

S  
1.3:

75/1957



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
**BULLETIN**

Volume LXXV • No. 1957 • December 27, 1976

HUMAN RIGHTS: LET'S MEAN WHAT WE SAY

*Statement by Ambassador Scranton 745*

LATIN AMERICA AND TODAY'S WORLD ECONOMY

*Address by Under Secretary Rogers 751*

THE OFFICIAL WEEKLY RECORD OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

*For index see inside back cover*

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE **BULLETIN**

VOL. LXXV, No. 1957  
December 27, 1976

---

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

*The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, 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

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

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

## Human Rights: Let's Mean What We Say

*Statement by William W. Scranton*

*U.S. Representative to the U.N. General Assembly*<sup>1</sup>

Human rights is as vital and generic an interest of the United Nations as is peacekeeping itself. In fact, the two were the impetus for the founding of the United Nations after World War II—a war fought against tyranny for the preservation of humanity and human values. While U.N. efforts in peacekeeping have not always been effective, this organization has served well in this field, as it is doing today in several parts of the world. But, to me at least, that second and equally vital concern of our institution has brought deep disappointment. The rhetoric on human rights has been superb. The record of accomplishment has been sadly deficient.

This committee has the privilege of dealing with human rights, a subject with but few exceptions absent from the body of international law before the United Nations was established. Until the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights set forth standards for relations between states and individuals, only global indignation could cause a state to desist from barbarous practices. The Universal Declaration and the cornucopia of papers that has flowed from the United Nations since, proclaiming principles and goals about the dignity of all humans, were to have made things different.

Have they? Rarely does a state dare con-

tradict the declaration publicly; yet far too few pursue its goals conscientiously, and fewer still embrace its principles to the point of allowing domestic practice to be inspected. In short, the world has not come far.

Today, the only universality that one can honestly associate with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is universal lipservice.

Why is the United Nations so long on declarations and so short on implementation? Why does it spend so much energy recognizing rights and so little providing remedies for the wronged? Why did the year 1968—the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the declaration, designated as the International Year for Human Rights—follow the 19th-century pattern of treating human rights as little more than a political issue? Why did the Tehran Conference [Apr. 22–May 13, 1968] all but restrict its focus to anti-Israeli grievances and the black-white problems of southern Africa and consciously ignore other obvious and egregious instances of oppression on every continent?

The reason is simply this: Human rights are still treated almost exclusively in a political context, even though positions are cloaked in high moral principles. As a result, compliance with human rights standards is measured not by the standards themselves, but by vote-gathering ability.

Those imprisoned for political dissent, those tortured because they refuse to abandon what they know to be true, cannot await the day their case might happen to come

---

<sup>1</sup> Made in Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) of the General Assembly on Nov. 24 (text from USUN press release 162).

under the international political spotlight. For the literally hundreds of thousands suffering and denied their dignity as humans, the damage is irreparable. In short, in the field of human rights, justice delayed, as it is by slow and easily obstructed U.N. procedures, becomes mass murder condoned.

### **Liberty and Economic Development**

My belief and the basic concept upon which the free society of the United States is founded is this: The idea of human rights is not unique to certain groups at isolated points in history; the idea is a unifying thread through all of the history of man, even in darkest times.

Before becoming a place, or even a people, the United States was an idea: that men and women can live together in a society without surrendering their rights; that human beings are individuals, not just members of political communities or parts of social institutions; that there exists a limit on the state's right to interfere with the rights and freedoms of a citizen. This awareness of human rights and the natural dignity of human individuals lay at the very heart of our revolutionary birth 200 years ago. The idea of liberty is the single most important animating principle of our Constitution and of our people today.

The focus of that liberty has been the individual, his energies and creative abilities and how best to free those energies. Perhaps more than anything else, this has been the chief theme of our whole history, both at home and in our dealings with other nations. We have gone to war for it, and we have made peace with it foremost in our minds. To this day it remains the most powerful argument for our system.

For the protection of that liberty we limit the power of the government over the rights of the governed. During our nation's infancy it took a four-year struggle over the negotiation and ratification of the U.S. Constitution, a struggle resulting in 10 amendments—our Bill of Rights—to circumscribe government authority. Yet our nation's founders knew that without a Bill of Rights,

freedom gained from colonial domination could one day be lost to an authoritarian regime.

There are men and women in this room who share these views, who believe deeply in human rights, but whose governments confront what are said to be special and extraordinary social needs requiring priority attention. Their leaders are preoccupied with the immense problems of raising their people from poverty, of holding together diverse racial, tribal, and religious elements, of eradicating illiteracy, and of acquiring an elementary technology. In many cases their problems become a basis to rationalize a dominant role for the state, one so dominant that liberty and human rights disappear in the name of development.

History shows this to be an unfounded and destructive fiction, one the United States challenges first and foremost out of respect for the inherent dignity of man and woman, but one we also challenge for the sake of economic development itself. We offer the central lesson of modern history: that liberty is the spur to economic development, not its enemy. Countries grow economically when the inventiveness, creativity, and freedom of their citizens are unfettered, not when energies of their people are locked and chained.

So to those who tell us they are too poor to afford our notions of human rights, we reply that freedom from want can best be achieved when civil and political rights are respected, that promoting and cherishing freedom is both a moral necessity and a precondition to better living.

When some leaders who do not heed that lesson are later called to account for their failures, they blame the devastation of their societies on the effects of a bygone colonialism or, more currently, on the economic strength of the industrialized democracies and the myth of neocolonialism. Then they take for the state an even more dominant role to cope with increased discontent and opposition. Repression follows inevitably and leads to violence.

Yet for many leaders in the Third World this subordination of fundamental freedoms

to government authority was not and is not desired. Far from fundamentally opposing individual human rights, these leaders hope for the day when their people can enjoy both freedom and prosperity.

### **Human Rights Versus Marxist Dogma**

The Communist states, however, especially the Soviet Union, evidence no such aspirations. In the Soviet system any genuine respect for human rights encounters the harsh opposition of basic Marxist dogma: that individual rights stand in the way of a planned and directed society. Then there is their cynical approach to human rights discussion itself. For example, by putting forward in the Human Rights Commission what they call "the right to life" they attempt to justify in the name of national security the limitation of every other human right—the right to speak freely, to write, to worship, to be free of arbitrary action by the state.

