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Dear Mr. President:

Your trip had historic importance for all of us. Having just read your letter, I know the rewards for our country were even greater than I had anticipated. The reports I have received on the trip have been positive – from our own embassies as well as from the Indonesians, the Chinese, the Singaporeans and many others. This highly successful example of personal diplomacy conducted with great skill and wisdom has helped this Administration. I personally want to thank you for your great contribution.

Your letter, which I shared with certain members of my staff, was studied carefully, and I do want to focus on those issues which you selected in your letter. The first of these important issues you raised concerns the reliability of the United States in the Persian Gulf region.

I was disturbed to read your reports that the Gulf leaders, particularly Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, have doubts about our commitment to their futures aside from our dependence upon oil and transit rights. Secretary Haig, who has just returned from the Middle East, assures me that doubts concerning the Carter Administration's policy and the United States reliability as a friend, have been largely put to rest.

One of the primary objectives of the Secretary's visit to Egypt, Israel, Jordan and Saudi Arabia was to reassure our friends that we were interested in them, quite aside from other strategic interests we and the Western countries might have. We hope that the smaller Gulf States will realize this, too. As you know, Senator Baker has recently visited the region as has the Director of Central Intelligence. Furthermore, while Secretary Haig was in the Middle East, several spin-off visits for his senior staff
were arranged. Senator Jim Buckley, the Under Secretary for Security Assistance, visited Oman, the United Arab Emirates and Bahrain. He was accompanied to Oman by Robert McFarlane, Counsellor to the Secretary of State.

In the near future we intend to send more high-ranking civilians to this region to build up confidence in our Administration's new, more assertive and supportive policies. It is our belief that in the past we have, perhaps, sent too many uniformed personnel as our emissaries to these countries giving the impression that we are solely interested in military matters. While, of course, we continue to attach great importance to our military cooperation with the Gulf States, we intend to do this in the overall context of working towards an Arab-Israeli peace settlement and maintaining strong economic and personal ties with the local regimes. I am sure that when General Scowcroft meets with Secretary Haig he will provide further information on this important point.

The second issue you raised was Kampuchea, and this has been troubling for us. We have seen an aggressive Vietnam extend its control by military force over its neighbor, Kampuchea, as well as consolidate its occupation of Laos. With Soviet backing, Vietnam remains the major destabilizing force in Southeast Asia. Fortunately, as you have noted, Asian states have developed a certain consensus on the handling of the Vietnam threat - the consensus is not perfect but it is cohesive and it has brought together a coalition of independent countries of great strength and wealth to oppose a totalitarian militarized Vietnam.

The Vietnamese face grim long-term prospects - their aggression, although seemingly successful in the short term has, as you suggested, brought China, the ASEAN countries and Japan closer together. The Vietnamese socialist economy is faltering and requires an enormous Russian contribution to survive.

With these factors in mind, I see our policy beginning to develop along these lines:

-- Keep the pressure on Vietnam and work towards an eventual troop withdrawal from Kampuchea. Unlike the previous Administration, we are not considering recognition of this aggressor state.
-- Support fully the Thais who are the frontline state facing Vietnam by continuing our military sales.

-- Let ASEAN take the lead; the problem is on their border and they seem to be making the right moves.

-- Monitor and encourage efforts of Cambodia to form a united front. Son Sann will be here next week and will meet with high-level officials at State.

-- Strengthen our military position in the Philippines to confront the Soviet naval buildup in the Vietnam area.

-- Consult with the Chinese on how to deal with the problem of Vietnam and in some instances develop parallel policies.

As for US-PRC-Taiwan relations, I found your comments most useful. I agree that China is a key element in U.S. global strategy and have stated this on several occasions. Most recently I said it directly to Ambassador Chai here in Washington on March 19, at the White House. I have repeatedly reassured the Chinese leaders that I intend to make our relationship work. I want it to expand in many different areas such as trade, technology transfer, student exchange and government consultations.

At the same time I will treat Chinese in Taiwan with dignity and respect, and I will carry out my obligations to Taiwan as spelled out in the Taiwan Relations Act. I will do this prudently and with concern for Peking's views, but I will do it.

The previous Administration humiliated and degraded the fine people of Taiwan and this has complicated our dealings with Taiwan. This is going to stop, and I intend to build a strong, stable relationship with Taiwan based on mutual confidence and respect. This should not bother Peking. A weakened, unstable Taiwan helps no one. A strong Taiwan will be a partner in facing up to the real threat in Asia -- the growth of Soviet power.

