we must take to deal with them.

Renewal of our commitment to the alliance is the most important of these purposes. The United States of America, unconditionally and unequivocally, remains true to the commitments undertaken when we signed the North Atlantic Treaty, including the obligation in article 5 to come to the assistance of any NATO nation subjected to armed attack. As treaties are the supreme

¹As prepared for delivery; issued at Brussels (text from White House press release).

law of my land, these commitments are juridically binding in the United States. These commitments are strategically sound, politically essential, and morally justifiable and therefore command broad support in the United States. They remain the firm foundation, as they have for 26 years, on which our relationship rests. This foundation has well served the purposes for which it was created. It will go on serving these purposes, even in the face of new difficulties, as long as we continue our common resolve.

In the treaty we signed 26 years ago, and from which we drew confidence and courage, we pledged:

—To live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

—To safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of our peoples founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law.

—To promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

—To settle by peaceful means any international dispute in which any one of us may be involved.

—To eliminate conflict in international economic policies and encourage economic collaboration.

—To maintain and develop our individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid.

—To consult together when any one of us is threatened.

—To consider an armed attack against one as an armed attack against all.

There is no need today to improve on that statement of principles and purposes. It remains as clear, as resolute, and as valid today as when first adopted. But it is worth reminding ourselves of these pledges as we turn our attention and energies to the problems we now face both outside and within the alliance—problems very different from those we confronted 26 years ago.

As NATO heads of governments and friends, we have a duty to be frank and realistic with one another. Therefore, I must

cite the following matters of concern to the United States and of importance to the alliance:

—In Indochina, the events of recent months have resulted in enormous human suffering for the people of Cambodia and Viet-Nam, an ordeal that touches all human hearts. Because of the United States long involvement in Indochina, these events have led some to question our strength and reliability. I believe that our strength speaks for itself—our military power remains, and will continue to remain, second to none—of this let there be no doubt; our economy remains fundamentally sound and productive; and our political system has emerged from the shocks of the past year stronger for the way in which it met a severe internal test. Our actions will continue to confirm the durability of our commitments.

—There have been strains and difficulties within the alliance during the past year. Serious disagreements have marred relations among some members. The unity of the alliance and our common resolve have come into question.

—There are some problems that relate directly to our defense capabilities. I refer to increasing pressures to reduce the level of military commitments to NATO despite the fact that the forces of our potential enemies have grown stronger. We also face basic problems of military effectiveness. A generation after its creation, the alliance wastes vast sums each year, sacrificing military effectiveness. We have simply not done enough to standardize our weapons. We must correct this. We must also agree among ourselves on a sensible division of weapons development programs and production responsibilities. And we must do more to enhance our mutual capacity to support each other both in battle and logistically. The pressures on defense budgets throughout the alliance should by now have convinced each of us that we simply must rationalize our collective defense.

—In the field of energy, we are still not immune from the political pressures that result from a heavy dependence on external

sources of energy. Indeed, we are becoming more vulnerable each month. We have made joint progress in offsetting the effect of the action taken last year by the major oil-producing countries. But we have far more to do.

—In the Middle East, there remains a possibility of a new war that not only could involve the countries in the area but also sow discord beyond the Middle East itself, perhaps within our alliance.

This is a formidable array of problems. However, we have faced formidable problems before. Let us master these new challenges with all the courage, conviction, and cohesion of this great alliance. Let us proceed. It is time for concerted action.

At this important stage in the history of the alliance, we must pledge ourselves to six primary tasks:

—First, we must maintain a strong and credible defense. This must remain the foremost objective of the alliance. If we fail in this task, the others will be irrelevant. A society that does not have the vigor and dedication to defend itself cannot survive. Neither can an alliance. For our part, our commitment not to engage in any unilateral reduction of U.S. forces committed to NATO remains valid. But that is not enough. We must make more effective use of our defense resources. We need to achieve our long-standing goals of common procedures and equipment. Our research and development efforts must be more than the sum of individual parts. Let us become truly one in our allocation of defense tasks, support, and production.

—Second, we must preserve the quality and integrity of this alliance on the basis of unqualified participation, not on the basis of partial membership or special arrangements. The commitment to collective defense must be complete if it is to be credible. It must be unqualified if it is to be reliable.

—Third, let us improve the process of political consultation. We have made considerable progress in recent months but there is—as each of us knows—room for improvement by all parties if we are to maintain our solidarity. This is of particular importance

if we are to move forward together in our efforts to reduce the tensions that have existed with the Warsaw Pact nations for more than a quarter of a century. We should further cultivate the habit of discussing our approaches to those matters which touch the interests of all so that we can develop common policies to deal with common problems.

—Fourth, let us cooperate in developing a productive and realistic agenda for détente, an agenda that serves our interests and not the interests of others who do not share our values. I envision an agenda that anticipates and precludes the exploitation of our perceived weaknesses. One item on that agenda must be to assure that the promises made in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are translated into action to advance freedom and human dignity for all Europeans. Only by such realistic steps can we keep CSCE in perspective, whatever euphoric or inflated emphasis the Soviet Union or other participants may try to give it. Another agenda item should be the negotiations on mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe. We in NATO should be prepared to take appropriate initiatives in these negotiations if they will help us to meet our objectives. But the Soviet Union and its allies should also be prepared to respond in good faith on the common objectives both sides should be working toward—undiminished security for all, but at a lower level of forces.

—Fifth, let us look to the future of the West itself. We must strengthen our own democratic institutions and encourage the growth of truly democratic processes everywhere. Let us also look beyond our alliance as it stands today. As an important topic on this agenda, we should begin now to consider how to relate Spain with Western defense. Spain has already made, and continues to make, an important contribution to Western military security as a result of its bilateral relationship with the United States.

—Sixth, we should rededicate ourselves to the alliance as a great joint enterprise, as a commitment to follow common approaches to shared aspirations. We must build on the contribution our alliance already makes

through the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society in coping with the environmental problems of industrialized societies. We must address the issues of population, food, and raw materials. We must find ways to strengthen the world trading and monetary system and to meet the imperatives of energy development and conservation. With the wealth and technological skills which are the products of our free systems, we can make progress toward a better standard of life in all of our countries if we work together.

These six primary tasks of the alliance illustrate the breadth and depth of our responsibilities and opportunities. They reflect how very complex the world has become and how much more difficult it is to manage the alliance today than a generation ago. Then our problems were relatively simple to define. It was easier to agree on common solutions. Today the problem of definition seems more complicated. In many of our countries there has been a fragmentation of public and parliamentary opinion which has made it more difficult for governments to mobilize support for courses of action of importance to the alliance.

But there are constants as well, and they are, in the final analysis, more important than the complexities. Together, we continue to be the greatest reservoir of economic, military, and moral strength in the world. We must use that strength to safeguard our freedom and to address the grave problems that confront us.

I am proud of America's role in NATO, and I am confident of the future of our alliance.

As President of the United States, but also as one who has been a participant and close observer of the American political scene for close to 30 years, I assure you that my country will continue to be a strong partner. On occasion, in the public debate of our free society, America may seem to stray somewhat off course. But the fact is that we have the willpower, the technical capability, the spiritual drive, and the steadiness of purpose that will be needed. Today, we in the United States face our NATO

commitments with new vision, new vigor, new courage, and renewed dedication.

America's emphasis is on cooperation—cooperation within NATO and throughout the world. From diversity, we can forge a new unity. Together, let us build to face the challenges of the future.

TEXT OF NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL COMMUNIQUE, MAY 30²

1. The North Atlantic Council met in Brussels on 29th and 30th May, 1975 with the participation of Heads of State and Government.

2. As a result of their review of developments since the Ottawa Declaration on Atlantic Relations was signed in Brussels last year, the Allied leaders are strengthened in their resolve to preserve the solidarity of the Alliance and restore it where impaired by removing the causes which disturb it among Allies. They reaffirm that the essential purpose of the Alliance is to safeguard the independence and security of its members and to make possible the creation of a lasting structure of peace.

3. Serious problems confront the Allies in the pursuit of this purpose. The armed forces of the Warsaw Pact continue to grow in strength beyond any apparent defensive needs. At the same time, the maintenance of the Allied defence effort at a satisfactory level encounters new difficulties arising from the world-wide economic situation. The Allies are resolved to face such challenges together and with determination.

4. The collective security provided by the Alliance, on the basis of a credible capacity to deter and defend, is a stabilising factor, beneficial to international relations as a whole, and indeed an essential condition of détente and peace. In a troubled world subject to rapid transformation the Allies reaffirm that the security of each is of vital concern to all. They owe it, not only to themselves but to the international community, to stand by the principles and the spirit of solidarity and mutual assistance which brought them together as Allies. Accordingly the Allies stress their commitment to the provisions of the North Atlantic Treaty, and in particular Article 5 which provides for common defence.

5. The security afforded by the Treaty enables the Allies to pursue policies reflecting their desire that understanding and co-operation should prevail over confrontation. An advance along this road would be made if the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe were concluded on satisfactory terms and its words translated into deeds. The Allies hope that progress in the negotiations will

² Issued at Brussels at the conclusion of the meeting (text from press release 313 dated June 2).

permit such a conclusion in the near future. They reaffirm that there is an essential connection between détente in Europe and the situation relating to Berlin. The Allies participating in the negotiations in Vienna emphasize that the development of understanding and co-operation also requires mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe in a manner which would contribute to a more stable relationship and enhanced security for all.

6. The peoples of the Alliance share in the universal aspiration for justice and social progress. They desire that through concerted efforts there should emerge an international order which reflects the political, economic and social realities of our time. The Allies are resolved to co-operate with the other members of the international community on global problems such as those of population, food, energy, raw materials and the environment. The well-being of mankind depends on success in these common tasks.

7. The Allied leaders meeting in Council recall that the future of democracy and freedom throughout the world is closely linked to the future of those countries whose common heritage embraces these ideals and where they enjoy the widest popular support. With this in mind, they unanimously affirm that they will enhance the effectiveness and vitality of their association within the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty, which is fundamental not only to the security of the Allied nations but also to the preservation of the values to which they are deeply attached.

NEWS CONFERENCE, BRUSSELS, MAY 30

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9

President Ford: Let me first set out the basic reasons why we welcomed the United Kingdom's proposal for this meeting at the highest level and why we gave it support and thought it was very timely.

We wanted to reaffirm the need for undiminished defense efforts and to have a general discussion of the problems associated with collective defense.

Second, we wanted an opportunity in this Atlantic forum to review the issues on what we have called the new agenda—the energy problem and its ramifications, the food problem, the interaction of national economies.

We think—and we very much agreed with Chancellor Schmidt [Helmut Schmidt, Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany] and others—that these problems affect the well-being and future of all of the countries

of the alliance, as much as would a potential military threat.

Of course, we know there are other international bodies to deal specifically with these problems but we feel that this political forum is a good and suitable one in which to have a broad discussion of the approaches.

Third, we felt it timely to review the status of East-West relations, the progress of our efforts to achieve meaningful détente with countries of the East. This is particularly so because the Geneva Conference on Cooperation and Security in Europe is in its decisive phase.

Fourth, and finally, there are clearly some problems within the alliance itself. We felt it was desirable to have an opportunity to review these; where appropriate, to have some bilateral and private contacts. Among these problems is the dispute between Greece and Turkey and the uncertain developments in Portugal, which concern us.

I have been extremely pleased by the tone and the content of the remarks that were made around the NATO table. I feel that these discussions, the numerous bilateral contacts, the informal talks at the King's dinner last night and the Secretary General's luncheon today, and the final public statements fully justified this meeting.

In terms of our objectives, the common interests of all of the allies in a strong defense and in safeguarding our security by common efforts were reaffirmed. We also recognize that there is much room for improvement in this area, including with respect to more efficient use of the existing resources.

I think new impetus has been given to the work of the military bodies of the alliance. All of us came away, in my judgment, with a sense of urgency in dealing with the items on the new agenda, and we were especially pleased to hear Chancellor Schmidt's review of these issues.

I think it was a good expression of political will by the allies following the recent sessions of IEA [International Energy Agency] and the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development]. We reaffirmed the need for giving détente

real meaning in terms of the values of our countries.

We agreed to continue the close and full consultation among allies on East-West relations, as well as to continue to pool our efforts in ongoing negotiations like CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] and MBFR [mutual and balanced force reductions].

We faced alliance problems in a mature and a quite constructive way. I was struck by the fact that all allies stressed common interests even when—as in the case of Greece and Turkey—there exist differences in particular instances.

It is a measure of the general sense of satisfaction with this meeting that quite spontaneously there arose sentiment for holding these high-level meetings at more regular intervals, as proposed by Prime Minister Trudeau [Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada]. I would strongly support this.

We can be quite flexible about the precise manner in which such meetings are prepared and held, but it is clear that there was widespread feeling among allies that contact at the highest level, the highest political level, is valuable.

Finally, I found it noteworthy that many allies stressed that they did not feel the need of any special American reassurance concerning our commitment to the alliance. They stressed that they consider our commitment firm and vigorous. Their confidence is fully justified.

With that, I will be glad to recognize Mr. Cormier [Frank Cormier, Associated Press].

Q. Mr. President, the NATO communique laid heavy emphasis on military preparedness, and I wonder if this reflects any misgivings about the future of détente?

President Ford: I certainly did not have that impression, Mr. Cormier. The feeling was that by strengthening our allied forces, we could be more effective in implementing the détente approach.

On the other hand, any weakening of our military forces within the alliance could make it more difficult to proceed with détente

between not only the United States and the Soviet Union but between the East and the West in general.

Q. Mr. President, would you use nuclear weapons if there was a conventional attack on Europe by the Soviet Union?

President Ford: Miss Thomas [Helen Thomas, United Press International], I don't think that I should discuss military decisions at this time. I think a decision of that kind would have to be made in the proper channels. I, of course, would not expect, if our strength continues and détente prospers, that that there would be any need for such a hypothetical circumstance developing.

Q. Mr. President, what do you consider to be the most important achievements of your visit to Brussels?

President Ford: Mr. Smith [Joseph Kingsbury-Smith, Hearst Newspapers], I think it was extremely healthy for the heads of state to get together on this occasion because there had been some difficulties, some traumatic experiences, in Southeast Asia. There were rumors to the effect that the United States, because of that experience there, was retreating to an isolationist stature. It seemed to me that it was wise, under those circumstances, for me to come here representing the United States and speak so firmly, so unequivocally as to our commitment to the alliance.

But in addition, the exchange of views among the heads of state on the need for close cooperation in the economic field, and I say the economic field in the broadest sense—we recognize that the free world must have a healthy economy if we are to sustain an adequate military stature. And it is important therefore that we work together to move us all out of the recession that has been plaguing us for the last few months, and the exchange of views in this area, in my judgment, will be helpful in meeting this particular challenge. Of course, within the parameters of the economic problems, we did follow on the IEA, the OECD, on the questions of energy and other commodities. So those three areas—particularly, plus, I think the meeting itself—gave the people of

the 15 countries a feeling that unity did exist and that we had a solidarity that would continue the blessings that we have had in the last 26 years.

Q. Mr. President, in your interview with the five foreign journalists last week, you expressed your concern about Portugal, and I wonder if, after your meetings with the Portuguese leaders, that concern has been eased or not?

President Ford: Mr. Lisagor [Peter Lisagor, Chicago Daily News], we had an extremely candid discussion with the Portuguese Prime Minister and his colleagues. The Portuguese Prime Minister explained the goals of the political movement in his country. He explained, in some detail, the political setup as it existed and as they anticipated it would be for a period in the future.

I spoke very frankly about the concern of democratic forces in Portugal, and I particularly emphasized this because all of us in the alliance greeted the revolution that took place there about a year ago. We had much hope and we had much sympathy for the trends that developed as a result of that revolution.

Equally, however, I did point out the contradiction that would arise if Communist elements came to dominate the political life of Portugal, and it is my judgment that others among the allies had a somewhat similar concern.

There is a general agreement that the situation must be watched with care and concern but also with deep sympathy and friendship with the people of Portugal.

What I said last week, I think, coincides with what I have said today. We are all hopeful, but we have to be watchful.

Q. Mr. President, after the NATO rebuff with Spain, what new proposals have you in mind to shape the American-Spanish agreement?

President Ford: Could the question be repeated?

Q. The NATO rebuff with Spain. What

proposals do you have in mind at this time?

President Ford: We will be negotiating, of course, with the Spanish Government for the extension of base rights and the bilateral relationship. I don't think it is proper for me at this time to get into the details of those negotiations and the talks that will take place tomorrow.

I might, since the question was raised about Spain, indicate the situation as it developed here in the last 24 to 36 hours.

As I think most of you know, I believe very strongly that the role played by Spain through its contribution to Western defense by its bilateral U.S. defense relations is an important one.

The bilateral relations that the United States has with Spain, as we see it, does contribute significantly to the defense of the West.

Now, without speaking personally for any one of the other allies, I think this is an understood fact and, hopefully, therefore the negotiations that you speak of can be concluded successfully.

Now, if I could add one other comment vis-a-vis Spain and the allies, we, the United States, continue to favor a Spanish relationship with the alliance. We think this is important, even though we recognize the unlikelihood of it taking place in the future, or the immediate future.