The Soviet Union's efforts to manipulate the developing world are very destructive. Using the guise of neocolonialism to discredit the ideas and forms of freedom, they hope to strengthen the ideas and forms of totalitarianism.

But there are ways for the Soviet Union to play a constructive role for human rights, to demonstrate concrete followup on promises made. The forthcoming change in Administration in the United States will not change one fundamental fact: The United States will insist that the Soviet Union fulfill its commitments under the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, including the "basket" 3 provisions.<sup>2</sup> In considering further normalization of relations with the Soviet sphere, we shall measure their performance under the standards agreed to at Helsinki.

Mr. Chairman, some countries make fear an instrument of national policy. The creative instincts of people are continually kept

---

<sup>2</sup> For text of the final act, signed at Helsinki on Aug. 1, 1975, see BULLETIN of Sept. 1, 1975, p. 323; for "basket" 3, Co-operation in Humanitarian and Other Fields, see p. 339.

in check; arrest, torture, and imprisonment without trial, often under so-called emergency powers, become an institutionalized pattern. In this connection, I wish to reiterate my government's unequivocal condemnation of the doctrine and practice of apartheid. This pernicious philosophy has led to wave after wave of mass detention and wholesale violation of even the most elementary human rights. It degrades not only its victims but those who promulgate and defend it.

While the United States will not impose its system on others, it will and must make its views known. Concern about respect for human dignity is more than a simple reflection of American tradition; it is a critical current priority for the American people. Note the focus on human rights in U.S. foreign policy during the year's Presidential campaign and the specific pronouncements by the President-elect during the campaign itself and again last week at a press conference in Plains, Georgia.

Note, too, the legislation enacted this year by the U.S. Congress to encourage the worldwide observance of human rights. Consistent patterns of gross violations against internationally recognized human rights already affect decisions on U.S. security assistance abroad and votes in multilateral lending agencies. Future legislation may well extend the range of our concern.

### **U.N. Procedures To Deal With Violations**

Next year this Third Committee is scheduled to review human rights machinery in the United Nations. Will it then consider that, notwithstanding the body of U.N. resolutions, conventions, and declarations, violations of human rights appear as widespread today as in any recent time?

U.N. policies require secrecy of proceedings and restrict the committee from discussing the literally tens of thousands of petitions to the United Nations that cite violations of human rights in so many nations. Yet we all know what they are about: denial of basic freedoms and particularly religious expression in the Baltic states—Lithuania,

Latvia, and Estonia; coercive political indoctrination in the so-called "work camps" of Indochina; massive detentions and torture of political prisoners in some countries of Latin America; mass slaughter in some countries of Africa; denial of freedom of thought, religious freedom, and emigration in the Soviet Union. The full rollcall is long and depressing; it goes on and on.

We are all familiar with the procedures which were authorized by the Economic and Social Council in 1970 in Resolution 1503. These procedures marked what we then hoped would be a major step forward in improving the capability of the United Nations to deal with situations of serious human rights violations. They authorized action on human rights petitions which "reveal a consistent pattern of gross and reliably attested violations . . . ."

But the record of Human Rights Commission actions under these procedures has been one of nonperformance. One basic reason for the dismal record is the procedures themselves. They virtually assure that complaints of violations will die in a bureaucratic maze. For example, after the receipt of the complaint, long delays occur before there is any possibility of action by the Commission.

Eighteen months must pass before a complaint is first reviewed—a complaint that evidences "a consistent pattern of gross violations." By the time a complaint is considered, it needs updating, and an update must go through the same delay-plagued process. Last March, when a motion to allow supplementary material to bypass delaying procedures was proposed, in typical fashion it too was postponed. Obviously these procedures should be made more effective, sped up to bring action. My government will do its utmost to support improvement in Resolution 1503.

This committee should establish mechanisms to stem the massive violations of human rights in the world—not merely in the handful of countries to which this body has attracted world attention. It must act against the abuse of human rights wherever it takes place. Effective investigatory power, effective procedures, effective action taken

before a particular abuse becomes a global political issue—all these are needed.

If, at the close of the third decade since the adoption of that Universal Declaration, no better U.N. machinery exists than does now, then we will have bared our true intent: to avoid fulfilling the purposes of that declaration. That anniversary will then not be a celebration, but an occasion for dismay at how little was done and how much was concealed. If we will not act to give life to the principles we profess, maybe the honest course would be for us to file out of this hall one by one, each admitting we have no intent to keep faith with our promises. But none of us can afford to abandon this sacred responsibility, whatever the difficulties.

Yearn as I may for utopia, right now I would settle for comparatively small changes and additions to our system. Total restructuring and fundamental change is not essential. But we must build upon the existing machinery, remove its weaknesses, and make it work.

There is no shortage of suggestions that merit consideration: a United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, an International Human Rights Court, a permanent body to meet and review complaints regularly throughout the year. Each could provide timely, continuous, and public attention to serious human rights violations. In addition, this organization should make a more deliberate effort to coordinate with the important human rights work being done by regional groups. Further, more regional human rights organizations should be established. All these suggestions could improve the current situation immensely.

The responsibility to safeguard human rights is simply too sacred for all of us—and might indeed someday be needed to preserve life and freedom for any one of us—to be left hostage to political manipulation.

Every country represented here subscribes to the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A number honor them. Many more would if they thought they could. It is time for this body to make those principles a reality, to act now to turn on some light.

Human rights are destroyed in little moves that flourish in darkness and quiet—destructive steps, each so minor that one seems able to justify not putting up a defense, not just yet. Only exposure—precise, unrelenting, and complete exposure—will prevail against that destructive process.

The conscience of mankind can ignore injustice in the dark. When the lights are on, few men of conscience can remain quiet. This body must choose between darkness and decency, between protecting the violators of human dignity and protecting human dignity itself with the light of world opinion, the clear light of truth.

## Secretary Kissinger's Statement on Designation of Mr. Vance

*Following is a statement by Secretary Kissinger made on his behalf on December 3 by Robert L. Funseth, Special Assistant to the Secretary for Press Relations.*

Press release 583 dated December 3

President-elect Carter has made an outstanding choice in choosing Cyrus Vance as his Secretary of State. I have known Mr. Vance for many years and have had the privilege of working with him. He is exceptionally well qualified for his new responsibilities. I wish him well; his success will be the success of all Americans.