I understand Peking's concerns on future arms sales to Taiwan and I greatly appreciated Peking's emphasis on peaceful means in dealing with Taiwan. The sale of selected defensive arms to Taiwan poses no threat to
Peking. In my view the Taiwan leaders might be more willing to deal with Peking, as Peking desires, if they felt secure, than if they believed they were being let down by their long-time friends. I will certainly look into the matter of timing in the sale of military equipment to Taiwan, and your comments on this subject were especially relevant.

Again, my profound thanks to you for helping us so much in representing the best of America to our friends and allies around the world, and for bringing to me your valuable insights.

Sincerely,

The Honorable Gerald R. Ford
P.O. Box 927
Rancho Mirage, California 92270

P.S. It was good to talk to you the other day. Many names for what a grand am in regard to Betty.
April 1, 1981

Dear Mr. President:

My recently completed trip around the world gave me valuable perspectives on a number of significant issues and, in my judgement, provided useful and in some cases unique support to the interests of the United States.

The leaders of all the countries I visited asked me to convey to you their very best wishes for the success of your Presidency. The four years of the Carter Presidency have left a residue of uneasiness and even disillusionment among our friends and allies. I found everywhere I went a feeling of satisfaction at your election and an atmosphere of optimism at the early indications of firmness and consistency from your Administration. Needless to say, I emphatically encouraged their hopes about what could be expected from your leadership.

All in all, I found the good will with which your Administration is being received to be very reassuring, but it is apparent that the problems facing the United States, exacerbated as they have been by incorrect or inept policies over the past four years, are formidable. There is an enormous amount of work which must be done to simply recover from the erosion of the past four years.

Of all the many issues which I discussed with the various leaders with whom I met, three stand out in my mind as paramount. For that reason, I am concentrating my remarks in this letter on these specific issues. Those subjects of lesser significance can be dealt with by General Scowcroft with Secretary Haig and appropriate officials of the State Department.

The first of these issues relates to attitudes about the reliability of the United States in the Persian Gulf region. The foreign ministers of the new Gulf Council for Cooperation discussed this subject among themselves very recently. According to the Foreign
Singapore wants both to get the Vietnamese out of Kampuchea and to administer a setback to Soviet or Soviet-supported expansionism. Prime Minister Lee does not want Pol Pot back in power and it is for this reason Singapore is pushing a Third Force. Their principal hope is Sam Sann, although they are also prepared to use Sihanouk, even though they consider him unreliable. Sihanouk they principally consider a stop-gap until new leadership can emerge, though they would not object if the Kampuchean people wanted Sihanouk back. The overall objective is to force Vietnamese withdrawal through a combination of political and military pressure. They feel they have Third World support and believe it is important to retain the initiative and keep the Soviet Union and Vietnam on the defensive, including at the forthcoming debate in the U.N.

Indonesia is somewhat less assertive in its position. Its objective is a political solution acceptable to all, including Vietnam. According to President Suharto, a conflict between Vietnam and Kampuchea is of significance to Indonesia only because of the involvement of the Soviet Union and China on the respective sides. Indonesia believes the key element is to achieve peace even at some cost because it believes that Vietnam is best at fighting and would not be able to cope with an era of peace. The Indonesians believe the Thai are more inclined to fight and that the Chinese (of whom they are very suspicious) objective is to bleed Vietnam in Kampuchea.

The Chinese were very tough on the Kampuchean question. They support creation of a coalition, but contend that San Sann is reluctant to join forces with the DK (Pol Pot) group because he fears being submerged. Vice Chairman Deng therefore urged direct U.S. military and economic aid to Sam Sann and asked that the U.S. urge Sam Sann to join forces with the DK faction. China itself had given aid to Sam Sann, he said, and it did not fear a strengthened Sam Sann so long as he would fight the Vietnamese. U.S. assistance, he suggested, could be provided through Thailand.

In response to my explanation of the sensitivity in the United States on any issue of U.S. reinvolvelement in Southeast Asia, Deng agreed that the Asian states should take the lead in putting together a coalition to contest the Heng Samrin/Vietnamese control of Kampuchea. China, he said, also was playing a behind-the-scenes role.