But it is an issue that the alliance must face, and we hope that as time moves on, there will be a better understanding of it and hopefully a developing relationship.

Q. Mr. President, in your address to the NATO conference, you talked about partial membership or special arrangements in the alliance. We all know that Greece has a special arrangement now and that France has a special arrangement now. Would you tell us the differences, as you see them, between those two relationships and what ought to be done with them?

President Ford: Well, the comment that was included in my prepared text did not refer to France's permanent relationship. The comment in the text had specific relation-

ship to the circumstances involving Greece.

As you know, following the Cyprus difficulties of last summer, Greece made a decision to terminate its previous relationship with the allies. It is now in a different relationship than any one of the others in the alliance.

It is a relationship, however, that—we hope, once the Greek-Turkish dispute is resolved over Cyprus, that Greece will return to its previous status within the alliance. And, of course, the meetings that have been held between Greece and Turkey over the last several months, and the meeting that the Foreign Ministers of Greece and Turkey are having tomorrow, will hopefully lead to some progress in this dispute.

If that progress materializes and the dispute is settled, we are most hopeful that Greece will return to its permanent previous relationship within the alliance.

Q. Mr. President, the NATO communique refers to the need for deeds in terms of the accomplishments projected for the European Security Conference, and you also have referred to that, sir. Also, we have the problem of the SALT [Strategic Arms Limitation Talks] negotiation to be concluded. Do you see, sir, any risk that the timetable may be upset, which could affect the convening of a summit conference in Washington with Secretary General Brezhnev [Leonid I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union]?

President Ford: The CSCE negotiations are reaching a point where there is some reason for optimism. There are some points that must be resolved, but progress is being made.

I am not in a position to forecast when the final agreement will be achieved, if it is, but there is a possibility that the time schedule of several months ago might materialize, and if it does, then I think the follow-on SALT Two meeting in Washington can also be on schedule.

But, in both cases, there is no final agreement, so I hesitate to be precise as to a date in either case.

Q. Mr. President, in your head-to-head talks with some of the leaders from the other nations, did you carry the ball in the discussions or did you rely on Secretary Kissinger to do most of your talking? [Laughter.]

President Ford: Those bilateral discussions between myself and the heads of state were carried out in the traditional fashion. In each case, the Foreign Minister representing the other government and Secretary Kissinger were present.

They were constructive. They were, I think, a free discussion where the parties there fully participated.

Q. Mr. President, in your meetings with the full Council and with the individual heads of state and government, did there come up in the conversation the difficulties you have had in trying to get a Middle East peace settlement, and did you come away with a feeling that you will have support of the member nations in your efforts in Vienna [Salzburg] with President Sadat and later, in Washington, with Rabin?

President Ford: In almost every bilateral meeting, the question of the Middle East did come up. In each instance, we gave our re-assessment procedure. We indicated that I was meeting with President Sadat in Salzburg and then subsequently meeting with Prime Minister Rabin in Washington.

We pointed out the three alternatives that have been well written about. We indicated that any views or recommendations that might be made by the heads of state or the foreign ministers would be most welcome.

We did reemphasize that our objective in the Middle East was peace, that we could not tolerate stagnation or a stalemate. We felt that movement was essential in the recommendations that I do make, sometime the latter part of June, early July, will be a position of movement aimed at the objective of a secure peace in the Middle East, and I think, the feeling of the allies here was one of—supportive of the general objectives without

getting into any of the procedures, or the details.

The press: Thank you, Mr. President.

ARRIVAL, MADRID, MAY 31

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9

Generalissimo Franco, Mrs. Franco, friends of Spain and of the United States: I begin my visit in Spain with very real satisfaction that comes from renewing and underlining the traditional relationship and friendship between our two countries.

My last visit to Spain was at a time of mourning in the closing days of 1973. Today is a happier occasion. I look forward with keen interest to our discussions.

This is a time of rapid change and challenge worldwide. We shall respond to these new challenges, as we must, both individually and collectively. I have confidence in our proven ability to work together in the pursuit of common interests, and I have confidence in Spain, a nation with future of great promise.

The dignity, the pride, the resilience of the Spanish people have been forged over a history much longer than that of the United States. Spain has contributed much to the history and to the culture of the United States. Today, millions and millions of Americans speak the Spanish language.

My visit to Spain is above all a recognition of Spain's significance as a friend and as a partner. Our excellent relationship is confirmed in the 1974 Joint Declaration of Principles. Our peoples seek the same objectives of peace, progress, and freedom.

By geography and by history, Spain has a logical place in the transatlantic community. For more than 20 years, Spain has shared with America and with Europe the burdens of promoting the prosperity and the security of the Atlantic and Mediterranean regions. Spain can be proud of that contribution.

Generalissimo Franco, Your Excellencies, friends, it is my privilege to bring to you the greetings of the people of the United States. Our two countries look forward to a future

of expanding cooperation. I know that we will meet the challenges and the changes that lie ahead.

Thank you.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND SPANISH PRESIDENT ARIAS, MAY 31³

President Ford

Mr. President, Mr. Minister, Your Excellencies: For a quarter of a century, Spain and the United States have enjoyed the most cordial and the most productive ties, characterized by our common efforts to meet the danger of aggression against the Western community of nations and supported by mutual respect for the aspirations of our respective peoples to secure for themselves a better life.

Mindful as we have been of each other's concerns and needs, we have forged, fortunately, a harmonious and a very fine relationship.

We have met today to reaffirm our commitment to build this cooperation in a mutually beneficial manner.

The world has changed, as we well know, from when the first U.S.-Spanish friendship agreement which was signed in 1953. But the need for strong defenses has not lessened in any way whatsoever. Spain and the United States have, in the past, contributed together to the maintenance of a strong Western security. The present and future call for no less effort. The United States remains totally dedicated to this task.

It would be my observation that the cooperation being carried out in so many fields between our countries demonstrates the breadth of our interests, the depth of friendship, and the commitment of the United States and Spain to a better life for our citizens. Spain, of course, is an important part of our Atlantic conception.

³ Given at a luncheon hosted by President Ford at Moncloa Palace, Madrid; President Arias spoke in Spanish (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9).

Mr. President, I raise my glass and propose a toast to this spirit of friendship. May our cooperation be preserved and strengthened. May it assure peace for Spaniards and Americans alike. Mr. President.

President Arias

Mr. President: It constitutes for me a great honor to attend this working lunch, which you have so kindly invited me to.

During the tight schedule of your visit to our country, we will have the opportunity to keep a broad exchange of views, which will constitute the basis of an understanding with which to cement an official and positive cooperation of the one that fortunately has guided so far the relations between our two countries.

Spanish-American relationships have blended throughout history. For Spain, it is a motive of deep pride in her glorious past to have so substantially contributed to the origins of the great American nation, both during its discovery and its independence.

In the past, European inhabitants of territories which then became the United States were of Spanish origin. Also Spanish was the initial impulse and backing received by the forefathers of America in the heroic days of her access to the concert of free nations.

The last 25 years of understanding and cooperation between Spain and the United States has become particularly intense. This cooperation has been, I am sure, one of the fundamental supports for the existence of the free world.

Spain believes that the hour has come for this direct, loyal, and disinterested contribution on her part to be acknowledged in specific and practical terms by the nations that formed the Western world, to which our country belongs, as well as for its geographical position, its history, and its culture and for its past and present contributions.

Mr. President, this is not the first time that Spain has had the honor to receive you. You have come to Madrid before, when you represented your country in the event of the tragic death of my predecessor, Almirante

Carrero Blanco, a sorrowful occasion for all Spaniards, especially for those of us who had the privilege of sharing the responsibilities of government under his command.

Your visits then and today, we believe, fit in that long tradition of cooperation that I have already mentioned; that is why the Spanish people, my colleagues in the government, and myself think that nobody better than you can understand the depth and importance of existing cooperation between our countries, as well as the need for preserving such understanding for the future sake of values that belong to our common civilization and that have been so efficiently defended so far.

We congratulate ourselves, Mr. President, and we thank you for your visit to Spain. We are certain that you share with us the desire to continue our friendship, already a tradition. You can be sure that Spain trusts your leadership in the Western world and knows that our common objectives can be reached.

Allow me, Mr. President, to raise my glass for the perseverance of that spirit of friendship and understanding existing between Spain and the United States, for the friendship of the American people, as well as for yours.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND GENERALISSIMO FRANCO, MAY 31⁴

Generalissimo Franco

Mr. President: It has been for me both an honor and great affection to welcome here President Ford, whose human qualities and whose virtues as a statesman are well known to us all, also, his long political record in his service to his country and in the defense of world peace.

It also constitutes a special pleasure to my wife and to myself the presence among us of Mrs. Ford, whose personal charm and grace has conquered us all.

⁴ Given at a dinner hosted by Generalissimo Franco at the Royal Palace, Madrid; Generalissimo Franco spoke in Spanish (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9).

Finally, it is also noted with greatest affection to have here the distinguished guests that accompany you.

During nearly a quarter of a century, relations between Spain and the United States have followed a line of consolidation in our friendship, of participation in a series of common aims and objectives, of the nation of values that we as members of a free world share together.

With your visit now, you have intended to renew the attention of the government and the American people showed us on the occasion of former visits by your former predecessors, Presidents Eisenhower and Nixon.

I would like to extend to you, Mr. President, my gratitude and that of the Spanish people for proving to you in your visit to Madrid that Spain constitutes one of the fundamental stops in your visit to Europe, a visit which you are making as head of a country which leads the group of nations that forms the Western world.

Before the foreign threats that are looming over our civilization, on which we have to act now—subversion and terrorism, seeking without any doubt to destroy our way of life—the Western world is in need more than ever before for cohesion for the defense of values that are common to us all.

It can be said, Mr. President, that you will find in Spain a sincere friend ready to cooperate with generosity and reciprocity to defend those values, as well as to keep peace and justice among all nations.

Allow me, Mr. President, to raise my glass to the continued friendship of our two countries, to the personal welfare of yourself and Mrs. Ford, and to the peace and happiness of the country in whose name you are here today—the United States of America.

President Ford

Generalissimo Franco, Mrs. Franco, Your Royal Highnesses, distinguished guests, and friends: In 1953, our two nations embarked on a new course designed to increase cooperation and to enhance security. Our rela-

tionship is succeeding in its purposes in the past and at the present time. The independence of the West has been preserved. We have prospered in a manner that would have not been expected a quarter of a century ago. Our nations have both benefited.

Today's challenges, however, are much more complex. We must maintain strong and credible defenses while working to lessen tension. We live in a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent; cooperation becomes ever more important.

We are both proud of our independence, yet we recognize the need of working together. Each year marks increasing contacts, increasing cooperation between the Spanish and the American people in a growing number of fields ranging from medicine to urban development, to the arts, to agriculture, to science, and education.

To meet the needs of tomorrow, we must continue our cooperation, and I know this is a shared objective between your country and mine. As recognized in the 1974 Joint Declaration of Principles, our joint endeavor has strengthened the cause of peace. Through its bilateral defense cooperation with the United States, Spain is making a major contribution to the Western world.

Other nations of the transatlantic community have benefited from our cooperation, that of Spain and the United States. In our bilateral relations, we are prepared to draw practical consequences from these facts. We are both members of the international organizations created to increase cooperation among nations, such as the International Energy Agency. Such ties should be continually broadened to increase the strength of each, and we are determined that they will be.

Your Excellency, the warmth of your welcome today and the hospitality of the people of Spain has been very important to me and to my country. This delightful dinner in such splendid surroundings with so many friends has been the climax of a day filled with deeply moving experiences—from the demonstration of affection by the Spanish people who

greeted us today, to renewing friendships with you and Prince Carlos, and exchanging ideas for the first time, in a most profitable way, with President Arias Navarro. Each were very rewarding experiences.

They are eloquent testimony to the depth of friendship between our two countries.

I lift my glass to Spain and to the United States, to our growing friendship in the years ahead, to Generalissimo Franco, to His Royal Highness Prince Juan Carlos, and to the Spanish people.

STATEMENT ISSUED UPON PRESIDENT FORD'S DEPARTURE FROM MADRID, JUNE 1

White House press release (Madrid) dated June 1

As we depart Spain, Mrs. Ford and I wish to express our sincere gratitude to General and Mrs. Franco, to Prince Juan Carlos and Princess Sofia, to President and Mrs. Arias, and to the Spanish Government and to the Spanish people for the wonderful reception accorded to us.

The warmth with which we have been received, the cordial, frank, and productive discussions I have had with your highest officials, the friendship which we have found for the United States, have made our visit to Madrid an unforgettable experience which Mrs. Ford and I will long remember.

Many today question the course of the future, but I have no doubt of the increasingly important role Spain will play in that future, in the world as a whole and, particularly, in the West. Spain is a part, geographically and historically, of Europe. Spain is a part of the transatlantic community. Accordingly, I am sure the future holds for Spain a greater role in European and Atlantic organizations of importance to both of our countries.

You have our sincere thanks and appreciation for the wonderful welcome extended to us at all levels and during every moment of our stay. As a result of my meetings here, I am confident that the United States and Spain, working together, will produce a better life for our peoples and contribute to the prospects of a better life for people everywhere.

ARRIVAL, SALZBURG, JUNE 1

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9

Mr. Chancellor, Mrs. Kreisky, ladies and gentlemen: Thank you for your gracious welcome to Salzburg—and I am sorry that I tumbled in.

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to renew my acquaintance with you, Mr. Chancellor, your country, and the Austrian people.

Mr. Chancellor, 20 years after the signing of the State Treaty in 1955, Austria is a stable, prosperous country and an active participant in European and world affairs. Your hospitality in offering Salzburg as the site for my meetings with President Sadat reflects Austria's constructive international policy and the traditional warmth of the Austrian nation.

Mr. Chancellor, I look forward to my personal discussions with you today. I know personally of Austria's commitment to reaching peaceful solutions to the international problems from our productive talks in Washington last fall.

America is committed to the reduction of tension and the increase of cooperation in our efforts to achieve a peaceful world. The talks that we will have can contribute to this process.

I thank you very, very much.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND EGYPTIAN PRESIDENT SADAT, JUNE 1⁵

President Sadat

Mr. President, distinguished friends: It is with great pleasure that I welcome you and look forward to our talks. This is so in the light of my firm conviction that we should grant this historical moment and combine our efforts in order to defuse the explosive situation in the Middle East and

⁵ Given at a luncheon hosted by President Sadat at Schloss Fuschl, Salzburg (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9).

pursue the course of action we have initiated in the recent past for laying down a solid foundation for a just and durable peace.

Mr. President, it is seldom in history that the heads of state of two countries on which peace or war depends in such a strategic area as the Middle East meet together to build the foundation of normalcy, tranquillity, and the legitimacy for the peoples of the Middle East.

Salzburg, this beautiful city, will go into the annals of history marking a new development in our area, together with the evolution of our bilateral relations in such a manner that would promote more contact and understanding between the American and Egyptian people.

Mr. President, in a moment of such magnitude, what it needs is not only vision and wisdom but most of all leadership, coupled with the readiness and ability to take major decisions and implement them.

This is really the crux of the whole matter, and it is up to both of us to take the decision and restore peace and justice in conformity with the norms of international law and legitimacy.

Mr. President, it is often said that the Middle East problem is a complex one, and that this is the reason why it is not possible so far to find an equitable solution to that problem.

In my opinion and in all candor, I believe that there is no other problem which is easier to solve than the Middle East problem. It is a simple question as long as the parties concerned—including the superpowers who are, in one form or the other, wittingly or unwittingly, involved in the problem—adhere to the basic and undisputed principle: namely, the recognition of independence and territorial integrity of states, the inadmissibility of acquisition of territory by force, the acceptance and respect of the basic kind of self-determination for the Palestinian people and their right to live in a national home.

If all these principles are adhered to and respected by all the parties, then and only then belligerency can be terminated, and peace could reign over the Middle East with its strategic importance. Only then could the

countries of the area contribute to the progress and development of the international community at large. Hence, all countries existing in the area will continue to develop in their own way, and the state of peace and nonviolence will prevail.

In short, Mr. President, we are facing a historical challenge, and the whole world is watching our meeting. And I do not think that either of us will shrink his responsibility. Let us meet the challenge and prove to the world that we are people worthy of our own civilization and that the horizons of peace are not very far along as we act, and act with determination and vigor.

Distinguished friends, as a tribute to the wisdom of President Ford and his constructive efforts toward peace and friendship among nations and the mutual cooperation between our two countries, I invite you to drink a toast and wish him all the success and fulfillment.

Thank you.

President Ford

Mr. President and distinguished guests: I have long looked forward to meeting you, and I am especially happy that the arrangements were made for us to meet in this historic area in these beautiful surroundings.

I have heard so much from our Secretary of State concerning your forward-looking, statesmanlike views and attitudes; I am sure that we can have many, many constructive moments here in this wonderful area.