My colleagues in the Department of State and I will do everything we can to assist the Secretary-designate during the transition period. I have ordered that all cables and other information available to me as Secretary of State be made available immediately to Mr. Vance. I look forward to meeting soon with the Secretary-designate to work out this and other details of the transition.

Mr. Vance deserves the support and prayers of all Americans; for the peace, progress, and prosperity of the United States—which will so much depend upon him—are crucial to the realization of a better world for all mankind.

## Secretary Reaffirms Continuity of U.S.-Mexican Relations

*Secretary Kissinger, as Special Representative of the President and Chief of Delegation to the inauguration of Mexican President José Lopez Portillo, visited Mexico City November 29–December 2. Following are remarks made by Secretary Kissinger at a reception for the U.S. delegation on November 30.<sup>1</sup>*

Press release 576 dated December 1

I would like to welcome you all and to express our appreciation for your coming here to see us. My wife and I are always happy to visit Mexico, where we had our honeymoon and where we have spent so many happy occasions. And our country has such profound ties to the people and the Government of Mexico which are symbolized by the presence here of the son of our current President, Mr. Jack Ford, and the wife of the President-elect, Mrs. [Rosalynn] Carter. Nothing could express more profoundly the importance that the United States attaches to its relationships in the Western Hemisphere and to its very special relationship to its growing, complicated, difficult, occasionally cantankerous but always close friends in Mexico.

We live in a period in which we have to find peace in the midst of ideological conflicts and we have to strive for progress when the disparities between people and within countries are enormous. And we must give expression to the interdependence of nations at a time when the pride of nations has never been more pronounced.

In this respect, our relations with our neighbors in Mexico are of central importance. We have to deal with each other on the basis of mutual respect. We have to recognize that we will not always see things identically—and how is that possible, anyway, in a nation of some 70 million anarchistic individualists? But we must also recognize that our destinies are linked and that we can

---

<sup>1</sup> Other press releases relating to Secretary Kissinger's visit to Mexico City are Nos. 574 of Nov. 29, 577 of Dec. 2, and 579 of Dec. 3.

set an example to the rest of the world how proud nations can cooperate.

For the first time in nearly three decades, periods of transition in Mexico and in the United States coincide. And just as the transfer of authority is taking place in Mexico with dignity and with continuity and with the assurance that the basic principles of the relationship between our two countries will be maintained, so I am confident that the basic principles of peace, of progress, of interdependence and mutual respect reflect the views of all Americans. They do not reflect the view of a single party—and, after all, the first time that I met our President-elect, when only he knew he was going to run for President, I heard him give an address in Spanish to a group of diplomats from the Western Hemisphere signifying his own commitment to the closer relationship within the Western Hemisphere.

So, in thanking once again Mr. Ford and Mrs. Carter for joining us, I would like to propose a toast to the friendship between the Mexican and American people, to the health and long life of President Echeverría, and to the health and success of President-elect Lopez Portillo.

## **United States and Mexico Sign Treaty on Execution of Penal Sentences**

Press release 570 dated November 26

The following is the text of a press release issued November 25 in Mexico City after the signing of a treaty between Mexico and the United States on the execution of penal sentences:

“Today, at 5 p.m., Secretary of Foreign Relations Alfonso García Robles and the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, Joseph John Jova, signed the treaty between the United States and Mexico on the execution of penal sentences.

“The agreement is the first of its kind for both Mexico and the United States.

“This treaty, which has been under negotiation since last September, has the objective of facilitating the social rehabilitation of prisoners by allowing them to serve their prison terms in their own social environment.

“That is, Mexican nationals who may be sentenced in the United States could serve their sentences in Mexico, and U.S. nationals sentenced in Mexico could serve their sentences in their own country. In determining whether a transfer should be requested, the treaty provides several factors which may be taken into account. Among these are: the type and seriousness of the crime for which the prisoner was sentenced; his previous criminal record, if any; the strength of his connections by residence, family relations, and otherwise to the social life of the country where he is imprisoned or with his native country.

“The transfer of a prisoner requires the initiation of the request by the state in which the sentence has been imposed, and the approval of the request by the other state. No transfer shall take place without the consent of the offender.”

After the signing, the Secretary of Foreign Relations made the following official statement: “As is the case with all treaties, the present one is subject to Senate approval in accordance with section X of article 89 and with section I of article 76 of the Political Constitution of Mexico.”

In the present case, the ratification of the treaty by Mexico is also subject to—and this has been made perfectly clear in the discussions with the U.S. Government officials—the approval by the majority of the state legislatures of an amendment to article 18 of the Constitution proposed by the Federal Executive Authority on September 4 and favorably approved by the Congress of the Union. In the United States, the treaty and enabling legislation will be sent to the Congress for appropriate action.



## Latin America and Today's World Economy

*Address by William D. Rogers  
Under Secretary for Economic Affairs*<sup>1</sup>

I should like to say a word or two about the world economic circumstance and try to draw a few lines of relevance to Latin America and for our relations with Latin America.

First, however, a brief reference to Mexico. I have just returned from Mexico City. I had the privilege of participating in our delegation, led by the Secretary of State, to the inauguration of President Lopez Portillo. He and his new Cabinet, as this group well knows, face substantial challenges in the coming months in the economic field. But I am confident that they are putting together a program of public policy with vision, determination, and courage which will permit Mexico indeed to achieve its immense potential in the years ahead.

Mexico, of course, is not alone in its present economic difficulties. Yellow lights are flashing around the world.

A few months ago the OECD [Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development] estimated that aggregate 1977 growth rates for the industrial democracies—on whom the economic vigor of the world turns—would be something like 5 percent. Although the precise revised estimate of the OECD Secretariat has not been officially released, I think it fair to say that it was recognized at last month's meeting of the OECD Economic Policy Committee, which I attended with Chairman [of the Council of Economic Advis-

ers Alan] Greenspan, that the level for 1977 has slipped and that aggregate growth rates will be measurably lower than OECD had first thought.

High rates of inflation persist among the OECD countries. The average is between 8 and 9 percent for the group. Japan, Germany, and the United States are better off. The United Kingdom and Italy are well into double digits.

Investment rates are slowing, particularly in Western Europe, and some company balance sheets are in bad shape.