This issue is obviously one of vital concern to our friends in the area. It represents an excellent opportunity for the United States to underscore its determination to stem Soviet or Soviet proxy aggression. While the prospects for success for the Third Force initiative of the Asian states and China appear uncertain at best, no other more viable options appear to be available and it offers at a minimum the opportunity to keep the Soviet Union and Vietnam on the offensive.
In view of this situation, I would recommend that the United States offer encouragement to the Asian nations to continue their efforts to establish a coalition of opposition forces, while making clear that, both from an international and a U. S. domestic perspective, the United States role should be quietly supportive rather than public and predominant. Should Asian efforts result in the creation of a cohesive coalition, I would recommend material support, perhaps through Thailand, in order to minimize the public U. S. role.

The last and by all odds the most difficult issue which I encountered was that of the U. S.-PRC-Taiwan relations. My approach to this issue is based on the premise, derived from my trips to China in 1972 and 1975, as well as my latest visit, that the continuation and expansion of the Sino-U. S. relationship is a vital interest of the United States. It is my judgement that this is true not only in terms of a key element in the U. S. global strategy, but also as a very major factor in U. S. strategy to cope successfully with the Soviet threat. It is my conclusion as well that the present Chinese leadership under Vice Chairman Deng Xiaoping is the best vehicle for implementing this U. S. strategy, and that this leadership is having some internal difficulties and needs time to consolidate its domestic position. It was in these terms that I evaluated my lengthy discussions with top Chinese leaders Deng, Premier Zhao Ziyang and Vice Premier/Foreign Minister Huang Hua.

The Chinese made it very clear that the only obstacle in the Sino-U.S. relationship and their principal concern about your Administration, with which they are otherwise well pleased, is Taiwan. They expressed with fervor their hope that Taiwan would not get in the way of global cooperation between the two countries against the increasing menace of Soviet aggression.

While the Foreign Minister spoke in fairly stereotyped terms, Deng was very open and blunt on the subject. He said that "if we fail to deal properly with Taiwan we will lose the support of the Chinese people." He expanded further on the subject of arms sales, saying it was not a military issue, but instead was a roadblock to peaceful unification. The Chinese leadership, he said, has determined that unification will be peaceful, so that arms sales are not necessary for Taiwan's security. They cannot state this publicly because the Taiwan leadership would then refuse to enter negotiations. Arms sales would have the same negative effect on the prospect for negotiation.

In addition, he said - and I am quoting him almost precisely - that if U. S. arms sales took place it would cause a strong reaction by the Chinese people, not only against the United States, but against Chinese leadership. Please tell President Reagan and Haig, he added, that this is not a simple question. It would bring a strong reaction.
It is not a question which can be solved by a few Chinese leaders. He then estimated that, if the United States behaved "correctly," talks with Taiwan might be able to begin in three to five years.

This was strong and frank language. Not to my knowledge have the Chinese ever admitted that the Taiwan issue could cause serious problems for them domestically. In more informal discussions, the Chinese indicated that they needed a year of grace in order to be able to deal with the arms sales issue.

I do not dismiss the possibility that these Chinese statements were partly or wholly self-serving, designed to elicit sympathy for a government which it is in the U.S. interest to support and thus to deter U.S. actions with respect to Taiwan. The Chinese have not survived as a state for more than 2000 years by being unskilled in diplomatic maneuvering. On the other hand, there is no pressing issue in U.S.-Taiwan relations of which I am aware which would prevent a testing of the sincerity of the representations which the Chinese have made to me.

In light of these discussions and overall U.S. interests, I suggest that no precipitate actions regarding Taiwan be taken. I would recommend high level discussions with the Chinese by you or Secretary Haig to reconfirm the message I received. Assuming such reconfirmation, a delay in major arms sales for as much as a year to allow consolidation of the Deng regime could pay enormous dividends. Should the Chinese claim of domestic vulnerability turn out to have been simply a ruse to dissuade us from sales, no significant damage will have been done. A balancing of the risks against the possible gains seems to me emphatically to recommend such a course of action.