My great hope, of course, Mr. President, is that our next meeting will take place in the United States, where we can reciprocate for the warm and very gracious hospitality recently extended by you and the Egyptian people to so many of my fellow Americans, for which I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. President, we can take great pride in the accomplishment achieved through the very close cooperation of the past year and a half between your country and mine. Inevitably, there have been some disappointments. Nevertheless, I do not feel that these frustrations and difficulties should turn us

away from our mutual goal, which is the establishment of a durable peace, just and fair to all peoples of the Middle East.

I would like to take this opportunity to say with emphasis that the United States will not tolerate stagnation in our efforts for a negotiated settlement—stagnation and a stalemate will not be tolerated. A just and durable peace, fair and equitable to all parties, can and will be achieved.

Mr. President, you have impressed the American people and the world, in my judgment, by your statesmanship and by your wisdom. We understand quite clearly the historic significance of your policies and we will, in every way, attempt to be responsive to the opportunities that you have created.

I think you have demonstrated beyond any doubt, Mr. President, Egypt's sincere desire for peace by deeds as well as by your own fervent desire to turn the energies and the talents of your people toward the creation of a better life for them, and all peoples.

The United States is prepared. We recognize the problems you have and will do our utmost to be a helpful partner in your programs for progress of Egypt.

Mr. President, I would like to propose a toast: To your health and to your efforts on behalf of your people, and to the people of your country.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND AUSTRIAN CHANCELLOR KREISKY, JUNE 1⁶

Chancellor Kreisky

My dear Presidents, ladies and gentlemen: The people of Austria are honored and pleased that two leaders, two heads of state of such great importance, have decided to meet in Austria in order to become acquainted with one another here in the city and in the Land of Salzburg.

The Austrian Federal Government is aware of the political significance of this

meeting. It does not presume to seek a share in this dialogue. It only wants to express its hope that the deliberations between two statesmen of such great importance may serve the cause of peace and understanding among nations.

The Federal President has authorized me to raise my glass on his behalf and on behalf of the Austrian Federal Government to the personal well-being of the two Presidents and to the health and well-being of their nations.

President Ford

Chancellor Kreisky, President Sadat, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen: In the few hours that Mrs. Ford and I have been here, we have been struck by the remarkable charm and the character of Salzburg. And we thank our hosts in this area for their warmth and the friendship that they have shown us.

Austria and the United States have enjoyed warm and friendly ties over a long span of time. Our relationship during the postwar period has been especially close and mutually sustaining.

We value Austria's important role in the search for order and stability in the world, for its contributions in the Middle East, in Cyprus, and elsewhere, in the effort to preserve peace and work toward the negotiated resolution of international conflicts.

When I arrived this morning, I spoke of the reestablishment of a sovereign Austria, the 20th anniversary of which was celebrated just a few weeks ago. The State Treaty and subsequent rebuilding of Austria has served as a landmark for the postwar history.

This landmark demonstrates the possibility of achieving stability and security through negotiation and strict adherence to the principles of democratic self-determination and national sovereignty.

The conciliation demonstrated by all sides helped to produce the vigorous, dynamic, and prosperous Austria that we see today. It contributed to a stable, regional political environment. This experience proves a useful

⁶ Given at a dinner hosted by Chancellor Kreisky at the Residenz, Salzburg; Chancellor Kreisky spoke in German (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9).

lesson in the search for peace in other regions.

I am particularly grateful to your government and to you, Mr. Chancellor, for providing these hospitable surroundings for the meetings with President Sadat.

In our talks today, we have had a welcome opportunity to review the recent positive trends and relations between the United States and Egypt. We have also begun a very useful review of developments in the Middle East, and the exchange of views has been extremely helpful. It is my fervent hope that our talks will contribute to a settlement in the Middle East.

Mr. Chancellor, I raise my glass to Austria and to the objectives that we seek and to you and to world peace.

REMARKS TO THE PRESS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND EGYPTIAN PRESIDENT SADAT, JUNE 2⁷

President Ford: President Sadat and myself have concluded extensive discussions. It has been a pleasure for me to personally meet President Sadat, and I am appreciative for the opportunity of establishing a relationship with him.

I explained the considerations that are important, from our point of view, of the dedication that we have for a permanent peace based on a fair and equitable settlement.

The meetings were conducted, I think, in a very constructive manner.

After leaving here, in the weeks ahead I will have further consultations that I trust will lead to the overall objective that I seek of a permanent peace that will be in the best interests of all of the parties.

President Sadat: Well, ladies and gentlemen, if I may add some words, I consider that the big achievement in this meeting is that I have made the acquaintance of President Ford. I have always said, before I met

⁷ Made in the courtyard at the Residenz, Salzburg, at the conclusion of their meetings (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9).

him and when I saw Congress receiving him, that he is an honest and a straightforward man.

Now I must add that he is a peace-loving and peace-struggler, also. Added to what I said before, we had intensive talks and a complete survey of the whole situation, and we have discussed lots of considerations.

I shall be going back to my country, and we shall be discussing all the various aspects, and at the same time I shall be always in contact with President Ford.

And may I seize this opportunity to extend an invitation for President Ford to visit our country and to meet with our people, and we shall be very happy to have him among us.

Thank you.

Ronald H. Nessen, Press Secretary to President Ford: We will have a few questions. Miss Thomas [Helen Thomas, United Press International].

Q. I would like to address my question to both Presidents, and it is a two-part question.

Mr. President, first, did you reach any kind of an agreement on a second-stage disengagement which would involve step-by-step diplomacy? And two, did you discuss in any way the final form of a peace settlement within the context of the prewar 1967 borders?

President Ford: As I said in my opening statement, we took into consideration all of the circumstances that are necessary for any agreement, whether it was step-by-step or a comprehensive agreement. The considerations were on the broadest basis so that we could have a complete and total picture of what the problems are in seeking the solution that is what all of us want, which is peace on a fair and equitable basis, that being in the best interests of not only those in the Middle East but the world at large.

Q. My question is to Mr. President Ford. How do you expect the reaction in the Senate after the reassessment of the U.S. policy in the Middle East? And don't you consider the letter of the Senators to be—delivered

to you before this meeting with President Sadat—as a sort of pressure?

President Ford: The reassessment that I have been conducting for the last several months has included a great many suggestions from within the United States—experts in both political parties. It has included the observations and suggestions of those from other nations throughout the world, of course including the Middle East.

I have never felt that the suggestions that have come from any source in the context of pressure. We have sought to assemble all of the information that would be aimed at seeing all of the difficulties, all of the benefits. There is a wealth of information that is vitally important, and on the benefit of those recommendations my reassessment will be concluded with a plan that I will submit at the appropriate time.

Q. President Sadat, if I may, sir, I believe you have said that real peace between Egypt and Israel is not possible in this generation. Have you changed your mind or, in fact, has Egypt changed its position in any way since last March?

President Sadat: Well, I didn't say, for the first thing, that peace cannot be achieved. On the contrary. In my speech I said—in spite of the fact that it is a very complicated and difficult problem—but it is very easy to reach a solution when we solve the very simple, fundamental basis of the whole conflict.

I said, and I say always, that the biggest achievement we can do is that we end the state of belligerency that has already taken more than 27 years up till this moment. The peace process will be a long one, so it should be clear, and I think I made myself clear.

Q. President Ford, just to follow up your answer to Miss Thomas, what do you envisage the next step to be in the movement toward the settlement of the Middle East crisis?

President Ford: We have not made any decision as to the next step. There are, of course, a number of alternatives. I think it is premature at this time for me, not having

concluded the full consultation that I had programed, to indicate in any way whatsoever that a final decision has been made. The objective is clear—it has been from the outset—and it will be the aim of whatever recommendation that I make as a result of the reassessment.

If I might, I would like to add, the discussions between President Sadat and myself have reaffirmed the bilateral relationship between Egypt and the United States, a bilateral relationship that I feel has been constructive, and the discussions that we have had for the last day or so have reaffirmed the continuity of this relationship.

The press: Thank you, Mr. Presidents.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND EGYPTIAN PRESIDENT SADAT, JUNE 2^{*}

President Ford

Mr. President: As you know, it has been a very high privilege for me to meet with you and discuss our mutual problems, as well as our hopes and our aspirations for a joint and a very durable peace in the Middle East [based] on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

I am also glad to see so much of Henry here in Salzburg, I have often thought he might have been taking up residence in the Middle East. [Laughter.]

As you know, the United States will celebrate its 200th anniversary of independence next year. We are now taking a new look at our own early history. As our celebration begins, we have new pride in the courage, the vision, and the wisdom and determination of our forefathers.

America has long stood for peace and human progress based upon justice. And I want you to know, Mr. President, that these remain in our objectives now and, I am certain, in the future. They have the full

^{*} Given at a luncheon hosted by President Ford at Schloss Klessheim, Salzburg (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9).

support of the American people, regardless of their political persuasion.

You and I have very thoroughly reviewed the situation in the Middle East and its implications for the area and the world as a whole. We have discussed the approaches to the continuing process of negotiation. The final decision, of course, cannot be made until other consultations have been held.

We both are totally agreed on the need, indeed, the imperative, of giving momentum to progress toward peace. And, as I have pledged to you, Mr. President, the United States will not permit a stalemate or a stagnation to develop in this all-essential progress. And I believe that our consultations have made a very important contribution toward this objective.

Mr. President, you gave me a very illuminating picture of your plans to put Egypt on the path of sustained economic progress for the future. And I assure you that the United States is prepared to provide Egypt with current assistance as a basis for a long-range economic development, both bilaterally and in cooperation with other states and other international institutions. And I will work with our Congress to give reality to this continuing pledge.

Mr. President, I have found in our talks that we both share the same goal—peace and progress for our peoples and for all humanity. For that reason, I am gratified that our two countries have strengthened friendship dramatically in the past 2½ years and begun cooperation in so many broad fields. I am determined, Mr. President, to continue and to expand this friendship.

Nothing is more apparent in today's world than the fact that the destinies of nations are intertwined. The interdependence of nations is not simply an abstract concept; it is a reality that all peoples and all nations must recognize. The problems of one are the problems of all; the progress of one contributes to the progress of all.

We in the United States will conduct our relations with you, Mr. President, in this

broad spirit. And we know this is your desire as well. Together, Mr. President, and in cooperation with other states that seek peace, progress, and human dignity, we will achieve our common goal.

Gentlemen, I ask all of you to join me in a toast to the President and to the people of Egypt, to peace in the Middle East, and in the cause of peace for all peoples.

President Sadat

Dear President Ford, distinguished friends: It was only yesterday when I first met President Ford in person to deepen the acquaintance, respect through the exchange of letters and views in the last few months.

I am pleased to say that our first get-together was a delightful and illuminating one, as it revealed to me President Ford's great vision, compassion, and genuine commitment to the cause of peace.

Not surprisingly, I found that the President agrees fully with me that the situation in the Middle East is an explosive one that makes it imperative on all the parties concerned to take the urgent actions and measured decisions if we are to avoid another unfortunate outburst of violence.

No one who is sincere in his desire to establish peace in that sensitive and strategic area can possibly tolerate a stalemate or stagnation. Such a state of affairs does not in the least reduce tension or stimulate the process of peace. On the contrary, it gives way to increased mistrust, accumulated frustration, and escalated tensions.

We cannot keep the conflict within manageable proportions unless we strive to maintain the momentum of peace through concrete actions that could convince people that peace is not only a desirable ideal but also a practical and workable proposition.

I am equally pleased with President Ford's sincere desire to strengthen the bilateral relations between our two countries and peoples in the interest of world peace and international cooperation.

Dear friends, while I invite you to stand

up and drink a toast for President Ford and the American people, I would like to state that we are looking forward to seeing the President and Mrs. Ford in Cairo.

ARRIVAL, ROME, JUNE 3

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9

President Leone, Mrs. Leone, Mr. Prime Minister, Excellencies, and friends: Mr. President, Mrs. Ford and I express our grateful appreciation for the very warm and generous welcome. We are delighted to be here.

The United States and Italy are close friends and very close allies. This fact was apparent during President Leone's visit to Washington in 1974. That visit was memorable to me as the first visit by a European head of state to the United States during my Presidency. The very positive results of our discussions were reflected in the U.S.-Italian joint statement issued last September.

Now, during my first visit to Europe as a President, I come to Rome to continue our consultations on the many, many issues of great importance to both of our countries.

Our discussions today will be inspired and strengthened by the results of the NATO summit meeting in which both our countries participated last week, and by our reaffirmation, together with other NATO member nations, of our dedication to Alliance goals.

Extraordinary ties of friendship and kinship link our people. It is my pleasure to bring to you, Mr. President, the greetings and the very high regard of the people of the United States for Italy. In a world of rapid and dramatic change, Italian-American friendship stands out as a symbol of stability and resolve.

I know that our meetings, Mr. President, will reinforce the traditional bonds of affection and cooperation between our two countries, thus contributing to our goals of peace and prosperity for Italy, for the United States, and for all nations.

TOASTS BY PRESIDENT FORD AND ITALIAN PRESIDENT LEONE, JUNE 3⁹

President Leone

Mr. President: It is with great pleasure that I take this opportunity of again expressing to you, to Mrs. Ford, to the Secretary of State, Dr. Kissinger, as well as to the other eminent members of your party, the most cordial greetings of the Italian people, the government, and myself, and to confirm to you my great and sincere satisfaction at having you as so welcome a guest in our country.

I should like to say first of all how greatly we appreciate the fact that you have wanted to include this visit to Italy in the first trip that you are making to Europe, thereby giving us the opportunity of resuming the fruitful dialogue so happily begun on the occasion of my visit to the United States in September of last year, a visit of which I harbor the most happy memories and whose positive results were expressed in the joint declaration of Washington. To this document we attach the value of a substantial step forward in Italo-American collaboration. And a similar importance attaches to the two meetings that we have had here in Rome with the Secretary of State.

During this morning's talks, we noted with great interest your impressions regarding the results of your intensive diplomatic activity of these last few days. These talks have brought to the attention of our government and public opinion the significance and the importance of this first mission that you are undertaking to Europe in order to stress the solidarity between the United States and her European allies with a view to ever more promising developments of the process of détente among all nations and the consolidation of the cause of peace. We particularly

⁹ Given at a luncheon hosted by President Leone at the Quirinale Palace, Rome; President Leone spoke in Italian (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9).

appreciate the efforts you are making to find a peaceful and lasting solution of the Middle East crisis, a matter, as you well know, to which Italy is particularly sensitive.

The objective of peace that the United States pursues offers new perspectives, thanks to the recent meetings of Salzburg and to the further diplomatic action that the United States intends to carry on. As always, Italy gives its full support to these efforts with the greatest commitment.

Italy continues to consider decisive the role that our friend the American nation can play in insuring for the international community an orderly and peaceful future based on the respect of the principles of freedom, democracy, and progress that constitute the common heritage of our civilizations, the firmest of foundations for our understanding and our alliance. For our part, we should like to assure you that we shall make every effort to collaborate—in the spirit of friendship and cooperation that binds us to the United States and to our European allies—in creating, maintaining, and consolidating everywhere a climate of confidence and peace and in promoting a harmonious economic development to insure the balanced progress of all peoples and nations. The grave problems of our times call for a full understanding and the active collaboration of all countries, the industrialized ones as well as the developing ones. Italy will make its convinced contribution to the farsighted action that the United States is undertaking to this end.

We have welcomed with profound satisfaction the accent that you placed at the recent Brussels meeting of the Atlantic alliance on the fundamental value of the relations between America and Europe for the purpose of strengthening security and insuring a more even development of the two sides of the Atlantic.

Italy, considering the Atlantic alliance as an irreplaceable instrument of equilibrium and peace, has always held that a more concrete and effective European dimension would also give new vigor to the alliance itself.

As you know, we in Italy feel a profound

European vocation. This vocation is reinforced by our realization that a strong and united Europe will be an essential element in an increasingly close collaboration with the United States and the West in general for the solution of the great problems of peace, stability, and harmonious progress of the whole world that characterize our times.

Our meeting of this morning will give new impetus to the already fertile collaboration that has been instituted between the United States and Italy with a view to attaining the solutions that we all look forward to in a framework of continued and, indeed, strengthened solidarity among the peoples of the West. I am sure that a similar result will be obtained by the discussions that you and the Secretary of State will have this afternoon with our Prime Minister.

Mr. President, America is about to celebrate the second centenary of the Declaration of Independence, a document that embodies ideals and aspirations that originated, among others, also in my own country. In this connection, I need only recall that the name of an Italian figures among the signatories of the Declaration and that Benjamin Franklin had frequent contacts with the more enlightened thinkers in Italy. And Italy therefore feels that it wants to participate wholeheartedly in this celebration.

In this spirit, then, I raise my glass to the good health and well-being of yourself, Mr. President, and Mrs. Ford, to the success of your lofty task at the head of the American nation, and to the live and deep-reaching friendship that binds Italy to the United States.

President Ford

Mr. President and Mrs. Leone, Mr. Prime Minister, and Excellencies: I am delighted to be in the Eternal City of Rome, the justly celebrated capital of Italy.

It is a pleasure and an honor to be with you today in this hospitable and historic palace. I am mindful of the symbolism of this visit, underlining as it does the traditional friendship and ties between our two countries.