The OECD countries' balance of payments on current account has deteriorated steadily. It was balanced in the first half of 1975. The deficit is now \$25–\$30 billion. If there is an increase in the price of oil, an issue to which I will come in a minute, this deficit will grow.

Faced with a need to finance growing balance-of-payments deficits, more and more OECD countries are facing a severe credit crunch. The United Kingdom and Italy are now both in the process of arranging additional IMF [International Monetary Fund] drawings, with all that implies by way of painful internal adjustments.

The divergence in economic performance among the industrial democracies is growing, and this is making more difficult the management of a sustained general expansion.

Finally, there is the ominous possibility that the OPEC [Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries] members will increase the price of their oil exports. A few stark

---

<sup>1</sup>Made before the Council of the Americas at New York, N.Y., on Dec. 6.

facts about the effects of an oil price increase:

The world's import bill for OPEC oil this year is \$125 billion. OPEC's balance-of-payments surplus—the mirror image of the balance-of-payments deficit of the rest of the world—will be about \$45 billion in 1976. A 10 percent price increase would add more than \$12 billion annually to the global energy import bill.

The effects would be to transfer additional resources to OPEC, reduce the import capacity of oil-importing countries, add to the cost of the energy component of all we consume, and thus increase worldwide inflationary pressures.

These effects would not be evenly felt. Weaker economies the world over would be the most seriously affected. And the hardest hit would be those who can least afford it: the poorest among the developing countries, the weaker of the industrial democracies.

Let us not deceive ourselves. An oil price increase of any magnitude would constitute a significant setback to the world economy and to our prospects for inflation-free recovery for all countries, rich and poor.

The restoration of the global economic system must begin with the industrial democracies. The rest of the world depends on them.

First, this means structural change in the economies of the West. Over the past decade and a half the share of national income going to wages and compensation in OECD countries as a whole has increased dramatically. Two examples illustrate the point, as well as the consequences: Between 1960 and 1964 on the one hand, and mid-1974–75, the share of consumption in relation to total domestic product has risen in Italy from 47 percent to 60 percent. In the United Kingdom it has risen from 64 percent to 71 percent. Similar changes have occurred in other countries.

There can be no permanent sustained growth for the industrial democracies without a shift in the strong as well as the weak—away from consumption expenditures to real investment. A beginning is essential, if we are to make up for low investment in

the seventies and overcome the resulting sectoral pressures on capacity, technical obsolescence, and low rate of growth.

While this may mean some restraint on demand for those economies of the West more urgently requiring structural reform, it must be matched by harmonizing policies in those countries which have relatively strong economies.

As I said a minute ago, the OPEC surplus of about \$45 billion each year has as its mirror image a deficit of the same magnitude in the current account of the rest of the world. In its internal growth policy and in its international trade posture, the United States must reflect an acceptance of its share of this deficit, in its external accounts, as must the other strong industrial economies, particularly Germany and Japan. It is up to these nations to lead the expansion and provide the impulse to renewed health that the world economy needs.

#### **Fundamental Strengths of Latin America**

Renewed growth is not only significant to our own future, it is vital to the developing world and to the corner of the developing world in which those assembled here have a special interest: Latin America.

The Americas are special and will play a special role in the world's economic future.

Here is a region with:

*Considerable natural resources.*

*Food production:* For the area as a whole, output is nearly keeping up with population. And the potential is there for much larger production.

*A declining population growth rate.*

*Human resources:* Literacy rates are considerably higher than those of other developing areas. And the picture continues to improve.

*Basic infrastructure:* During the past decade most Latin American countries have made excellent progress in expanding infrastructure to spur sustained growth. Brazil now produces as much cement as the United Kingdom. Mexico already produces as much natural gas as Iran, and its capacity is expanding rapidly.

*Existing industrial capacities:* Manufacturing now accounts for more than 25 percent of Latin America's gross domestic product. At the current rate of expansion, Brazil, for example, expects to be self-sufficient in steel, petrochemicals, fertilizers, and paper products shortly.

*Export potential:* Latin America's export earnings have tripled since 1970.

It was these fundamental strengths that made things look so bright at the beginning of the decade.

It seemed six years ago that Latin America was about to ride the crest of a world boom. A simultaneous upswing in the business cycle among the industrialized countries served to boost prices for Latin America's 15 basic export commodities 300 percent between 1970 and 1974. Even excluding petroleum—the region's largest single export—prices of the other 14 commodities rose by 200 percent. The improved terms of trade, of course, spurred economic growth:

—Manufacturing output grew at an 8.5 percent annual growth rate.

—Exports of manufactures did even better; from \$2.2 billion in 1970, they reached \$7.4 billion in 1974. Even accounting for inflation, this was a tremendous improvement.

### **Current Economic Situation**

Governments, as would be expected, responded to these conditions. Development programs were infused with new vigor.

Then came trouble; first, in the form of higher oil import prices; then from the ensuing worldwide recession.

Latin American export prices crashed. Their import prices, however, stayed high. The index of the region's terms of trade for 1974 was, as a consequence, no better than the not very good period of 1961–65.

The region's rate of economic growth sank to a mere 2.6 percent for 1975—less than the 2.8 percent growth in population. Yet the countries of the region were reluctant to slow the momentum of their respective development programs launched during better days.

Country by country the specifics varied. But almost every country in Latin America now finds itself faced with a fundamental contradiction. Growth and social objectives are, at least for the moment, at odds with balance-of-payments realities.

The difficulties are reflected in the trade figures:

—Brazil is facing almost a \$6.5 billion current account deficit this year.

—Peru will probably have a \$1.3 billion imbalance.

—Jamaica and the Dominican Republic will be hard hit, as prices for their principal exports, sugar and bauxite, remain depressed.

It is not unusual for developing nations to run current account deficits. But today's deficits will require some hard choices. The need now is for:

—Austerity without repression;

—Growth without inflation; and

—Social justice without damage to more slowly expanding economic systems.

### **New Phase in U.S.-Latin American Relations**

Those are internal necessities. Externally, the crucial ingredients, as I have pointed out, are for oil price restraint by OPEC and sustained, solid recovery by the OECD countries. And we must all keep our markets open.

These, in my view, are the elements in the present global economic equation and its bearing on Latin America. I am hopeful, almost confident, that Latin America will emerge from this period of economic difficulty as an even stronger and more vital region of the world and one with which our relations will enter a new phase.

The change that has taken place in our relations in the past couple of years is astonishing. We were on a confrontation course with Latin America a short while back. Today we are on a far more constructive path. Secretary Kissinger is the author of much that has been accomplished.

—We have dealt with the Cuban trade and recognition problems and removed Cuba as

an item of conflict from the inter-America agenda.

—We are dealing with the Panama Canal issue.

—We are talking seriously with other governments of the region, both in the OAS and bilaterally, about the expansion of trade and accelerated development of technology appropriate to the region's needs.

—And we are leading no crusade. We are not taking over the region's problems for ourselves. Specifically, we do not consider that we can resolve Latin America's present balance-of-payments problems with massive unilateral official resource transfers. But we are proposing to increase our development assistance. And we are, however, demonstrating our concern and our willingness to consider how we can play a part in the search for practical solutions to these and other problems.

But how? Our effort must not be something the United States does *to* Latin America or something *by* the United States *for* the Latin Americans. We and the nations of Latin America can and must cooperate. Our success in the cooperative effort to speed growth and spread the sense of equity and justice in the hemisphere will be measured by the extent to which we can work effectively together.

## **Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy**

### **94th Congress, 2d Session**

Human Rights in Iran. Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizations of the House Committee on International Relations. August 3–September 8, 1976. 87 pp.

East German Claims Program. Report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to accompany S. 3621. S. Rept. 94-1188. August 30, 1976. 21 pp.

Military Sales to Turkey. Communication from the President of the United States transmitting his determination that the sale of certain defense articles and services to Turkey are necessary to enable her to fulfill her obligations as a member of NATO. H. Doc. 94-590. August 30, 1976. 5 pp.

## **U.S.-Egypt Joint Working Group on Technology Meets at Washington**

### *Joint Statement*

Press release 566 dated November 22

The fifth meeting of the U.S.-Egypt Joint Working Group on Technology, Research and Development was held in Washington, D.C., November 18–19, 1976. The Joint Working Group was established in June 1974 to encourage a broad program of scientific and technological cooperation for peaceful purposes and mutual benefit, advance the state of science and raise the level of technology in both countries, and strengthen the bonds of friendship between the American and Egyptian people. The last meeting was held in Cairo in February 1976.

Ambassador Frederick Irving, Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, served as U.S. cochairman; Dr. Hassan M. Ismail, President Emeritus of Cairo University, served as Egyptian cochairman.

The Joint Working Group noted with satisfaction encouraging progress in ongoing cooperative programs in the fields of instrumentation technology, science and technology information systems, science policy and research management, building materials and technology, water management and treatment, and Lake Nasser-Nile River environmental studies.

The Joint Working Group provided for broadening and expanding future scientific and technological cooperation between the two countries by encouraging exchanges and joint research in the fields of science and technology; agriculture; environment, ecology, and energy; and standards and applied technology.

The Joint Working Group considered promising new activities within this framework, including multidisciplinary research of the Red Sea marine environment, baseline environmental investigations and econometric modeling of the Suez Canal, studies of endangered wildlife species in Egypt related to

endangered U.S. species, Cairo traffic studies, telecommunications research, and educational programs in applied technology.

The Joint Working Group agreed to hold its sixth regular meeting in Cairo in November 1977. It expressed its appreciation for the strong technical participation in the meeting by officials and scientists of both countries who are planning ahead together to achieve increasing benefits from scientific and technological cooperation.

## INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

### United States Calls for Support for UNRWA

*Following is a statement on agenda item 53, "United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East" (UNRWA), made in the Special Political Committee of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative Pearl Bailey on November 2.*

USUN press release 138 dated November 2

Twenty-seven years ago the General Assembly created the United Nations Relief and Works Agency and tasked it with one of the most complicated and difficult humanitarian missions undertaken in modern times. Despite the fact that it is a temporary organization, created to fulfill what was expected to be a temporary mission, UNRWA has had to cope with problems and needs which have persisted and indeed grown year by year. Recently we have witnessed a renewal of fighting and bloodshed in the Middle East, this time in Lebanon, in which many innocent Palestinian noncombatants have shared the immense human tragedy and physical disruption suffered by the Lebanese people. As long as the underlying political problem related to the Palestinian refugees

persists, the United Nations must continue to assure that UNRWA remains strong and responsive to their needs.

The United States is proud that it played an important role in the creation of UNRWA. We have over the years expressed our support for its mission and confidence in its operation through contributions which have totaled some \$675 million.

Our overriding objective in the Middle East, however, is to help bring about the political conditions which will permit the eventual disappearance of UNRWA within the context of a just and lasting peace in the area and permit all Palestinians to lead meaningful and fruitful lives. We are committed to determined efforts to assure that this goal does not elude us or recede indefinitely into the future. In the meantime, there is no practical alternative, in either political or humanitarian terms, to maintaining the essential services which UNRWA has so effectively delivered to Palestinian refugees over the years.

We would like to pay tribute here to the tireless and dedicated service of UNRWA's distinguished Commissioner General, Sir John Rennie. There are few assignments in the area of international civil service more demanding of managerial skill and patient diplomacy. The uncertainties and frustrations attendant on UNRWA's dependence on voluntary contributions has magnified the already onerous burdens we have placed on him and on his most capable staff. Sir John deserves both our profound gratitude and our pledges of continued and increased support for the organization he serves.

The Commissioner General has stated in graphic terms the precarious financial position which UNRWA faces in the year ahead. Contributions to UNRWA this past year have not kept pace with the rapid rise in the cost of UNRWA's operations. This has been due principally to a combination of global inflation and special conditions in UNRWA's service area, including the hostilities in Lebanon. During the past year UNRWA services have been reduced in a desperate effort to cope with the serious shortfall in con-

tributions in relation to program expenditures. We believe further reductions cannot be made without cutting dangerously into UNRWA's basic services. We would be particularly loath to see this organization compelled to reduce those educational and health programs on which rest the hope of future generations.