We in America have just begun the cele-

bration of the 200th anniversary of the U.S. struggle for independence. The very name "America" derives from an Italian navigator. Among the Italian contributors to the early history of the American Republic are William Paca, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, Filippo Mazzei, a close friend and collaborator of Thomas Jefferson.

Since the very beginning of our country, the human ties between Italy and the United States have enriched America's life, America's culture, and have served to establish the basis for the deep and very warm friendship that exists today.

For a quarter of a century as a Member of the U.S. Congress, I served in our national Capitol building. As a result, I was mindful of the contributions of artists and skilled workers from Italy to design, to construct, and decorate our national Capitol.

The paintings, the carvings, and the statues of Italian conception and artistry have become enshrined at the very heart of our government as a part of America's history and America's heritage. This symbolizes only one aspect of our great debt to Italy.

Our hearts are lifted when we hear America's many bands playing stirring airs, and we do recall that President Thomas Jefferson, who loved the music of Italy, invited Italian musicians to create our first military band.

In considering those who have made distinguished contributions to the relations between our countries, I would like to take this occasion to express my appreciation for the outstanding service of your Ambassador to the United States, Ambassador Ortona. He has gained the respect and the appreciation of not only American Presidents and Secretaries of State, but also of the American people.

Americans in Italy never feel that they are among strangers. We always have the feeling that we are with close friends. In this relationship, our two countries share much in common:

—Our cultural, economic, fraternal, commercial, and social ties affirm our continued cooperation and close association.

—Our governments are committed to a

world of freedom and peace and to overcoming tensions which threaten the peace.

—We are committed to the strength of an alliance that has kept more than a quarter century—a quarter of century of peace on the continent and which is indispensable to our concerted efforts to reduce tensions and to increase cooperation.

—Of first importance, we share a firm dedication to democratic government and the principles of freedom and liberty.

We in America value the role of Italy in the world, your contributions to the Atlantic alliance, and your efforts toward a stronger and more cohesive Europe working with the United States.

These bonds and shared goals, Mr. President, were set forth in the joint statement issued on the occasion of your visit to the United States last year. They have been reaffirmed in our discussions today.

At the NATO summit conference in Brussels last week, the member nations of the Atlantic alliance renewed their commitment to the Atlantic alliance and to the principles of friendship and cooperation and the common defenses which are its foundation.

I must emphasize how much the United States values Italy's partnership and Italy's contributions to the alliance. We greatly admire the leaders and the people of Italy in carrying through difficult economic measures which are crucial in fighting today's economic difficulties. We are keenly aware of Italy's strengths. We are proud of our alliance with you and take confidence in the knowledge that this relationship is welcomed by you.

Mr. President, the warmth of the welcome given me today by you, by your gracious and charming wife, and by the people of Rome on behalf of all of the Italian people has been in the highest tradition of Italian hospitality. For me, this delightful luncheon with so many friends symbolizes the depth of friendship between our two countries.

In this spirit, I lift my glass in toast to the United States and to Italy, to our continuing, growing friendship in the years ahead, to President Leone, to Prime Minister Moro, and to the great Italian people.

Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 9

President Ford

President Leone, Mr. Prime Minister, Your Excellencies: Upon our departure from Italy, Mrs. Ford and I wish to express our profound gratitude to President and Mrs. Leone, to Prime Minister and Mrs. Moro, and to the Italian Government and the Italian people for the wonderful reception accorded us on this occasion and this visit.

The warmth with which we have been received, the cordial and productive discussions that I have had with your highest leaders, and the friendship and good will expressed everywhere for the United States have made this a memorable experience for all of us.

For over a quarter of a century, Italy and the United States have had a remarkable identity of purpose in working as democracies with shared ideals toward the goals of an enduring peace and prosperity for our people.

We have worked together as allies in NATO to preserve peace and to insure stability in Europe and in the Mediterranean. We can take satisfaction in the successes we have achieved.

As a result of my many meetings here in Rome, I am confident that the United States and Italy together, as partners in the Atlantic alliance, will enjoy similar success in meeting the complex and difficult challenges before us.

In this way, we can contribute to the prospects of a peaceful and prosperous life for the people throughout the world.

On behalf of Mrs. Ford and myself, you have our sincere thanks, our deepest appreciation for the hospitality and the many kindnesses extended to us at all levels during every moment of our stay.

As we prepare to leave this beautiful country, I am reminded of the saying that fond

memories spare departures for final sorrow. Thus, we cannot leave Italy in sorrow, for we carry far too many warm memories of a very special day with gracious friends.

I thank you.

President Leone¹⁰

Mr. President: Upon your departure, I should like once again to say to you and Mrs. Ford how pleased we are to have had this opportunity of meeting you again.

The intensive and fruitful talks that I, Prime Minister Moro, Foreign Minister Rumor, and other members of the Italian Government have had with you and Dr. Kissinger have once again concerned the friendly, constructive, and firm spirit with which our two countries are facing the problems which concern them both on the bilateral and the general plane.

Your trip to Europe, in which you so opportunely included this short visit to Rome, has been of great importance. The Brussels summit in particular has shown the vitality of the alliance. It is a guarantee of our collective security and also an essential condition for détente and peace.

Our talks today have concerned the existence of a full agreement of views on this essential point and a common wish to seek the solution of problems relating to peace and to political and economic stability in Europe and in the Mediterranean, in particular in the Middle East area, as well as those problems of a global dimension which are characteristic of our ties.

Thank you for the kind words you have just said and for the lofty things you said about my country. In thanking you again for the good will that you have displayed to us, I wish you every success in our ongoing cooperation and in your enlightened work at the head of the American nation.

¹⁰ President Leone spoke in Italian.

Secretary Kissinger's News Conferences at Brussels and Salzburg

BRUSSELS, MAY 29

Press release 308 dated May 30

Secretary Kissinger: Ladies and gentlemen, I will begin with the President's presentation at the NATO session; then I will summarize the bilateral meetings that took place today. I know you have already been briefed on the ones this morning, but I will sum them up anyway.

On the speech that the President made to the NATO Council, you will have the text, and therefore there is no point in my going through all of the portions.

The President began by summing up the nature of the original American commitment, the purposes that NATO originally had been designed to serve, and stated his conviction that in his view these required no new restatement, that they were as valid today as they were then.

He then discussed a number of problems that he saw before the alliance, or problems that might affect the alliance in the field of defense, in the field of disagreements that had arisen between some allies, the field of energy, and with respect to the Middle East.

He then discussed six major areas that in his view required attention.

First, the need for a strong and credible defense. He pointed out that without security no other objectives would make any sense. He called for meeting the longstanding goals for common procedures of equipment, for a more systematic research and development, and reiterated our commitment not to engage in any unilateral withdrawal of American forces. You can take that as a given of our policy that outside the MBFR [mutual and balanced force reductions] framework the United States will not withdraw any forces from NATO.

The second point he stressed was the need to preserve the quality and integrity of the

alliance on the basis of unqualified participation and not on the basis of partial membership or special arrangements that individual countries might wish to make with the alliance.

Q. Does that mean that France—

Secretary Kissinger: I will answer questions later. Let me just run through this.

The third was a call for an improvement in the process of political consultation. As you know, it has been our position throughout our discussions with our allies that solidarity with respect to defense cannot be maintained for an indefinite period of time unless there is solidarity with respect to political objectives and, in our view, increasing them with respect to the new agenda which the President treated separately.

Fourth, the President asked for a joint action in developing a productive and realistic agenda for détente that serves our interest and not the interests of others, an agenda, in other words, that we could do jointly rather than each of the individual members separately. He related this to the European Security Conference and to the mutual balanced force reduction.

Fifth, he called attention to the future of the West itself, calling for the strengthening of our democratic institutions within the alliance and encouraging the growth of democratic processes within the members of the alliance.

Sixth, he emphasized that the vitality of the alliance depended on the conception by the members of the alliance as a great joint enterprise and not simply as a series of individual efforts and not purely as a defense, and he called attention to the agenda which we have been putting forward all week in other forums—of energy, of population, of food, and of raw materials in addition to the need for strengthening the world trad-

ing and monetary systems—and he called for cooperative action in all of these things.

He expressed his conviction that the United States had trials over the recent months; it is nevertheless in a strong position—that we possess the willpower, the technical capability, and the spiritual conviction to do what is needed to master the agenda that he outlined.

Now, so much for his presentation at the NATO Council. He was the only speaker except for a military briefing by the Chairman of the Military Committee.

Now, we can proceed in one of two ways: I can either sum up the bilateral talks and then take your questions, or I can take questions on this and then—should I continue?

Q. Yes. Sum it up.

Secretary Kissinger: Sum up the bilateral talks?

Q. Yes, that is correct.

Secretary Kissinger: The President met during the day, as you know, with the Prime Minister of Luxembourg, with the Prime Ministers of Greece and Turkey, with the Chancellor of the Federal Republic, the Prime Minister of Denmark, and with the Prime Minister of Portugal. If I have forgotten somebody, we are in a major diplomatic problem. [Laughter.]

As I understand it, you have already been briefed about the meetings that took place this morning. Let me just add one comment about the discussions that are taking place with the representatives from Greece and Turkey.

We are not, as we have repeatedly pointed out, acting as mediator. What we are attempting to do is, one, to contribute to a framework in which the negotiations between the parties would be eased. We are therefore talking to the parties about general principles and approaches that could be followed in moving toward a solution of the dispute between them, because we believe that the quarrel between two allies—both of whom we value—is against the interests of the alliance, against their own interests.

We believe that while these negotiations

are going on, neither side should take any military actions or make any military threat or take any steps that could lead to military action, and we have expressed that conviction to the parties concerned.

As you know, the Greek and Turkish Foreign Ministers are going to meet tomorrow, and the Greek and Turkish Prime Ministers are meeting on Saturday.

I will be meeting with the Greek Foreign Minister, maybe the Prime Minister, tomorrow, and I will also meet with the senior Turkish official.

We hope that this process will contribute not only to easing the tensions but to generating a framework in which a solution to their dispute becomes easier and is ultimately attained, and within these limits which I have described to you, we thought the talks went well.

As for the meeting with the German Chancellor, he is, of course, a very close ally and a very good friend. We reviewed the state of the alliance, the state of East-West relations. We had a brief discussion on the Middle East, but we spent most of our time on the nature of the economic conditions in the industrial world and the problem of industrial growth as they affected stability, cohesiveness of our societies and of our alliance, as well as the relationship between the industrial societies and the developing society.

The meeting with the Prime Minister of Denmark dealt with the general problems of the alliance, and were such common issues as their perception of the Portuguese situation and our joint views on East-West relations.

For the benefit of the fraternity of Foreign Ministers, I want to point out that in each case the Prime Ministers, or Chancellors, were accompanied by their Foreign Ministers, who made a major contribution to the discussion. Therefore I hope you will—yes, the American Foreign Minister also contributed. [Laughter.] Just a minute. You don't want to hear about Portugal? [Laughter.] I will be glad to take questions now.

In the meeting with the Portuguese Prime Minister, the discussion was very frank and was conducted in a friendly atmosphere. The President explained his views about the im-

fact on NATO of a government in which a Communist might play a significant role. The Portuguese explained to us the nature of their domestic structure, which is, as you all know, unique in the NATO alliance, and there was a very frank and, I believe, mutual exchange of views.

This is the extent of the bilaterals.

Now I will take some questions.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when you outlined the President's remarks, including the point that special arrangements could not be made, does that mean that if Portugal becomes Communist dominated, there is no way to fit it into NATO? Is that what he was trying to say?

Secretary Kissinger: No, I think that what we were saying, in elliptical diplomatic language, is that the special arrangements that various member nations have already attempted to make cannot become the normal pattern if the alliance is to survive in its present form.

Q. Do you mean Greece pulling out on the military side and Turkey threatening and that kind of thing?

Q. Question, sir?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is, in Helen Thomas' precise formulation, Greece pulling out of the alliance, Turkey threatening, or that sort of thing, and the answer is—

Q. Military bases.

Secretary Kissinger: The answer is we mean that sort of thing. [Laughter.]

Q. Dr. Kissinger, you are always so enlightening in your elliptical terms. Thank you. [Laughter.]

Secretary Kissinger: That is another sort of thing. [Laughter.]

Q. Mr. Secretary, did the Turkish Prime Minister, according to one report, tell the President that he would prefer not to have the United States act as a mediator or to intervene and leave it to both sides to settle this type of dispute?

Secretary Kissinger: No, that did not hap-

pen. We have never said that we were acting as mediators. We did not put ourselves forward as mediators, nor did the Turkish Prime Minister tell us what role he wanted us to play or that he didn't want us to play any role. The discussions with the Turkish leaders were in the framework that had originally been charted in my two visits to Ankara, and there was no such implication.

It is, of course, clear that the basic negotiation will have to take place between the Greek and Turkish communities on Cyprus, as well as between the Greek and Turkish Governments. Our role is to facilitate, to help, as we are requested, and perhaps to come up with an occasional idea.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the United States having expressed its concern about unqualified membership in NATO, what does it intend to do about it? Were there any specific proposals, or does the United States have any specific proposals to carry out this intention?

Secretary Kissinger: No.

Q. Question?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is, the United States having expressed its concern about the problem of—not unqualified support, qualified support—qualified membership in NATO, what is the United States going to do about it?

The purpose of the President's speech was to outline the problems he saw before the alliance and the issues that needed solutions. As you know, the whole day tomorrow will be devoted to discussion and there will, without any doubt, be additional Presidential intervention as the discussion continues. This was not an attempt to put forward all of the solutions to all of the problems he outlined.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when you, in several different formulations, warned the Turks and the Greeks against taking forceful action, why is it necessary to make that such a strong point?

Q. Question?

Secretary Kissinger: The question was, if in several formulations I warned the Greeks and the Turks against forceful action.

It was only in one formulation. I tried to sum up what our general view is, and our view happens to be that the use of force and the threat of force during these negotiations by either side would not be helpful and that the process of negotiation should have the primary role.

There is no specific threat of force at this particular moment, but given the potential tenseness of the situation, we simply wanted to state our view.

Q. Mr. Secretary, excuse me. If I could just follow up. Did the President make that same cautionary remark?

Secretary Kissinger: Of course. I am reporting about the President's conversation.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what did the President tell the Portuguese Prime Minister he thought the impact on NATO would be if Portugal were dominated by Communists?

Q. Question?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is, what did the President point out to the Portuguese Prime Minister that the impact on NATO would be if Portugal were dominated by Communists?

He pointed out that the impact would be unfortunate and somewhat incompatible with the purposes of NATO.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in connection with your discussion with the Portuguese, did they give any assurances that it is not the intention of the Portuguese Government to be a Trojan horse in a NATO structure, that that was not their purpose? Could you give us some of the language he might have used?

Q. Question?

Secretary Kissinger: I obviously cannot. The question is, did the Portuguese Prime Minister give us any assurances about Portugal not being a Trojan horse?

As a matter of fact, that was a phrase that came up in the discussion. We did not ask for any assurances. The purpose of this meeting was to make clear our view and to enable in the first meeting between the President and the Portuguese leaders—for them to express their views.

We also made clear that we welcomed a

change in Portugal from its previous system to a democratic system, and we expressed our good will toward such efforts.

The view of the Portuguese ministers was that they did not represent a Communist dominated government.

Q. During the course of the President's conversation with the Chancellor [of the Federal Republic of Germany], were the subjects of Spain and Portugal discussed?

Secretary Kissinger: The President pointed out in his speech, which you will get, our view that Spain should have a closer relationship to Western defense. There was some brief discussion about our views with respect to Spain—and on which there was perhaps not complete unanimity—and some brief discussion on Portugal.

We had already, last week when I was in the Federal Republic, extensive conversations with both the Chancellor and the Foreign Minister on Portugal, which, of course, the President was fully familiar with.

Mr. Nessen [Ronald H. Nessen, Press Secretary to President Ford]: The last question right over here.

Q. Sir, was the conversation with the Portuguese in English or was that through an interpreter?

Q. Question?

Secretary Kissinger: We can ask one more substantive question.

The question was, was the conversation with the Portuguese in English or through in interpreter? It was through an interpreter.

Q. Mr. Secretary, what about the meeting with d'Estaing [Valery Giscard d'Estaing, President of France] tonight and if you could answer that and tell us how it came about, would you also tell us what you think about France's special relationship within the NATO organization?

Secretary Kissinger: I think it is covered in the point that is made in the President's speech.

Q. Question?

Secretary Kissinger: With respect to the meeting of the two Presidents, President

March 30 called President Ford about two weeks ago and told him that he had decided to attend the meeting of the NATO heads of state and heads of government, and on that occasion suggested or it was mutually agreed, that while he attended this meeting a discussion between the two Presidents seemed appropriate.

We feel very strongly that this is the case, that a number of topics that we wish to discuss, including the energy problem, which I have already had a preliminary discussion with the French President about, Middle East, Atlantic relations, and the usual agenda of U.S.-French relations—and as you know, the two Presidents have a very warm personal relationship.

Q. You mentioned energy. You said meeting. You meant dinner?

Secretary Kissinger: I meant dinner. I am sorry. He was going to come to the dinner, and in connection with that dinner, a meeting would be appropriate.