Mr. Chairman, I must in all candor observe that the record of international support for UNRWA has been quite uneven. Many governments have made consistently generous contributions, while others clearly do not provide support commensurate to their means or in some cases do not contribute at all. I am pleased to observe that there have, however, recently been some notable and generous contributions from governments which have not previously contributed in substantial amounts. We commend these contributors, appeal to others to follow their example, and pledge that the United States, for its part, will not be tempted by the generosity of others to slacken its traditional support of this vital humanitarian enterprise.<sup>1</sup>

In closing, Mr. Chairman, the U.S. delegation introduces draft resolution A/SPC/31/L.2 in recognition of the critical financial situation described by Commissioner General Sir John Rennie. We urge support of this resolution, but far more important, we urge all member states of the United Nations to support the indispensable activities of UNRWA through increased financial contributions.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> On Oct. 20, in a meeting of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA, Miss Bailey announced an additional U.S. pledge of \$6 million, making a total U.S. contribution of \$38.7 million for 1976. For her statement in the working group, see USUN press release 120 dated Oct. 20. On Nov. 24, in a meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee of the General Assembly for the Announcement of Voluntary Contributions to UNRWA, U.S. Representative Albert W. Sherer, Jr., announced the U.S. pledge of \$26.7 million for 1977. For his statement in the ad hoc committee, see USUN press release 163 dated Nov. 24.

<sup>2</sup> The U.S. draft resolution calling upon all governments "to make the most generous efforts possible to meet the anticipated needs" of UNRWA was adopted by the committee on Nov. 5 by a vote of 96 to 0, with 1 abstention, and by the Assembly on Nov. 23 by a vote of 115 to 0, with 2 abstentions (A/RES/31/15A).

## United States Reaffirms Support of UNHCR Programs

*Following is a statement made in Committee III (Social, Humanitarian and Cultural) of the U.N. General Assembly by U.S. Representative Jean Picker on November 15.*

USUN press release 149 dated November 15

It is a pleasure to comment on the High Commissioner's program and to review the accomplishments of his office over the past year as outlined in the excellent and comprehensive report we are now reviewing.<sup>1</sup> We congratulate the High Commissioner on his most worthy efforts and commend him for this useful report. We have read it with great care and with the attention it deserves.

On the other hand we must observe with a high degree of sadness that the work of the High Commissioner is not diminishing. Rather, the scope and complexity of his activities have increased. There are, unfortunately, new refugee situations and increased demands upon this office, and the prospects for the future offer little solace. As we approach the end of this busy year for the High Commissioner and his staff, we must acknowledge that there are still many unresolved refugee problems to be faced in the year ahead. We will want to comment in a moment on some of them. More than ever there is a clear need for continued support of the High Commissioner's program. We join others in urging that there be full financing of the High Commissioner's program through increased contributions from the traditional donors and fuller participation by others. There is a need to widen significantly the base of support for the High Commissioner's activities.

We were indeed fortunate to have had a visit to Washington by the High Commissioner a few weeks ago. The work of the High Commissioner was featured on United Nations Day on October 24. During the course of the High Commissioner's visit we had an opportunity to review his program in

---

<sup>1</sup> U.N. doc. A/31/12, report of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).

some detail and to gain a better understanding of his future needs.

We are encouraged that the High Commissioner continues to devote priority attention to the question of international legal protection for refugees. Critical areas where such protection is so badly needed have come to light in recent months, and we are assured that the High Commissioner is making a special effort in each case. It is equally satisfying to note that the Executive Committee of the U.N. High Commissioner's program has seen the wisdom of establishing, in the formal sense, a subcommittee concerned exclusively with matters involving legal protection. The United States looks forward to participating in the work of the subcommittee when it meets in Geneva next year. We welcome this development as a means of focusing further attention on this important subject.

We are pleased to note also that two additional governments have decided to accede to the Convention on Refugees and that three governments have joined the ranks of those who have agreed to accede to the protocol. This represents further progress, but there are still substantial areas of the world where such accessions are sadly lacking.

Progress has also been made on the draft convention on territorial asylum, and the plenipotentiaries will meet in January. This represents another step forward. The United States has always supported the concept of a realistic convention on territorial asylum, one to which all governments could accede. We will continue to work toward this end in the spirit that has always governed our attitude toward refugee problems.

The attachment of the United States to the principle of asylum and no forced repatriation is well known. Our views on this subject have been enunciated over and over again. It is therefore particularly distressing to learn from the High Commissioner's report that there are still instances where these principles were either violated or ignored. It is unthinkable that acts of terrorism were undertaken against refugees in certain areas. We condemn terrorist activities against anyone in any form. Refugees are particularly vulnerable. At the same time we must agree

with the High Commissioner that refugees who engage in such activities against governments which have granted them sanctuary, by virtue of such acts automatically disqualify themselves for assistance under the High Commissioner's programs.

In considering the question of legal protection for refugees there is one area that deserves our special attention, and we commend the High Commissioner for bringing it into sharp focus. The High Commissioner has made a special appeal that every humanitarian consideration be given to those refugees afloat in small boats in the South China Sea. In many cases their lives are in great peril. Many are in need of rescue at sea. Unfortunately there have been instances where such rescue was not performed. There is also the critical need for places or points of safe haven and first asylum. These, too, have in some cases been denied. And finally, there is a need for governments to come forward and to offer permanent resettlement opportunities. In this connection the United States has informed the High Commissioner that it is willing to accept, for permanent resettlement, up to 100 of these boat cases per month, with the understanding that other governments will accept their fair share. The High Commissioner has agreed to provide the leadership for this international effort, and we are pleased to be able to do our share. We have already received over 145,000 Indochinese refugees in the United States, of whom 1,240 were boat cases accepted in 1976.

Tribute must be paid to the High Commissioner for the effective way in which he has carried out his regular worldwide Material Assistance Program. This program should continue to enjoy a very high priority. We note that this activity has increased over the level of previous years, with the greatest emphasis placed on refugee needs in Africa and Latin America. We share the view of the High Commissioner that these are the areas where the need is now the greatest. That is not to suggest in any way that the High Commissioner has not paid due attention to refugee needs elsewhere. The problems of refugees in Europe, Asia, and the Middle

East are still with us, and the High Commissioner continues to focus his attention on them with efficiency and in a realistic way. An important aspect of these activities is the concern that the High Commissioner has shown for the problem of family reunification. We very much support this objective of giving the tragedy of separated families in the refugee community priority attention.

The demands on the High Commissioner to exercise his good-offices function have, regrettably, also increased over the past year. Large groups of dislocated persons in Cyprus and refugees in Africa and Indochina have created new challenges. We are most appreciative and commend the High Commissioner for his leadership in these difficult areas. There will be a continued need to support these programs for next year. The High Commissioner has identified the targets. He needs all of our help in meeting them. I can assure you that he has the full support of the United States.

#### TREATY INFORMATION

### **U.S. and Romania Sign Agreement on Economic Cooperation**

Press release 568 dated November 24

U.S. Secretary of Commerce Elliot L. Richardson and Romanian Deputy Prime Minister Ion Patan, Cochairmen of the U.S.-Romanian Joint Economic Commission, signed a 10-year agreement on economic, industrial, and technical cooperation on November 21, 1976. The agreement was signed at the third session of the Commission in Bucharest. It reaffirms U.S. and Romanian support for the expansion of their economic relations.

The agreement sets forth general guidelines for long-term arrangements between firms and enterprises of the two countries. It protects investors against expropri-

ation or impairment of their contractual rights by government action and contains measures for improving business facilities and the provision of commercial information. It includes an annex designed to facilitate the establishment of U.S.-Romanian joint ventures and other forms of business cooperation on terms familiar to the U.S. business community.

The long-term cooperation agreement is intended to supplement, and not to replace, the U.S.-Romanian Trade Agreement, concluded with congressional approval in August 1975. Romania acquired most-favored-nation treatment under the trade agreement, which remains subject to periodic review by Congress according to the requirements of the Trade Act.

### **U.S., Mexico Sign Fishery Agreement; Set Provisional Maritime Boundaries**

Press release 573 dated November 26

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Mexico on November 26 signed an agreement on fisheries. The agreement was signed by Ambassador Joseph John Jova for the United States and Foreign Secretary Alfonso García Robles for Mexico.

The agreement establishes the principles and procedures under which fishing for certain living resources within 200 miles of Mexico may be conducted by vessels of the United States. Mexico and the United States have both recently passed legislation establishing jurisdiction over fisheries within 200 miles from their respective coasts.

The agreement signed on November 26 is intended to promote cooperation in the effective conservation, optimum utilization, and management by Mexico of coastal fisheries resources within 200 miles of Mexico's coast. At the same time, the agreement provides reasonable terms of access for U.S. fishermen to these resources which U.S. fishermen have habitually fished.

At the same time as the signing of the fisheries agreement between the United



States and Mexico, the two countries exchanged notes on provisional maritime boundaries. These provisional maritime boundaries will be utilized until certain technical work can be completed and pending the coming into force of a maritime boundary treaty in accordance with the constitutional processes of both countries.

The provisional boundary lines established are in the Pacific Ocean, in the western Gulf of Mexico, and in the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

The U.S. Government considers the signature of this agreement to be a positive step forward in the future fisheries relationship between the United States and Mexico and to reflect the spirit of friendship and cooperation which characterizes the relations between the two countries.

## Current Actions

### MULTILATERAL

#### Coffee

International coffee agreement 1976, with annexes. Done at London December 3, 1975. Entered into force provisionally October 1, 1976.

*Ratifications deposited:* Bolivia, November 30, 1976; Ethiopia, November 29, 1976; Sierra Leone, October 6, 1976.

#### Containers

International convention for safe containers (CSC), with annexes. Done at Geneva December 2, 1972. Enters into force September 6, 1977.<sup>1</sup>

*Ratification deposited:* Bulgaria (with declarations), November 17, 1976.

#### Maritime Matters

Convention on facilitation of international maritime traffic, with annex. Done at London April 9, 1965. Entered into force March 5, 1967; for the United States May 16, 1967. TIAS 6251.

*Accession deposited:* Iraq, November 15, 1976.

Amendments to the convention of March 6, 1948, as amended, on the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (TIAS 4044, 6285, 6490). Adopted at London October 17, 1974.<sup>2</sup>

*Acceptance deposited:* Surinam, November 26, 1976.

#### Safety at Sea

International convention for the safety of life at sea. Done at London June 17, 1960. Entered into force May 26, 1965. TIAS 5780, 6284.

*Acceptance deposited:* German Democratic Republic (with a declaration), November 11, 1976.

Convention on the international regulations for preventing collisions at sea, 1972. Done at London October 20, 1972. Enters into force July 15, 1977.

*Ratification deposited:* United States, November 23, 1976.

#### Telecommunications

Partial revision of the radio regulations, Geneva, 1959, as amended (TIAS 4893, 5603, 6332, 6590, 7435), to establish a new frequency allotment plan for high-frequency radiotelephone coast stations, with annex and final protocol. Done at Geneva June 8, 1974. Entered into force January 1, 1976; for the United States April 21, 1976.

*Notification of approval:* Ireland, October 5, 1976.

#### Terrorism

Convention on the prevention and punishment of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents. Done at New York December 14, 1973.<sup>2</sup>

*Ratification deposited:* German Democratic Republic, November 30, 1976.

*Accession deposited:* Philippines, November 26, 1976.

### BILATERAL

#### Australia

Memorandum of understanding regarding the exchange training program of units from both forces. Signed at Washington November 4, 1976. Entered into force November 4, 1976.

#### Austria

Agreement regarding mutual assistance between the United States and the Austrian Customs Services. Signed at Vienna September 15, 1976. Enters into force on the 90th day following the date on which parties inform each other in an exchange of diplomatic notes that all national legal requirements for entry into force have been fulfilled.

#### Canada

Agreement relating to the continued use of facilities at Goose Bay airport by the United States, with annex. Effected by exchange of notes at Ottawa November 10 and 24, 1976. Entered into force November 24, 1976, effective October 1, 1976.

#### Indonesia

Agreement amending the agreement for sales of agricultural commodities of April 19, 1976 (TIAS 8308). Effected by exchange of notes at Jakarta November 15 and 17, 1976. Entered into force November 17, 1976.

#### Mexico

Excess property transfer agreement, with list. Dated April 8 and August 19, 1975. Entered into force August 19, 1975.

Agreement extending the excess property transfer

<sup>1</sup> Not for the United States.

<sup>2</sup> Not in force.

agreement of April 8 and August 19, 1975. Effected by exchange of notes at Mexico September 2 and 30 and October 25, 1976. Entered into force October 25, 1976.