SALZBURG, JUNE 2

Press release 312 dated June 2

Ronald H. Nessen, Press Secretary to President Ford: The two Presidents [President Ford and President Sadat of Egypt], of course, have given you their views of the meetings they held here. A number of you have asked for elaboration and further explanation of some of the points, so the Secretary of State has come down to do that. After Dr. Kissinger has talked to you I will have perhaps three or four items in the way of schedule announcements to make.

Secretary Kissinger: I need hardly say how much I have been looking forward to an opportunity to have the press conference in Salzburg. [Laughter.] I have been rehearsing for it for a year.

The two Presidents have really stated their positions, and there is nothing I could add to those, but I thought it might be helpful to answer some questions. So within the limit—yes?

Q. Can you give us your reaction to the

decision by the Israelis to thin out their forces east of the canal, please?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is to give my reaction to the decision of the Israelis to thin out their forces east of the canal.

We think that that is a constructive move. It has clearly the intention of easing possible Egyptian concerns about Israeli artillery in range of the canal, and while not decisive on—no unilateral step can be a decisive step at this point—I think it is a helpful contribution to the process which the United States is strongly attempting to encourage in which both parties should make an effort to move toward peace.

Q. Mr. Secretary, how long have you known about this Israeli decision?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, we have talked about this Israeli decision—I mean about this concept or about a concept like this—previously. The actual decision we learned about this morning.

Yes?

Q. Did the Egyptians indicate there was any change in their negotiating position since last March? And if there was, was there enough to encourage a resumption of a negotiation with Israel on a partial agreement?

Secretary Kissinger: The purpose of these talks was not for the two heads of state to get into detailed negotiations on the issues of peace in the Middle East or on the issues of an interim agreement between Egypt and Israel. As I pointed out to a number of you previously, the intention of this meeting was to permit the two leaders an opportunity to look over all the various roads to peace that have so far been identified in the Middle East and to see which of them might be more promising or how to pursue those that were available.

I think the discussion proceeded from the assumption that if progress toward peace is to be made all parties must make a contribution, and in that sense I thought there was a positive spirit. It is too early to tell whether it permits a resumption of any par-

ticular negotiation, because we must now talk to the Israeli Prime Minister and see whether his ideas coincide with those we have heard from the Egyptian President or whether there should be perhaps some American suggestions.

But the atmosphere was constructive; the attitude was constructive. And together with the Israeli move that was made today perhaps we are moving into a period where some momentum can be put behind peace efforts again.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you anticipate Egypt making some parallel confidence-building moves? And also, does the shift of Syrian forces to the Iraqi front have any bearing or was it intended in any way to signal Syrian interests in a peace effort with Israel?

Secretary Kissinger: I believe that, of course, whether Egypt will make some response, it is too early to say. But in general, the Israeli announcement, as I understood it, was intended as a response to the Egyptian opening of the Suez Canal despite the suspension of the negotiations in March. So that maybe that concludes the sequence of moves.

We have no confirmed reports about the shift of Syrian forces away from the Israeli frontier, but it is very possible that if it did take place it is caused by reasons unrelated to the settlement issue, though it could have an effect on the settlement.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you be a little more precise on what form an American policy statement will now take after you have conferred with the Israeli Prime Minister? Will it be a general statement, or will you lay out a specific set of recommendations?

Secretary Kissinger: Well, as you know, we have always been reluctant to make specific recommendations unless we felt the parties were sufficiently close for these recommendations to bridge the gap. Certainly, the President will state his general views at some point after he has talked to the parties concerned. Whether he will make any specific

proposals will really depend on how close he judges the parties to be.

Murray [Murray Marder, Washington Post].

Q. Mr. Secretary, that certainly was not a very happy, exhilarated-looking group in the courtyard today. The two Presidents and those of you who were standing with him did not exactly—did not by any means look like it had lived up in any way to President Sadat's talk of this meeting marking a historic moment.

Can you say whether from your perception the Egyptian leaders had much higher expectations which could not be fulfilled because of the American timetable? And secondly, can you tell us whether the deadline of the expiration of the mandate in the Sinai is pressing with any urgency on your considerations?

Secretary Kissinger: As I understood Mr. Marder's conclusions, I don't—if he formed the impression that this was not a happy, exhilarated group that he saw standing in the courtyard at the Residency—that is the name of the place—and he wondered whether the expiration of the mandate in the Sinai might have been pressing on the consciousness of the unexhilarated group that was standing there.

If I can be frank and not be offensive to you ladies and gentlemen, you didn't look like a pretty exhilarated group to me, either. [Laughter.] It could be that the atmospheric conditions had something to do with it, because I don't know how you show exhilaration when somebody holds an umbrella over you and rain is pouring down on your back. But I am just beginning my lecture.

Basically, we thought it was a very constructive meeting. It was not intended to reach any specific conclusions—and it achieved that purpose. It was not intended to reach any precise conclusions that would lead to an immediate negotiation. It was, however, very positive, very constructive, and I think it provides the basis for useful talks with the Israelis. And I really think,

Murrey, that your impression was just not right.

The second part of your question was whether the imminence of the UNEF [U.N. Emergency Force] expiration was weighing on the leaders. I don't think it played any role in the discussions. It was never involved; it was never mentioned by either side. But I really want to go back to the first point.

It was not an occasion in which you could say a conclusion—a final conclusion—was reached, but I think the possibility exists for constructive further discussions with other parties.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did President Ford promise President Sadat an American aid program at least as large as last year's? Was there talk or was there agreement reached on American participation in an international consortium that could help the economic development of Egypt?

Secretary Kissinger: No. The question is, did the United States promise aid at least as large as last year's, and did the United States promise participation in an international consortium on Egypt's long-term economic progress?

With respect to the first question, the final decisions on American aid figures to Middle East countries will be reached after the conclusion of the general reassessment. But it is clear that we will retain an interest—as the President made clear in his luncheon toast—in the economic development and progress of Egypt, and it is our intention to make a substantial contribution to that, but what the precise figure is we will have to wait until the general decisions are made.

With respect to the idea on the long-term program, I think the word "consortium" is probably exaggerated, but we have indicated to a number of other countries that we favor assistance to Egypt for its long-term economic problems.

Q. Mr. Secretary, to what extent do you feel there was a similarity of views between the two Presidents on what should constitute the basis of an overall settlement?

Secretary Kissinger: We did not go into a discussion of the details of a final settlement. We discussed, rather, what approaches would be used if a final—if that were the road that all parties decided they prefer to take and how the discussions might be conducted. Of course, we are familiar with the Egyptian point of view on these matters, which has been stated repeatedly and publicly, but we have not taken any position on—we have not taken a formal American position; for that matter, we have not taken an American position on an overall settlement.

Q. Mr. Secretary, the Egyptian spokesman here yesterday seemed to give short shrift to your shuttle diplomacy, and step-by-step seems to be landing in the ashcan. Did you have any consensus with Sadat—did Ford have any consensus with Sadat on the one promising route—you know, the approach to this problem?

Secretary Kissinger: The question is, the impression was created by the Egyptian spokesman yesterday that Egypt was not interested any longer in a step-by-step approach.

Q. For a prolonged period.

Secretary Kissinger: Of course, for a long period—and that this seems to have given short shrift to one of the promising avenues.

Let me make clear the United States is not pushing any one approach. As both the President and I have stated repeatedly, we are prepared to go to a Geneva Conference, and we are prepared to discuss in that framework. At the same time, our conviction is that whatever approach is most promising should be pursued; and therefore if other avenues open up we are prepared to pursue them.

I did not have the impression from the talks that any avenue was excluded or that there was any strong preference for one approach rather than another. There was a preference on which both parties agreed that some progress toward peace in the Middle East was essential. We do not want to commit ourselves to which of the approaches is

the more likely to succeed until we have heard the Israeli views on that subject.

But I did not have the impression that the Egyptian side precluded any of the approaches.

Q. Will you have a meeting of minds?

Secretary Kissinger: We cannot have a meeting of minds until we have heard from the Israelis.

Q. Well, I mean meeting of minds between the United States and Egypt?

Secretary Kissinger: I think that we clearly understand the Egyptian view of what is in their view—what are the elements of an interim agreement and also the Egyptian view of the procedures and content of an overall agreement. Now we have to get the Israeli views on this subject and then we can see how closely they mesh; and of course, as we have stated with respect to the interim agreement, both sides will have to look at their positions compared to what they were at the end of March, if one wants to get movement.

Q. Before this meeting began, a senior American official said that there probably would be no announcements. He also said that would not mean an important decision was not reached. Are you now telling us that there was no important development here?

Secretary Kissinger: No, I am trying to tell you that on the whole we are encouraged by these talks, in the sense that we believe that serious discussions can be continued now on the issue of moving toward peace.

I have stated previously—and so did the senior spokesman—that no dramatic announcement could be expected here. It is the nature of things, since the decisions involve many other parties. But we consider this meeting to have been helpful, and we plan to have other meetings, and of course you know of the other meetings which will now be taking place.

Q. Do you anticipate that any of the subsequent discussions will take place at Geneva—either at an overall conference or in a step-

by-step basis but in Geneva—with other parties participating, apart from the United States?

Secretary Kissinger: There is no question that the Geneva Conference will have to be reassembled at some point. This is a view we have always had, even during step-by-step diplomacy, and that view has not changed. All the parties are agreed to it. We are agreed to it.

What the next step will be, we want to reserve our judgment until we have had our other conversations. But it is my impression that on the basis of the discussions that have been taking place that there are possibilities for useful talks.

Q. You have said on about a half a dozen occasions—just now from the podium—that what happens now depends on talks with the Israelis. Would it be unfair to say that in some way the Israelis have a hangup to finding a path—

Secretary Kissinger: No. I think this—we have gone through this on many of the shuttles. There always is somebody you have talked to last and you are going to talk to next. It is therefore inevitable that when you get into the talks with the next person, that in the nature of the sequence, you have to get their views before you can determine what is going to happen.

We are not saying that any country is the hangup. We did not elaborate a specific proposal with Egypt that will now be put forward with Israel. Rather, after we have discussed with Israel, we will then be in a position to see whether both parties should be encouraged to come forward with specific proposals or whether the time isn't right to go toward a more comprehensive solution.

But it is not of a nature where we can say here is a proposal and now ask the Israelis to accept it. It is, rather, to get the Israeli point of view, and then we would perhaps be in a position—then we will be in a position to see whether both sides should be asked to be more concrete.

Thank you.

Secretary Kissinger Welcomes Council of the Americas

Following are remarks by Secretary Kissinger made before a meeting of the Council of the Americas at the Department of State on June 4.

Press release 317 dated June 4

As you know, I only returned late last night from the Presidential trip to Europe. But I wanted to take this opportunity to welcome you here, to make a few remarks about our interest in Latin America, and then perhaps to answer two or three questions.

Before I go into the subject of Latin America, let me emphasize a more fundamental point.

We are this moment, as a country, having to adjust our policies and our perceptions to a world that is fundamentally different from that of the early postwar period. When America first ended its more or less traditional isolation, we were the dominant country militarily, economically, and politically. Foreign policy for a lot of our friends really became an effort to influence our own decisionmaking process.

But in the last decade we have seen the split within the Communist world; we have seen the emergence of new centers of power around the world; we have seen the emergence of newly developing countries; we have seen our friends in Europe and Japan gain in strength and economic and political influence. In other words, we are dealing with a world infinitely more complex than the one in which the foreign policy of this country was first designed in the immediate postwar period.

And most particularly there has emerged in recent years the increasing importance of economic policy—the relationship among the industrialized countries, the relationship between the industrialized countries and the developing countries. The whole agenda of interdependence that is reflected in energy, in raw materials, in food, and in the attempt

of many nations, especially the less developed nations, to organize themselves to bring about what they consider a different approach to the economic arrangements of the world—all of this has involved the United States in a very profound way. And it involves us, not only as an economic problem, but from the point of view of the structure of the world, of the relationship various nations feel toward each other.

No international system has ever been maintained or has ever been relatively stable unless the countries that comprised it felt they had a stake in it. And one of the tasks that the United States has at this moment is to bring about, or contribute to, an international environment in which the major nations—and in which those who are associated with us in any way—feel that they have a stake in the maintenance of order, stability, and progress.

I have made these general observations because our relationships to Latin America are very crucial in this respect. Even though we have a tradition of isolation, our relationship with Latin America is more continuous than with any other part of the world. We are connected here with countries that have comparable political origins, with countries sharing similar cultural traditions and having comparable economic aspirations.

Therefore in many important ways the test case of America's ability to relate itself to the less developed nations is our ability to live in peace and progress in the Western Hemisphere. This is why we have started the so-called new dialogue, which attempts to cut through some of the shibboleths that have developed and enable the countries of Latin America and the United States to exchange views on their actual problems and which attempts also to solve some of the outstanding political issues, such as the Panama issue, before they become unmanageable.

Now, I think we have made some progress, and I believe that the recent OAS [Organization of American States] meeting, in the spirit of its discussions and in the relative

lack of acrimony, was a tremendous advance. But still a great deal remains to be done.

On our side, I think it is important not to proceed in too doctrinaire a fashion and to realize that unless the concerns of Latin America are heard here and are understood here, there is no basis for a serious dialogue. We have a great missionary tradition, and therefore our tendency is to try to believe that our maxims are the only possible ones. But unless we understand that other parts of the world have their own concerns, then this spirit of confrontation, which is already too widespread in the world, will grow unmanageable.

On the other hand, it is incumbent on Latin America not to seek its sense of identity simply by confrontation with the United States.

So both sides ought to approach the issues in a new spirit.

We have recently, at the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] and in other forums, made clear that we are prepared to approach the dialogue with developing countries with a fresh attitude, taking into account some of their serious concerns. And we are particularly prepared to practice this in the Western Hemisphere.

I have had, unfortunately, to postpone a trip I had planned to Latin America on a number of occasions, but I firmly plan to do it within the next few months. Under the leadership of Bill Rogers [William D. Rogers, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs], I believe that the State Department has had the most dynamic and interested concern for Latin America that has existed here in many a year.

So I am delighted that this group is meeting here. I strongly support what you are seeking to do. We hope you will find that the policies we are trying to pursue here help you in your efforts, and I know that what you are doing helps us in ours.

Perhaps the best way we can proceed now is that I will take a few questions and let you go to lunch.

Q. May I have the first question?

Secretary Kissinger: Don't make it too technical; it's been a long night. [Laughter.]

Q. Mr. Secretary, a question came up a couple of times during the meeting, and it was on the problem of the pricing of commodities—the famous commodity problem—and some of your predecessors asked us to ask you the question. [Laughter.]

Secretary Kissinger: Well, I read in the newspapers with rapt attention about all the tremendous intramural fights that are allegedly going on in Washington on this issue. And the new sport in Washington is to take to the newspapers those issues which you never raised in the departmental meetings. [Laughter.]

The view with respect to commodities: We are not attempting to organize global cartels which will fix the price of every commodity, or indeed of any commodity.

On the other hand, we are engaged in discussions with many countries on the problem of energy. It is also a fact that for many countries the primary source of development income derives from the sale of their commodities. It is a demand that has been made rather insistently in the energy context, and it has been made outside the energy context.

The United States is opposed to indexing. The United States is opposed to fixing the prices of commodities by international agreement. But there are many other issues with respect to commodities that can be discussed—the relationship between aid and income stabilization, for example—regardless of what the price of the commodity is. That does not have to be tied to fixing the price of the commodity. The problem of assured markets and assured supply.

I think there are many aspects with respect to the commodity issue that can be discussed in international forums and in which we can express our opinion and listen to the concerns of other countries.

The United States has offered, in the OECD meetings, to create a monitoring group that will review those negotiations

that will in any event be going on in other frameworks and to do any additional work that may be needed to meet the concerns of various groups. But we have specifically rejected the idea of indexation, and we do not anticipate international price-fixing agreements.

Q. [Inaudible.]

Moderator: Can you repeat the question? I can't hear.

Secretary Kissinger: No, I can; I heard the question all right. But I have the feeling that we've got a ringer here. [Laughter.] That's a newsman who is asking, who is trying to turn this into a press conference. [Laughter.]

Moderator: I didn't notice that. I can't see him.

Secretary Kissinger: Yes, I think his shape looks a little familiar. I can't swear— [Laughter.]

Moderator: May we have the question?

Secretary Kissinger: No, I'll answer the question. I don't want him to think that I am running away from him.

There was, as part of the new dialogue, a group that was dealing with multinational corporations and which would have dealt with this particular problem. As a result of the cancellation of the Foreign Ministers meeting, the subgroups that were related to these Foreign Ministers meetings also canceled their discussions. At the same time we have created, within the framework of the OAS, the sort of informal possibility of dialogue which these Foreign Ministers meetings were supposed to create when the OAS machinery was still more formal.

The United States is prepared to resume these discussions. We recognize that this is a concern of many Latin American countries; and if they are prepared to deal with it on a concrete basis and not on a highly theoretical basis, I think some progress can be made.

Moderator: Mr. Secretary, I think that I

interpret the feeling of all my members of the council and their guests in thanking you from the bottom of our hearts for coming here today. We know that you just got back yesterday from an extremely strenuous trip all over Europe, and we really don't want to detain you.

Thank you very, very much, sir.

President Ford Urges Action on Energy Program

Address by President Ford¹

Last January 15, I went before your Senators and Representatives in Congress with a comprehensive plan to make our country independent of foreign sources of energy by 1985. Such a program was long overdue. We have become increasingly at the mercy of others for the fuel on which our entire economy runs.

Here are the facts and figures that will not go away. The United States is dependent on foreign sources for about 37 percent of its present petroleum needs. In 10 years, if we do nothing, we will be importing more than half our oil at prices fixed by others—if they choose to sell to us at all. In 2½ years, we will be twice as vulnerable to a foreign oil embargo as we were two winters ago.

We are now paying out \$25 billion a year for foreign oil. Five years ago we paid out only \$3 billion annually. Five years from now, if we do nothing, who knows how many more billions will be flowing out of the United States. These are not just American dollars; these are American jobs.

Four months ago, I sent the Congress this 167-page draft of detailed legislation, plus some additional tax proposals. My program was designed to conserve the energy we now

¹ Made on television and radio from the Oval Office at the White House on May 27 (text from Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents dated June 2).

have, while at the same time speeding up the development and production of new domestic energy. Although this would increase the cost of energy until new supplies were fully tapped, those dollars would remain in this country and would be returned to our own economy through tax cuts and rebates.

I asked the Congress in January to enact this urgent 10-year program for energy independence within 90 days, that is, by mid-April. In the meantime, to get things going, I said I would use the standby Presidential authority granted by the Congress to reduce our use of foreign petroleum by raising import fees on each barrel of crude oil by one dollar on February 1, another dollar on March 1, and a third on April 1. As soon as Congress acted on my comprehensive energy program, I promised to take off these import fees. I imposed the first dollar on oil imports February 1, making appropriate exemptions for hardship situations.

Now, what did the Congress do in February about energy? Congress did nothing—nothing, that is, except rush through legislation suspending for 90 days my authority to impose any import fees on foreign oil. Congress needed time, they said.

At the end of February, the Democratic leaders of the House and Senate and other Members concerned with energy came to the White House. They gave me this pamphlet outlining energy goals similar to mine and promised to come up with a congressional energy program better than mine by the end of April. I remember one of them saying he didn't see how they could ask the President to do more than postpone the second dollar for 60 days. If the Congress couldn't come up with an energy program by then, he said, go ahead and put it on.

Their request stretched my original deadline by a couple of weeks. But I wanted to be reasonable; I wanted to be cooperative. So, in vetoing their bill to restrict the President's authority, I agreed to their request for a 60-day delay before taking the next step under my energy plan.

What did the Congress do in March—what did the Congress do in April—about energy? Congress did nothing.

In fairness, I must say there were diligent efforts by some Members, Democrats as well as Republicans, to fashion meaningful energy legislation in their subcommittees and committees. My Administration worked very hard with them to bring a real energy independence bill to a vote. At the end of April, the deadline set by the congressional leaders themselves, I deferred for still another 30 days the second one-dollar fee on imported oil. Even then, I still hoped for positive congressional action.

So, what has the Congress done in May about energy? Congress did nothing and went home for a 10-day recess.

February, March, April, May—as of now, the Congress has done nothing positive to end our energy dependence. On the contrary, it has taken two negative actions—the first, an attempt to prevent the President from doing anything on his own; the second, to pass a strip-mining bill which would reduce domestic coal production instead of increasing it, put thousands of people out of work, needlessly increase the cost of energy to consumers, raise electric bills for many, and compel us to import more foreign oil, not less. I was forced to veto this anti-energy bill last week because I will not be responsible for taking one step backward on energy when the Congress will not take one step forward on energy.

The Congress has concentrated its attention on conservation measures such as a higher gasoline tax. The Congress has done little or nothing to stimulate production of new energy sources here at home. At Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve in California, I saw oil wells waiting to produce 300,000 barrels a day if the Congress would change the law to permit it.

There are untold millions of barrels more in our Alaskan petroleum reserves and under the continental shelf. We could save 300,000 barrels a day if only the Congress would allow more electric powerplants to substitute American coal for foreign oil. Peaceful atomic power, which we pioneered, is advancing faster abroad than at home.

Still the Congress does nothing about energy. We are today worse off than we were

in January. Domestic oil production is going down, down, down. Natural gas production is starting to dwindle. And many areas face severe shortages next winter. Coal production is still at the levels of the 1940's. Foreign oil suppliers are considering another price increase. I could go on and on, but you know the facts. This country needs to regain its independence from foreign sources of energy, and the sooner the better.

There is no visible energy shortage now, but we could have one overnight. We do not have an energy crisis, but we may have one next winter. We do have an energy problem, a very grave problem, but one we can still manage and solve if we are successful internationally and can act decisively domestically.

Four months are already lost. The Congress has acted only negatively. I must now do what I can do as President.

—First, I will impose an additional one-dollar import fee on foreign crude oil and 60 cents on refined products, effective June 1.² I gave the Congress its 60 days plus an extra 30 days to do something, but nothing has been done since January. Higher fees will further discourage the consumption of imported fuel and may generate some constructive action when the Congress comes back.

—Second, as I directed on April 30, the Federal Energy Administration has completed public hearings on decontrol of old domestic oil. I will submit a decontrol plan to Congress shortly after it reconvenes. Along with it, I will urge the Congress to pass a windfall-profits tax with a plowback provision.

These two measures would prevent unfair gains by oil companies from decontrol prices, furnish a substantial incentive to increase domestic energy production, and encourage conservation.

When I talk about energy, I am talking about jobs. Our American economy runs on energy. No energy—no jobs. In the long run, it is just that simple.

The sudden fourfold increase in foreign

oil prices and the 1973 embargo helped to throw us into this recession. We are on our way out of this recession. Another oil embargo could throw us back. We cannot continue to depend on the price and supply whims of others. The Congress cannot drift, dawdle, and debate forever with America's future.

I need your help to energize this Congress into comprehensive action. I will continue to press for my January program, which is still the only total energy program there is. I cannot sit here idly while nothing is done. We must get on with the job right now.

U.S. States Concern for Americans Held in South Viet-Nam

*Department Statement*¹

I wish to state our serious concern about nine Americans who have been held by the Communist authorities in South Viet-Nam since before the closing of the U.S. Embassy.

Among the group are six missionaries captured March 10 at Ban Me Thuot, South Viet-Nam, with a Ford Foundation scholar, a USAID [Agency for International Development] official, an Australian tourist, and a Canadian missionary couple.

In addition, a U.S. consular officer assigned to Nha Trang was captured when Communist forces overran Phan Rang on April 16.

There is wide concern about these persons, who continue to be held long after the departure of official Americans from Viet-Nam. We consider their release and safe return a matter of urgent priority and concern.

Moreover, about 2,300 Americans continue to remain unaccounted for in Indo-China from the period before the 1973 cease-fire—900 of them (including 30 civilians) still listed as missing, the rest declared dead with their bodies not recovered.

¹ Read to news correspondents on May 29 by Robert L. Funseth, Director, Office of Press Relations.

² For text of Proclamation 4377 signed May 27, see 40 *Fed. Reg.* 23429.

Under the Paris agreement the Communist side undertook to help account for the missing and to return the remains of the dead. Progress on this is long overdue.

We continue to expect the Communist side to cooperate in resolving this humanitarian problem.

Foreign Aid Authorization Bill Transmitted to Congress

Following is the text of identical letters sent by President Ford on May 15 to Speaker of the House Carl Albert and President of the Senate Nelson A. Rockefeller.

White House press release dated May 15

MAY 15, 1975.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: (DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:) I am transmitting today a bill to authorize Foreign Assistance programs for fiscal years 1976 and 1977 and for the transition period July 1, 1976 through September 30, 1976.

This proposal reflects both current realities and continuing uncertainties.

One reality is that we live in an interdependent world—a world in which the actions or inactions of any one great nation can affect the interests of all. By its actions, this nation will play its proper role in influencing the course of world events to make a better world for all. Foreign assistance is an essential element in the U.S. commitment to this objective.

A second reality, however, is that the recent events in Indochina have had a profound impact on the assumptions underlying the assistance requirements in my 1976 Budget, transmitted in February. There has not been sufficient time to fully assess the implications of these changes on foreign assistance requirements. What is abundantly clear, however, is the urgent need to assist

those people who have been forced to flee from Indochina. I have already requested legislation to permit us to meet this need and I urge speedy congressional action.

A third reality is the continuing tension in the Middle East—an area which has been wracked by war and even now knows only an uneasy peace. The United States has made every effort to assist in finding a solution to the problems in this part of the world and is now undertaking a thorough reassessment of every aspect of our relations with the countries of the Middle East.

These current realities are also the source of continuing uncertainties about the 1976 foreign assistance program.

In order to permit the fullest possible consideration of foreign aid requirements by the Congress, the legislation I am transmitting today contains specific funding proposals for development assistance and related programs. However, because of the uncertainties caused by changing events, this request does not include specific amounts for grant military assistance, foreign military credit sales and some economic supporting assistance programs at this time. For these accounts, I am requesting an authorization for such sums as may be necessary and will return to the Congress with specific funding proposals as soon as possible.

The review of our policies in the Middle East, which I initiated last month, will not be completed until later this summer. I have, therefore, also omitted specific requests for assistance to the four major Middle Eastern aid recipients until this review is completed.

With this bill, the Congress is now in a position to begin consideration of those elements of our foreign aid programs on which I have made firm recommendations. The other specifics will be transmitted as soon as our reviews permit. I urge that the Congress consider and enact this legislation.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. FORD.

U.S. Reaffirms Support for Nonproliferation Treaty at Review Conference

The Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons met at Geneva May 5-30. Following is a statement by Fred C. Iklé, U.S. Representative to the conference and Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, together with the text of the final declaration of the conference adopted May 30.

STATEMENT BY DR. IKLE, MAY 6

ACDA press release 75-16 dated May 6

It is my privilege to convey a message to this conference from the President of the United States:

This Review Conference offers an opportunity to focus new attention on our vital obligation to arrest the spread of nuclear weapons. It is a responsibility that confronts all nations equally and impartially. Nuclear energy can and should promote the fortunes of nations assembled at this conference. But its destructive potential can and must be contained.

Support for the Nonproliferation Treaty is a major tenet of American policy. Consequently, I hope this conference will:

- Convey the importance of nonproliferation to the security of all nations, hence to global stability;

- Promote international cooperation in peaceful uses of nuclear energy, while insuring that it not be misused as a means of mass destruction;

- Encourage the further development and wider application of effective safeguards and physical security measures for nuclear materials and facilities; and

- Review the considerable progress that has been made in arms control and disarmament since the treaty was signed, and promote efforts to build on what has been achieved.

We welcome the important recent additions to the roster of parties to the Nonproliferation Treaty,

as well as the indications that others are moving toward adherence. We recognize that the treaty's promise is not yet fully realized, but we take satisfaction from what has been achieved. We further recognize that no treaty by itself can prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Yet we remain convinced that the Nonproliferation Treaty is an essential means of advancing this purpose.

Although we still have a long way to go, we see in reviewing the record that the cooperative undertaking to create a more stable world community is well underway.

I take this occasion therefore to rededicate the United States to the support of the Nonproliferation Treaty and to the high purpose of a stable peace which animates it.

Few international endeavors are more deserving of our attention and energy than containing the destructive potential of the atom. The stakes involved are enormous.

We cannot be complacent—and indeed we are not—about the nuclear arsenals that now exist. We must press ahead to make more comprehensive the limitations which have been imposed and begin to reduce the potential for destruction, a potential that we can scarcely grasp.

But it would be a fatal error if we assumed that we could move forward in reducing the threat of nuclear destruction while nation after nation began to build its own nuclear arsenals. We cannot move forward and backward at the same time. The risk of nuclear destruction—by design, miscalculation, or accident—cannot be reduced if nuclear competition drives a dangerous wedge between neighboring nations throughout the world.

Let there be no mistake. The dangers resulting from nuclear proliferation are shared by all, nuclear powers and non-nuclear-weapon states alike.

We therefore have a common interest in the success of the Nonproliferation Treaty. It is my government's hope that this conference will focus attention on the treaty's essential role in promoting the security of all states and that it will provide a stimulus for cooperative international effort to make the treaty as effective and universally applicable as possible.

The basic provisions of the treaty, articles I and II, have been followed faithfully by the parties. The safeguards resulting from article III make an important additional contribution to the security of all states.

But in our judgment, the effectiveness of all three articles can be strengthened best by securing the widest possible adherence to the treaty. Hence, it is most gratifying that several states have recently completed their ratification. The Republic of Korea ratified the treaty. Just last week major industrial countries of Western Europe also became parties to the treaty: Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

We welcome all the new parties. Several of them have attained world leadership in peaceful applications of nuclear technology. This offers telling evidence that the treaty is consistent with progress in the peaceful uses of the atom. In fact, the treaty not only supports peaceful uses but helps preserve the world order without which peaceful uses could not survive and expand.

The First Five Years of the Treaty

In its first five years, the treaty has clearly served to increase the volume of international nuclear commerce. The United States, for example, has entered into international arrangements for the enrichment of uranium to meet the needs of some 150 power reactors in non-nuclear-weapon states, having a total capacity of about 120,000 megawatts. In addition, the United States has exported 35 nuclear reactors since 1970. Most of this cooperation has been with states now party to the Nonproliferation Treaty or with signatories whose ratification appears imminent.

The United States has shared its peaceful

nuclear technology generously. It has provided information, offered training, supported research programs, supplied uranium enrichment services, and sold or donated research and power reactors embodying the most advanced technology.

Aid to the developing countries has also increased considerably since the treaty was opened for signature. We believe the developing countries party to the treaty should be given favored consideration in nuclear assistance. Last year, my government announced that parties will be given preference in the allocation of our in-kind contributions to the technical assistance program of the International Atomic Energy Agency. At the same time, we are increasing substantially the amount of our voluntary contribution for 1975.

Safeguards Over Peaceful Uses

A major purpose—indeed, a major accomplishment—of the Nonproliferation Treaty is to make possible the expansion of peaceful nuclear cooperation. But, as Secretary Kissinger stated to the United Nations last fall [Sept. 23, 1974], our policy of widely supplying nuclear fuels and other nuclear materials "cannot continue if it leads to the proliferation of nuclear explosives."

The rapid expansion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy has raised massive new problems. One is meeting fuel-reprocessing needs in the safest and most economic way. Another is the disposal of the rapidly accumulating nuclear wastes. Fortunately, we still have some time to work out solutions. There is no economic need for reprocessing for several years to come, and spent fuel can still be kept in temporary storage. But nations must cooperate to solve these problems soon to protect the health and safety of all the people.

The promotion of peaceful uses of the atom is inseparably linked with safeguards to inspire international confidence that fissionable materials are not being diverted to destructive purposes. We can all take pride in what has been done about safeguards. Specifically, the International Atomic Energy Agency has

accomplished a great deal. Its efforts deserve the wholehearted support of us all.

Virtually every party to this treaty with nuclear facilities requiring safeguards has negotiated an agreement with the Agency; and almost every nuclear facility now operating in the non-nuclear-weapon states is subject to Agency safeguards or will be in the near future. This is a good record.

But much remains to be done. We need to insure:

—That all parties to the treaty conclude agreements with the Agency;

—That safeguards are effective and efficient; and

—That safeguards cover, as comprehensively as possible, the nuclear facilities of non-nuclear-weapon states not party to the treaty and preclude diversion of nuclear materials for any nuclear explosive device.

Also, we have to concern ourselves seriously with the threat of theft and other criminal seizure of nuclear material. We hope this conference will recognize the need for international measures to deal with this grim danger.

Peaceful Nuclear Explosions

Article V, as we all know, was included in the treaty to insure that the non-nuclear-weapon states adhering to the treaty would not be deprived of any potential benefits of peaceful nuclear explosions that might be realized by the nuclear-weapon states.

In the United States, there has been much research and experimentation on the use of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. But we have not yet reduced any application to practice, nor have we obtained any commercial benefits from this technology. If and when we should succeed in doing so, we would of course make those benefits available as called for in the treaty.

Questions remain to be resolved regarding the feasibility and practicability of peaceful nuclear explosions. Moreover, no request for such explosions has ever gone beyond the stage of preliminary feasibility studies. For these reasons, there has so far been no prac-

tical necessity to conclude the international agreement or agreements mentioned in article V. However, the United States stands ready to negotiate the requisite agreements when the practical need develops.

In the meantime, the United States is prepared to participate in consideration of the institutional arrangements that may be required to make the benefits of peaceful nuclear explosions available internationally. Toward this end, important steps have already been taken within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency. My government, as one of the potential suppliers of such services, has agreed to assist the Agency in a study of the related legal problems.

U.S.-Soviet Arms Control Agreements

When this treaty was opened for signature in 1968, the only other postwar arms control agreements were the Antarctic Treaty, the "Hotline" Agreement, the Limited Test Ban Treaty, and the Outer Space Treaty. While these were solid accomplishments, they did not reduce the levels of existing nuclear armaments.