Agreement concerning certain maritime boundaries. Effected by exchange of notes at Mexico November 24, 1976. Entered into force November 24, 1976.

Fisheries agreement, with exchange of notes. Signed at Mexico November 24, 1976. Entered into force November 24, 1976.

#### **Peru**

Agreement relating to compensation for the expropriated assets of the Marcona Mining Company. Signed at Lima September 22, 1976.

*Entered into force:* October 21, 1976.

#### **Romania**

Agreement concerning fisheries off the coasts of the United States, with agreed minutes and exchange of letters. Signed at Bucharest November 23, 1976. Enters into force on a date to be mutually agreed by exchange of notes.

Agreement relating to the reciprocal acceptance of airworthiness certifications. Effected by exchange of notes at Washington December 7, 1976. Entered into force December 7, 1976.

#### **Syria**

Loan agreement to provide assistance to Syria in its economic development programs. Signed at Damascus September 30, 1976. Entered into force September 30, 1976.

#### **Union of Soviet Socialist Republics**

Convention concerning the conservation of migratory birds and their environment. Signed at Moscow November 19, 1976. Enters into force on the day that instruments of ratification or confirmation are exchanged in agreement with international procedures.

## **PUBLICATIONS**

### **GPO Sales Publications**

*Publications may be ordered by catalog or stock number from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. A 25-percent discount is made on orders for 100 or more copies of any one publication mailed to the same address. Remittances, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, must accompany orders. Prices shown below, which include domestic postage, are subject to change.*

**Double Taxation—Taxes on Income.** Convention with the Socialist Republic of Romania. TIAS 8228. 65 pp. 80¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8228).

**International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.** Convention with other governments. TIAS 8249. 275 pp. \$3.15. (Cat. No. S9.10:8249).

**Narcotic Drugs—Provision of Helicopters to Curb Illegal Production and Traffic.** Agreement with Mexico. TIAS 8298. 5 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8298).

**Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters.** Treaty with Switzerland. TIAS 8302. 160 pp. \$2.20. (Cat. No. S9.10:8302).

**Defense—Use of Facilities at Goose Bay Airport, Newfoundland.** Agreement with Canada amending and extending the agreement of June 29, 1973. TIAS 8315. 6 pp. 35¢. (Cat. No. S9.10:8315).

<b>Congress.</b> Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy .....	754	United States Reaffirms Support of UNHCR Programs (Picker) .....	756
<b>Department and Foreign Service.</b> Secretary Kissinger's Statement on Designation of Mr. Vance .....	749	<b>Romania.</b> U.S. and Romania Sign Agreement on Economic Cooperation .....	758
<b>Economic Affairs</b>		<b>Science and Technology.</b> U.S.-Egypt Joint Working Group on Technology Meets at Washington (joint statement) .....	754
Latin America and Today's World Economy (Rogers) .....	751	<b>Treaty Information</b>	
U.S. and Romania Sign Agreement on Economic Cooperation .....	758	Current Actions .....	759
U.S., Mexico Sign Fishery Agreement; Set Provisional Maritime Boundaries .....	758	United States and Mexico Sign Treaty on Execution of Penal Sentences .....	750
<b>Egypt.</b> U.S.-Egypt Joint Working Group on Technology Meets at Washington (joint statement) .....	754	U.S. and Romania Sign Agreement on Economic Cooperation .....	758
<b>Human Rights.</b> Human Rights: Let's Mean What We Say (Scranton) .....	745	U.S., Mexico Sign Fishery Agreement; Set Provisional Maritime Boundaries .....	758
<b>Latin America.</b> Latin America and Today's World Economy (Rogers) .....	751	<b>United Nations</b>	
<b>Mexico</b>		Human Rights: Let's Mean What We Say (Scranton) .....	745
Secretary Reaffirms Continuity of U.S.-Mexican Relations (Kissinger) .....	749	United States Calls for Support for UNRWA (Bailey) .....	755
United States and Mexico Sign Treaty on Execution of Penal Sentences .....	750	United States Reaffirms Support of UNHCR Programs (Picker) .....	756
U.S., Mexico Sign Fishery Agreement; Set Provisional Maritime Boundaries .....	758		
<b>Middle East.</b> United States Calls for Support for UNRWA (Bailey) .....	755		
<b>Publications.</b> GPO Sales Publications .....	760		
<b>Refugees</b>			
United States Calls for Support for UNRWA (Bailey) .....	755		

*Name Index*

Bailey, Pearl .....	755
Kissinger, Secretary .....	749
Picker, Jean .....	756
Rogers, William D. ....	751
Scranton, William W .....	745

**Checklist of Department of State Press Releases: December 6-12**

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

No.	Date	Subject
*584	12/6	Shipping Coordinating Committee (SCC), Subcommittee on Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS), working group on bulk chemicals, Jan. 13.
*585	12/6	SCC, SOLAS, working group on carriage of dangerous goods, Jan. 4.
*586	12/6	Kissinger, Vance: remarks to press prior to meeting.
*587	12/7	Vance: remarks to press following meeting, Dec. 6.
*588	12/8	Malcolm Toon sworn in as Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. (biographic data).
+589	12/8	Kissinger: arrival, Brussels, Dec. 7.
*590	12/8	Kissinger, Commissioner of the European Community Soames: remarks to press.
*591	12/8	Kissinger, Crown Prince Hassan of Jordan: remarks to press.

No.	Date	Subject
*592	12/9	Kissinger, Norwegian Foreign Minister Frydenlund: remarks to press, Dec. 8.
*593	12/9	Kissinger, Dutch Foreign Minister van der Stoel: remarks to press, Dec. 8.
*594	12/9	Ocean Affairs Advisory Committee, San Diego, Calif., Jan. 11-12.
+595	12/10	Text of message from President-elect Carter to NATO Foreign Ministers delivered on his behalf by Secretary Kissinger, Dec. 9.
*596	12/10	Kissinger, Turkish Foreign Minister Caglayangil: remarks to press, Dec. 9.
*597	12/10	Kissinger, French Foreign Minister de Guiringaud: remarks to press.
*598	12/10	Kissinger, Federal German Foreign Minister Genscher: remarks to press, Dec. 8.
*599	12/10	U.S. and Republic of Korea initial new fisheries agreement.
+600	12/11	Kissinger: news conference, Brussels, Dec. 10.

\* Not printed.

+ Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.