At the signing ceremony of the Non-proliferation Treaty, my government and the Soviet Government announced that we would open negotiations to limit offensive and defensive strategic arms. The relationship between the treaty and this announcement was clear: the successful negotiation of this treaty had strengthened mutual confidence between the two largest nuclear-weapon powers and promised to keep nuclear arms control from becoming totally unmanageable.

Since then, serious and intensive negotiations on strategic arms limitations have continued steadily and received personal attention at the highest level of the two governments. The first fruits of these negotiations were the improved "Hotline" Agreement and the Agreement on Measures to Reduce the Risk of Outbreak of Nuclear War.

The culmination of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks in 1972 brought the Treaty on Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems limiting

each side to two narrowly circumscribed complexes. In my country it led in fact to dismantling an anti-ballistic-missile complex already well under construction. By renouncing major anti-ballistic-missile systems, the United States and the Soviet Union gave up a potential new weapons system that they were in a unique position to exploit. No other country could have built such systems.

Along with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, an interim agreement was worked out to limit the number of strategic offensive launchers on both sides for five years, a period that would provide time to achieve more comprehensive limits.

At the summit meeting in the summer of 1974, the leaders of the United States and Soviet Union took a further important step by negotiating the Threshold Test Ban Treaty. I should point out that this was not only an important arms control measure in its own right; it was also a positive step toward a comprehensive test ban, to which we remain firmly committed.

Last November, at Vladivostok, a major milestone was reached when President Ford and General Secretary Brezhnev established specific guidelines for a new agreement to limit strategic offensive arms. Based on this accord, negotiations are now underway here in Geneva. The new agreement is to limit strategic offensive armaments, including strategic bombers and missiles equipped with multiple reentry vehicles (MIRV's), to equal totals on each side.

The implications of this breakthrough are far-reaching. By putting an overall ceiling on strategic armaments, we establish a promising basis for further reductions. We look forward to follow-on negotiations on further limitation and reductions as soon as the Vladivostok agreement is complete.

An encouraging precedent has already been set: only two years after the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty imposed comprehensive, equal ceilings on these systems, both sides agreed to reduce the permitted deployment levels by one-half.

Five years have now elapsed since the Nonproliferation Treaty went into effect. This period is only one-sixth of the nuclear

era that began at the end of the Second World War. Yet, in this short time, far more has been accomplished in the control of nuclear arms than in the preceding 25 years. In historical perspective, the treaty has proven to be both a prerequisite and a catalyst for progress toward nuclear disarmament. That process is underway. And it is up to all of us to encourage and sustain it.

The Nonproliferation Treaty is indispensable to nuclear disarmament. It is indispensable to achieving the maximum peaceful benefits of nuclear energy. It is indispensable to the security of all. The task of this conference is to provide the support and forward movement that are needed to enable the treaty to fulfill its great promise.

TEXT OF DECLARATION¹

FINAL DECLARATION OF THE REVIEW CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

PREAMBLE

The States Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons which met in Geneva in May 1975, in accordance with the Treaty, to review the operation of the Treaty with a view to assuring that the purposes of the Preamble and the provisions of the Treaty are being realized,

Recognizing the continuing importance of the objectives of the Treaty,

Affirming the belief that universal adherence to the Treaty would greatly strengthen international peace and enhance the security of all States,

Firmly convinced that, in order to achieve this aim, it is essential to maintain, in the implementation of the Treaty, an acceptable balance of mutual responsibilities and obligations of all States Party to the Treaty, nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States,

Recognizing that the danger of nuclear warfare remains a grave threat to the survival of mankind,

Convinced that the prevention of any further proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices remains a vital element in efforts to avert nuclear warfare, and that the promotion of this objective will be furthered by more rapid progress towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race and the limitation and reduction of existing nuclear weapons, with a view to the eventual elimination from national arsenals of nuclear weapons, pursuant

¹ NPT/CONF/30/Rev. 1; adopted by consensus on May 30.

to a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,

Recalling the determination expressed by the Parties to seek to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for all time,

Considering that the trend towards détente in relations between States provides a favourable climate within which more significant progress should be possible towards the cessation of the nuclear arms race,

Noting the important role which nuclear energy can, particularly in changing economic circumstances, play in power production and in contributing to the progressive elimination of the economic and technological gap between developing and developed States,

Recognizing that the accelerated spread and development of peaceful applications of nuclear energy will, in the absence of effective safeguards, contribute to further proliferation of nuclear explosive capability,

Recognizing the continuing necessity of full co-operation in the application and improvement of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on peaceful nuclear activities,

Recalling that all Parties to the Treaty are entitled to participate in the fullest possible exchange of scientific information for, and to contribute alone or in co-operation with other States to, the further development of the applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes,

Reaffirming the principle that the benefits of peaceful applications of nuclear technology, including any technological by-products which may be derived by nuclear-weapon States from the development of nuclear explosive devices, should be available for peaceful purposes to all Parties to the Treaty, and

Recognizing that all States Parties have a duty to strive for the adoption of tangible and effective measures to attain the objectives of the Treaty,

Declare as follows:

PURPOSES

The States Party to the Treaty reaffirm their strong common interest in averting the further proliferation of nuclear weapons. They reaffirm their strong support for the Treaty, their continued dedication to its principles and objectives, and their commitment to implement fully and more effectively its provisions.

They reaffirm the vital role of the Treaty in international efforts

—to avert further proliferation of nuclear weapons

—to achieve the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to undertake effective measures in the direction of nuclear disarmament, and

—to promote co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy under adequate safeguards.

REVIEW OF ARTICLES I AND II

The review undertaken by the Conference confirms that the obligations undertaken under Articles I and II of the Treaty have been faithfully observed by all Parties. The Conference is convinced that the continued strict observance of these Articles remains central to the shared objective of averting the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

REVIEW OF ARTICLE III

The Conference notes that the verification activities of the IAEA under Article III, 1, of the Treaty respect the sovereign rights of States and do not hamper the economic, scientific or technological development of the Parties to the Treaty or international co-operation in peaceful nuclear activities. It urges that this situation be maintained. The Conference attaches considerable importance to the continued application of safeguards under Article III, 1, on a non-discriminatory basis, for the equal benefit of all States Party to the Treaty.

The Conference notes the importance of systems of accounting for and control of nuclear material, from the standpoints both of the responsibilities of States Party to the Treaty and of co-operation with the IAEA in order to facilitate the implementation of the safeguards provided for in Article III, 1. The Conference expresses the hope that all States having peaceful nuclear activities will establish and maintain effective accounting and control systems and welcomes the readiness of the IAEA to assist States in so doing.

The Conference expresses its strong support for effective IAEA safeguards. In this context it recommends that intensified efforts be made towards the standardization and the universality of application of IAEA safeguards, while ensuring that safeguards agreements with non-nuclear-weapon States not Party to the Treaty are of adequate duration, preclude diversion to any nuclear explosive devices and contain appropriate provisions for the continuance of the application of safeguards upon re-export.

The Conference recommends that more attention and fuller support be given to the improvement of safeguards techniques, instrumentation, data-handling and implementation in order, among other things, to ensure optimum cost-effectiveness. It notes with satisfaction the establishment by the Director General of the IAEA of a standing advisory group on safeguards implementation.

The Conference emphasises the necessity for the States Party to the Treaty that have not yet done so to conclude as soon as possible safeguards agreements with the IAEA.

With regard to the implementation of Article III, 2 of the Treaty, the Conference notes that a number of States suppliers of nuclear material or equipment have adopted certain minimum, standard requirements for IAEA safeguards in connexion with their exports of certain such items to non-nuclear-weapon States not Party to the Treaty (IAEA document

INFCIRC/209 and Addenda). The Conference attaches particular importance to the condition, established by those States, of an undertaking of non-diversion to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, as included in the said requirements.

The Conference urges that:

(a) in all achievable ways, common export requirements relating to safeguards be strengthened, in particular by extending the application of safeguards to all peaceful nuclear activities in importing States not Party to the Treaty;

(b) such common requirements be accorded the widest possible measure of acceptance among all suppliers and recipients;

(c) all Parties to the Treaty should actively pursue their efforts to these ends.

The Conference takes note of:

(a) the considered view of many Parties to the Treaty that the safeguards required under Article III, 2 should extend to all peaceful nuclear activities in importing States;

(b) (i) the suggestion that it is desirable to arrange for common safeguards requirements in respect of nuclear material processed, used or produced by the use of scientific and technological information transferred in tangible form to non-nuclear-weapon States not Party to the Treaty;

(ii) the hope that this aspect of safeguards could be further examined.

The Conference recommends that, during the review of the arrangements relating to the financing of safeguards in the IAEA which is to be undertaken by its Board of Governors at an appropriate time after 1975, the less favourable financial situation of the developing countries be fully taken into account. It recommends further that, on that occasion, the Parties to the Treaty concerned seek measures that would restrict within appropriate limits the respective shares of developing countries in safeguards costs.

The Conference attaches considerable importance, so far as safeguards inspectors are concerned, to adherence by the IAEA to Article VII.D of its Statute, prescribing, among other things, that "due regard shall be paid . . . to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible"; it also recommends that safeguards training be made available to personnel from all geographic regions.

The Conference, convinced that nuclear materials should be effectively protected at all times, urges that action be pursued to elaborate further, within the IAEA, concrete recommendations for the physical protection of nuclear material in use, storage and transit, including principles relating to the responsibility of States, with a view to ensuring a

uniform, minimum level of effective protection for such material.

It calls upon all States engaging in peaceful nuclear activities (i) to enter into such international agreements and arrangements as may be necessary to ensure such protection; and (ii) in the framework of their respective physical protection systems, to give the earliest possible effective application to the IAEA's recommendations.

REVIEW OF ARTICLE IV

The Conference reaffirms, in the framework of Article IV, 1, that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting, and notes with satisfaction that nothing in the Treaty has been identified as affecting, the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with Articles I and II of the Treaty.

The Conference reaffirms, in the framework of Article IV, 2, the undertaking by all Parties to the Treaty to facilitate the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and the right of all Parties to the Treaty to participate in such exchange and welcomes the efforts made towards that end. Noting that the Treaty constitutes a favourable framework for broadening international co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the Conference is convinced that on this basis, and in conformity with the Treaty, further efforts should be made to ensure that the benefits of peaceful applications of nuclear technology should be available to all Parties to the Treaty.

The Conference recognizes that there continues to be a need for the fullest possible exchange of nuclear materials, equipment and technology, including up-to-date developments, consistent with the objectives and safeguards requirements of the Treaty. The Conference reaffirms the undertaking of the Parties to the Treaty in a position to do so to co-operate in contributing, alone or together with other States or international organizations, to the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, especially in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world. Recognizing, in the context of Article IV, 2, those growing needs of developing States the Conference considers it necessary to continue and increase assistance to them in this field bilaterally and through such multilateral channels as the IAEA and the United Nations Development Programme.

The Conference is of the view that, in order to implement as fully as possible Article IV of the Treaty, developed States Party to the Treaty should

consider taking measures, making contributions and establishing programmes, as soon as possible, for the provision of special assistance in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for developing States Party to the Treaty.

The Conference recommends that, in reaching decisions on the provision of equipment, materials, services and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, on concessional and other appropriate financial arrangements and on the furnishing of technical assistance in the nuclear field, including co-operation related to the continuous operation of peaceful nuclear facilities, States Party to the Treaty should give weight to adherence to the Treaty by recipient States. The Conference recommends, in this connexion, that any special measures of co-operation to meet the growing needs of developing States Party to the Treaty might include increased and supplemental voluntary aid provided bilaterally or through multilateral channels such as the IAEA's facilities for administering funds-in-trust and gifts-in-kind.

The Conference further recommends that States Party to the Treaty in a position to do so, meet, to the fullest extent possible, "technically sound" requests for technical assistance, submitted to the IAEA by developing States Party to the Treaty, which the IAEA is unable to finance from its own resources, as well as such "technically sound" requests as may be made by developing States Party to the Treaty which are not Members of the IAEA.

The Conference recognizes that regional or multinational nuclear fuel cycle centres may be an advantageous way to satisfy, safely and economically, the needs of many States in the course of initiating or expanding nuclear power programmes, while at the same time facilitating physical protection and the application of IAEA safeguards, and contributing to the goals of the Treaty.

The Conference welcomes the IAEA's studies in this area, and recommends that they be continued as expeditiously as possible. It considers that such studies should include, among other aspects, identification of the complex practical and organizational difficulties which will need to be dealt with in connexion with such projects.

The Conference urges all Parties to the Treaty in a position to do so to co-operate in these studies, particularly by providing to the IAEA where possible economic data concerning construction and operation of facilities such as chemical reprocessing plants, plutonium fuel fabrication plants, waste management installations, and longer-term spent fuel storage, and by assistance to the IAEA to enable it to undertake feasibility studies concerning the establishment of regional nuclear fuel cycle centres in specific geographic regions.

The Conference hopes that, if these studies lead to positive findings, and if the establishment of

regional or multinational nuclear fuel cycle centres is undertaken, Parties to the Treaty in a position to do so, will co-operate in, and provide assistance for, the elaboration and realization of such projects.

REVIEW OF ARTICLE V

The Conference reaffirms the obligation of Parties to the Treaty to take appropriate measures to ensure that potential benefits from any peaceful applications of nuclear explosions are made available to non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty in full accordance with the provisions of Article V and other applicable international obligations. In this connexion, the Conference also reaffirms that such services should be provided to non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty on a non-discriminatory basis and that the charge to such Parties for the explosive devices used should be as low as possible and exclude any charge for research and development.

The Conference notes that any potential benefits could be made available to non-nuclear-weapon States not Party to the Treaty by way of nuclear explosion services provided by nuclear-weapon States, as defined by the Treaty, and conducted under the appropriate international observation and international procedures called for in Article V and in accordance with other applicable international obligations. The Conference considers it imperative that access to potential benefits of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes not lead to any proliferation of nuclear explosive capability.

The Conference considers the IAEA to be the appropriate international body, referred to in Article V of the Treaty, through which potential benefits from peaceful applications of nuclear explosions could be made available to any non-nuclear-weapon State. Accordingly, the Conference urges the IAEA to expedite work on identifying and examining the important legal issues involved in, and to commence consideration of, the structure and content of the special international agreement or agreements contemplated in Article V of the Treaty, taking into account the views of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) and the United Nations General Assembly and enabling States Party to the Treaty but not Members of the IAEA which would wish to do so to participate in such work.

The Conference notes that the technology of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes is still at the stage of development and study and that there are a number of interrelated international legal and other aspects of such explosions which still need to be investigated.

The Conference commends the work in this field that has been carried out within the IAEA and looks forward to the continuance of such work pursuant to United Nations General Assembly reso-

lution 3261 D (XXIX). It emphasizes that the IAEA should play the central role in matters relating to the provision of services for the application of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It believes that the IAEA should broaden its consideration of this subject to encompass, within its area of competence, all aspects and implications of the practical applications of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. To this end it urges the IAEA to set up appropriate machinery within which intergovernmental discussion can take place and through which advice can be given on the Agency's work in this field.

The Conference attaches considerable importance to the consideration by the CCD, pursuant to United Nations General Assembly resolution 3261 D (XXIX) and taking due account of the views of the IAEA, of the arms control implications of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

The Conference notes that the thirtieth session of the United Nations General Assembly will receive reports pursuant to United Nations General Assembly resolution 3261 D (XXIX) and will provide an opportunity for States to discuss questions related to the application of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The Conference further notes that the results of discussion in the United Nations General Assembly at its thirtieth session will be available to be taken into account by the IAEA and the CCD for their further consideration.

REVIEW OF ARTICLE VI

The Conference recalls the provisions of Article VI of the Treaty under which all Parties undertook to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating

—to the cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and

—to nuclear disarmament and

—to a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

While welcoming the various agreements on arms limitation and disarmament elaborated and concluded over the last few years as steps contributing to the implementation of Article VI of the Treaty, the Conference expresses its serious concern that the arms race, in particular the nuclear arms race, is continuing unabated.

The Conference therefore urges constant and resolute efforts by each of the Parties to the Treaty, in particular by the nuclear-weapon States, to achieve an early and effective implementation of Article VI of the Treaty.

The Conference affirms the determination expressed in the preamble to the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty and reiterated in the preamble to the Non-Proliferation Treaty to achieve the discontinuance of all test explosions of nuclear weapons for

all time. The Conference expresses the view that the conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear weapons tests is one of the most important measures to halt the nuclear arms race. It expresses the hope that the nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty will take the lead in reaching an early solution of the technical and political difficulties on this issue. It appeals to these States to make every effort to reach agreement on the conclusion of an effective comprehensive test ban. To this end, the desire was expressed by a considerable number of delegations at the Conference that the nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty should as soon as possible enter into an agreement, open to all States and containing appropriate provisions to ensure its effectiveness, to halt all nuclear weapons tests of adhering States for a specified time, whereupon the terms of such an agreement would be reviewed in the light of the opportunity, at that time, to achieve a universal and permanent cessation of all nuclear weapons tests. The Conference calls upon the nuclear-weapon States signatories of the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapons Tests, meanwhile, to limit the number of their underground nuclear weapons tests to a minimum. The Conference believes that such steps would constitute an incentive of particular value to negotiations for the conclusion of a treaty banning all nuclear weapons test explosions for all time.

The Conference appeals to the nuclear-weapon States parties to the negotiations on the limitation of strategic arms to endeavour to conclude at the earliest possible date the new agreement that was outlined by their leaders in November 1974. The Conference looks forward to the commencement of follow-on negotiations on further limitations of, and significant reductions in, their nuclear weapons systems as soon as possible following the conclusion of such an agreement.

The Conference notes that, notwithstanding earlier progress, the CCD has recently been unable to reach agreement on new substantive measures to advance the objectives of Article VI of the Treaty. It urges, therefore, all members of the CCD Party to the Treaty, in particular the nuclear-weapon States Party, to increase their efforts to achieve effective disarmament agreements on all subjects on the agenda of the CCD.

The Conference expresses the hope that all States Party to the Treaty, through the United Nations and the CCD and other negotiations in which they participate, will work with determination towards the conclusion of arms limitation and disarmament agreements which will contribute to the goal of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

The Conference expresses the view that, disarmament being a matter of general concern, the provision of information to all governments and

peoples on the situation in the field of the arms race and disarmament is of great importance for the attainment of the aims of Article VI. The Conference therefore invites the United Nations to consider ways and means of improving its existing facilities for the collection, compilation and dissemination of information on disarmament issues, in order to keep all governments as well as world public opinion properly informed on progress achieved in the realization of the provisions of Article VI of the Treaty.

REVIEW OF ARTICLE VII AND THE SECURITY OF NON-NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES

Recognizing that all States have need to ensure their independence, territorial integrity and sovereignty, the Conference emphasizes the particular importance of assuring and strengthening the security of non-nuclear-weapon States Parties which have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons. It acknowledges that States Parties find themselves in different security situations and therefore that various appropriate means are necessary to meet the security concerns of States Parties.

The Conference underlines the importance of adherence to the Treaty by non-nuclear-weapon States as the best means of reassuring one another of their renunciation of nuclear weapons and as one of the effective means of strengthening their mutual security.

The Conference takes note of the continued determination of the Depositary States to honour their statements, which were welcomed by the United Nations Security Council in resolution 255(1968), that, to ensure the security of the non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, they will provide or support immediate assistance, in accordance with the Charter, to any non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty which is a victim of an act or an object of a threat of aggression in which nuclear weapons are used.

The Conference, bearing in mind Article VII of the Treaty, considers that the establishment of internationally recognized nuclear-weapon-free zones on the initiative and with the agreement of the directly concerned States of the zone, represents an effective means of curbing the spread of nuclear weapons, and could contribute significantly to the security of those States. It welcomes the steps which have been taken toward the establishment of such zones.

The Conference recognizes that for the maximum effectiveness of any Treaty arrangements for establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone the co-operation of the nuclear-weapon States is necessary. At the Conference it was urged by a considerable

number of delegations that nuclear-weapon States should provide, in an appropriate manner, binding security assurances to those States which become fully bound by the provisions of such regional arrangements.

At the Conference it was also urged that determined efforts must be made especially by the nuclear weapon States Party to the Treaty, to ensure the security of all non-nuclear-weapon States Parties. To this end the Conference urges all States, both nuclear-weapon States and non-nuclear-weapon States to refrain, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, from the threat or the use of force in relations between States, involving either nuclear or non-nuclear weapons. Additionally, it stresses the responsibility of all Parties to the Treaty and especially the nuclear-weapon States, to take effective steps to strengthen the security of non-nuclear-weapon States and to promote in all appropriate fora the consideration of all practical means to this end, taking into account the views expressed at this Conference.

REVIEW OF ARTICLE VIII

The Conference invites States Party to the Treaty which are Members of the United Nations to request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to include the following item in the provisional agenda of the thirty-first session of the General Assembly: "Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

The States Party to the Treaty participating in the Conference propose to the Depositary Governments that a second Conference to review the operation of the Treaty be convened in 1980.

The Conference accordingly invites States Party to the Treaty which are Members of the United Nations to request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to include the following item in the provisional agenda of the thirty-third session of the General Assembly: "Implementation of the conclusions of the first Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and establishment of a preparatory committee for the second Conference."

REVIEW OF ARTICLE IX

The five years that have passed since the entry into force of the Treaty have demonstrated its wide international acceptance. The Conference welcomes the recent progress towards achieving wider adherence. At the same time, the Conference notes with concern that the Treaty has not as yet achieved universal adherence. Therefore, the Conference expresses the hope that States that have not already joined the Treaty should do so at the earliest possible date.

Five EURATOM Countries Ratify Nonproliferation Treaty

At a ceremony at the Department of State on May 2, the Ambassadors of Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands deposited with the United States their instruments of ratification of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).¹ Following are remarks made at the ceremony by Deputy Secretary Robert S. Ingersoll and Ambassador Egidio Ortona of Italy, the ranking Ambassador.

Press release 232 dated May 2

DEPUTY SECRETARY INGERSOLL

The ratification today of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons by our close friends and allies, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands, is an extraordinarily important development in the life of the NPT. The treaty now enjoys the support of the world's largest single group of industrialized states, states which are numbered among both the principal manufacturers and exporters of nuclear equipment and technology and also among the principal consumers of nuclear energy.

The simultaneous ratification of the treaty by these states symbolizes their close cooperation within the European Atomic Energy Community and evidences the common resolve of these partners to ratify the treaty together. The United States, of course, has had the benefit of working with EURATOM since its earliest days.

¹ For further details on the ceremony, see press release 232 dated May 2.

Today's significant additions add significant momentum to the global effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. They also demonstrate the dedication of the governments here represented to the goal of nuclear arms control.

AMBASSADOR ORTONA OF ITALY

Mr. Secretary: It is an honor for me to answer your kind words on behalf also of the representatives of the countries of the European Community here present that together have now deposited the instruments of ratification of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

This is an act of greatest political relevance in which the countries here represented have shown their awareness of the importance of contributing to the creation of a world in which civilization must be protected against the risks of the uncontrolled use of nuclear technology and benefit instead from its positive peaceful exploitation.

The countries that are represented here as full members of the treaty will contribute actively to the work that will shortly begin in Geneva for its review and enhancement. They consider the treaty a fundamental contribution to peace in the world, to international détente and to the creation of a new international society based upon security and progress of mankind.

To achieve these ends we believe that particular importance has the commitment embodied in the treaty that the member countries, faithful to the Charter of the United Nations, must refrain from the use of force or of the threat of force against the integrity and the political independence of all states.

Today's ceremony is particularly significant. Some of the most industrialized countries of the world become full members of the Nonproliferation Treaty. We deeply hope that this will serve as a springboard for similar actions by other countries in various geographical areas who have not yet decided

to subscribe or to ratify the treaty.

We consider at the same time the treaty as a cornerstone for negotiations aiming at further measures of disarmament, and as it is clearly stated in the treaty, we declare our readiness to proceed to those negotiations both in the field of conventional and nuclear armaments.

A very important section of the treaty is related to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The countries that today deposit the instruments of ratification have already a wide cooperation in this field with the United States. We believe that our ratification will further enhance that cooperation and will bring about the fullest sharing of the benefits of peaceful utilization of nuclear energy.

May I conclude in saying on behalf of my colleagues and myself that we are glad to participate in any event which constitute a new pillar stone on the way of international cooperation and human progress.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Consular Relations

Vienna convention on consular relations. Done at Vienna April 24, 1963. Entered into force March 19, 1967; for the United States December 24, 1969. TIAS 6820.

Ratification deposited: Iran, June 5, 1975.

Optional protocol to the Vienna convention on consular relations concerning the compulsory settlement of disputes. Done at Vienna April 24, 1963. Entered into force March 19, 1967; for the United States December 24, 1969. TIAS 6820.

Accession deposited: Iran, June 5, 1975.

Copyright

Universal copyright convention, as revised. Done at Paris July 24, 1971. Entered into force July 10, 1974. TIAS 7868.

Ratification deposited: Tunisia, March 10, 1975.

Accession deposited: Bulgaria (with a statement), March 7, 1975.

Protocol 1 annexed to the universal copyright convention, as revised, concerning the application of that convention to works of stateless persons and refugees. Done at Paris July 24, 1971. Entered into force July 10, 1974. TIAS 7868.

Protocol 2 annexed to the universal copyright convention, as revised, concerning the application of that convention to the works of certain international organizations. Done at Paris July 24, 1971. Entered into force July 10, 1974. TIAS 7868.

Ratification deposited: Tunisia, March 10, 1975.

Health

Amendment of articles 24 and 25 of the constitution of the World Health Organization of July 22, 1946, as amended (TIAS 1808, 4643). Adopted at Geneva May 23, 1967. Entered into force May 21, 1975.

Acceptances deposited: Greece, May 29, 1975; Morocco, June 2, 1975.

Judicial Procedure

Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters. Done at The Hague March 18, 1970. Entered into force October 7, 1972. TIAS 7444.

Signature: Luxembourg, May 2, 1975.

Ratification deposited: Sweden (with declarations), May 2, 1975.

Load Lines

International convention on load lines, 1966. Done at London April 5, 1966. Entered into force July 21, 1968. TIAS 6331.

Accession deposited: German Democratic Republic (with declarations), May 15, 1975.

Oil Pollution

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.

Ratification deposited: Federal Republic of Germany, May 7, 1975.¹

Property—Industrial

Convention of Paris for the protection of industrial property of March 20, 1883, as revised. Done at Stockholm July 14, 1967. Articles 1 through 12 entered into force May 19, 1970; for the United States August 25, 1973. Articles 13 through 30 entered into force April 26, 1970; for the United States September 5, 1970. TIAS 6923.

Notification from World Intellectual Property Organization that ratification deposited: Gabon, March 10, 1975.

Safety at Sea

Convention on the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1972. Done at London October 20, 1972.²

Accession deposited: German Democratic Republic (with declarations), May 15, 1975.

¹ Applicable to Berlin (West).

² Not in force.

Satellite Communications System

Agreement relating to the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization (INTELSAT), with annexes. Done at Washington August 20, 1971. Entered into force February 12, 1973. TIAS 7532.

Accession deposited: Libya, June 9, 1975.

Operating agreement relating to the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization (INTELSAT), with annex. Done at Washington August 20, 1971. Entered into force February 12, 1973. TIAS 7432.

Signature: Libya, June 9, 1975.

Tonnage Measurement

International convention on tonnage measurement of ships, 1969. Done at London June 23, 1969.²

Accession deposited: German Democratic Republic (with declarations), May 15, 1975.

Wheat

Protocol modifying and extending the wheat trade convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971. Done at Washington April 2, 1974. Entered into force June 19, 1974, with respect to certain provisions and July 1, 1974, with respect to other provisions. TIAS 7144, 7988.

Acceptance deposited: Japan, June 6, 1975.

Protocol modifying and extending the food aid convention (part of the international wheat agreement) 1971. Done at Washington April 2, 1974. Entered into force June 19, 1974, with respect to certain provisions and July 1, 1974, with respect to other provisions. TIAS 7144, 7988.

Acceptance deposited: Japan (with reservation), June 6, 1975.

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

Ratifications deposited: India, June 12, 1975; Mauritius, June 10, 1975.

Declaration of provisional application deposited: Switzerland, June 12, 1975.

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

Declaration of provisional application deposited: Switzerland, June 12, 1975.

BILATERAL

Asian Development Bank

Agreement amending the agreement of April 19, 1974, relating to the United States contribution to the Multi-Purpose Special Fund of the Asian Development Bank. Effected by exchange of letters

² Not in force.

at Washington and Manila December 23, 1974, and April 1, 1975. Entered into force April 1, 1975.

Chile

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of October 25, 1974 (TIAS 7993). Effected by exchange of notes at Santiago May 22, 1975. Entered into force May 22, 1975.

Guatemala

Agreement relating to the limitation of imports from Guatemala of fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of cattle, goats and sheep, except lambs, during calendar year 1975. Effected by exchange of notes at Guatemala April 18 and 25, 1975. Entered into force April 25, 1975.

Honduras

Agreement concerning payment to the United States of net proceeds from the sale of defense articles furnished under the military assistance program. Effected by exchange of notes at Tegucigalpa May 9, 1974 and May 15, 1975. Entered into force May 15, 1975; effective July 1, 1974.

Malaysia

Agreement relating to trade in cotton, wool, and man-made fiber textiles and textile products, with annexes. Effected by exchange of notes at Kuala Lumpur January 8 and May 16, 1975. Entered into force May 16, 1975; effective January 1, 1975.

Nepal

Agreement amending the agreement of June 9, 1961 for financing certain educational exchange programs. Effected by exchange of notes at Kathmandu July 10 and December 13, 1974 and May 18, 1975. Entered into force May 18, 1975.

DEPARTMENT AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Confirmations

The Senate on June 9 confirmed the following nominations:

Daniel P. Moynihan to be U.S. Representative to the United Nations and U.S. Representative in the U.N. Security Council.

Andrew L. Steigman to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic.

Galen L. Stone to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Laos.

Malcolm Toon to be Ambassador to Israel.

Austria. President Ford Visits Western Europe, Attends NATO Meeting, and Meets with President Sadat of Egypt at Salzburg (address, NATO communique, remarks by President Ford and foreign leaders)	885
Congress	
Confirmations (Moynihan, Steigman, Stone, Toon)	932
Foreign Aid Authorization Bill Transmitted to Congress (letter from President Ford)	920
Department and Foreign Service. Confirmations (Moynihan, Steigman, Stone, Toon)	932
Disarmament	
Five EURATOM Countries Ratify Nonproliferation Treaty (Ingersoll, Ortona)	930
U.S. Reaffirms Support for Nonproliferation Treaty at Review Conference (Iklé, final declaration of conference)	921
Egypt. President Ford Visits Western Europe, Attends NATO Meeting, and Meets with President Sadat of Egypt at Salzburg (address, NATO communique, remarks by President Ford and foreign leaders)	885
Energy. President Ford Urges Action on Energy Program (TV-radio address)	917
Europe. Secretary Kissinger's News Conferences at Brussels and Salzburg	907
Foreign Aid. Foreign Aid Authorization Bill Transmitted to Congress (letter from President Ford)	920
International Organizations and Conferences. U.S. Reaffirms Support for Nonproliferation Treaty at Review Conference (Iklé, final declaration of conference)	921
Italy. President Ford Visits Western Europe, Attends NATO Meeting, and Meets with President Sadat of Egypt at Salzburg (address, NATO communique, remarks by President Ford and foreign leaders)	885
Latin America. Secretary Kissinger Welcomes Council of the Americas	915
Middle East. Secretary Kissinger's News Conferences at Brussels and Salzburg	907
North Atlantic Treaty Organization	
President Ford Visits Western Europe, Attends NATO Meeting, and Meets with President Sadat of Egypt at Salzburg (address, NATO communique, remarks by President Ford and foreign leaders)	885
Secretary Kissinger's News Conferences at Brussels and Salzburg	907
Presidential Documents	
Foreign Aid Authorization Bill Transmitted to Congress	920
President Ford Urges Action on Energy Program	917
Spain. President Ford Visits Western Europe, Attends NATO Meeting, and Meets with President Sadat of Egypt at Salzburg (address, NATO communique, remarks by President Ford and foreign leaders)	885
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	931

Five EURATOM Countries Ratify Nonproliferation Treaty (Ingersoll, Ortona)	930
Viet-Nam. U.S. States Concern for Americans Held in South Viet-Nam (Department statement)	919

Name Index

Arias Navarro, Carlos	885
Ford, President	885, 917, 920
Franco, Francisco	885
Iklé, Fred C.	921
Ingersoll, Robert S.	930
Kissinger, Secretary	907, 915
Kreisky, Bruno	885
Leone, Giovanni	885
Moynihan, Daniel P.	932
Ortona, Egidio	930
Sadat, Anwar al-	885
Steigman, Andrew L.	932
Stone, Galen L.	932
Toon, Malcolm	932

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: June 9-15

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

Releases issued prior to June 9 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 232 of May 2, 308 of May 30, 312 and 313 of June 2, and 317 of June 4.

No.	Date	Subject
*322	6/9	U.S.-Malaysia textile agreement.
*323	6/9	Interagency Indochina Task Force: chronology, fact sheet.
†324	6/10	"Foreign Relations," 1949, vol. VII, the Far East and Australasia, part 1, released.
*325	6/10	Program for the official visit of Yitzhak Rabin, Prime Minister of Israel, June 10-13.
†326	6/10	Kissinger, Rabin: remarks upon Prime Minister Rabin's arrival.
*327	6/12	Program for the state visit of Walter Scheel, President of the Federal Republic of Germany.
*328	6/12	U.S.-Colombia textile agreement.
*329	6/12	Advisory Committee on Transnational Enterprises established.
*330	6/12	Advisory Committee on Transnational Enterprises, June 30.
*331	6/12	Shipping Coordinating Committee working group on radio communications, July 17.
†332	6/12	Kissinger: news conference.
*333	6/12	Toon sworn in as Ambassador to Israel (biographic data).
†334	6/13	Members of East-West Center governing board named (rewrite).

* Not printed.

† Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.