As I said at the outset, while my trip revealed a number of additional valuable perspectives, I did not wish to detract from the overriding importance which I ascribe to the three issues I have discussed by including them in this letter. As indicated, I shall insure that Secretary Haig is appraised of the remainder of my observations.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

The Honorable Ronald Reagan
The President of the United States
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20505
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MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL K. DEAVER

FROM: RICHARD V. ALLEN

SUBJECT: Categories of Visits

State has prepared for clearance the attached summary for diplomatic posts of the various categories of State, Official and Private Visits. It is the basic format used by preceding Administrations. One category has been added -- the "Official (Working) Visit" -- to provide greater flexibility for a "less" formal visit. Chuck Tyson and I have reviewed the draft and recommend the following suggested changes/additions:

Add:
Reciprocal Events (page 4, third day)

It is the present policy that the President and the Vice President do not attend reciprocal events.

Revise:
Private Visit -- Use of Blair House (page 9)

The President's Guest House is not automatically offered on private visits. If Blair House is available, consideration will be given to inviting the Head of State or Government to use it for one or two days. (The Secretary of State and the Chief of Protocol will make the determination in each case in coordination with the White House.)

Would appreciate your letting Chuck Tyson know after you have reviewed the draft. He will arrange to inform State accordingly.
MEMORANDUM FOR MICHAEL K. DEAVER

FROM: RICHARD V. ALLEN

SUBJECT: Categories of Visits

State has prepared for clearance the attached summary for diplomatic posts of the various categories of State, Official and Private Visits. It is the basic format used by preceding Administrations. One category has been added -- the "Official (Working) Visit" -- to provide greater flexibility for a "less" formal visit. Chuck Tyson and I have reviewed the draft and recommend the following suggested changes/additions:

Add:
Reciprocal Events (page 4, third day)

It is the present policy that the President and the Vice President do not attend reciprocal events.

Revise:
Private Visit -- Use of Blair House (page 9)

The President's Guest House is not automatically offered on private visits. If Blair House is available, consideration will be given to inviting the Head of State or Government to use it for one or two days. (The Secretary of State and the Chief of Protocol will make the determination in each case in coordination with the White House.)

Would appreciate your letting Chuck Tyson know after you have reviewed the draft. He will arrange to inform State accordingly.
MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

1690

ACTION

April 7, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR RICHARD V. ALLEN

FROM: Charles P. Tyson

SUBJECT: Categories of Visits

Attached for clearance is a summary cable prepared by State of the different kinds of visits for guidance to all diplomatic posts (Tab A). A memo to Mike Deaver is also provided to seek his concurrence.

Two points are suggested: to include the recent decision that the President and Vice President will not attend reciprocal events; to include in the loop of approval for the Blair House, the Chief of Protocol and Mike Deaver.

RECOMMENDATION:

That you sign the memo to Mike Deaver at Tab I.
MEMORANDUM FOR MR. RICHARD V. ALLEN
THE WHITE HOUSE

SUBJECT: Categories of Visits of Chiefs of State and Heads of Government -- Cable Draft

Attached is a cable outlining and defining the categories of visits that the State Department supports for all future visits of Chiefs of State and Heads of Government.

The categories are divided into five types:

1. State
2. Official to the United States
3. Official to Washington, D.C.
5. Private

The Department of State would greatly appreciate the review of this document and approval by the correct authorities for rapid transmission to our diplomatic posts.

L. Paul Bremer, III
Executive Secretary

Attachment:
As Stated
TO ALL DIPLOMATIC POSTS

PRIORITY

DRAFTED: S/CPR: LLDEWAN
x21676

CLEARANCES: S/CPR: RGOOKIN

S/S-S: JKELLY:

NSC:

E.O.: N/A
TAGS: OVIP
SUBJECT: VISITS TO THE UNITED STATES BY CHIEFS OF STATE AND HEADS OF GOVERNMENT

1. THIS CABLE ESTABLISHES NEW GUIDELINES FOR VISITS TO THE UNITED STATES BY CHIEFS OF STATE AND HEADS OF GOVERNMENT AND WILL BECOME EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY. BECAUSE THE PROCEDURES MAY VARY, NO COMMITMENT REGARDING HONORS AND PROGRAMMING SHOULD BE MADE TO REPRESENTATIVES OF OTHER GOVERNMENTS WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL.

2. FOR POSTS' GUIDANCE, THERE ARE FIVE TYPES OF VISITS:

(A) STATE VISIT

(1) DEFINITION:

A STATE VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES CAN ONLY BE MADE BY A CHIEF OF STATE (PRESIDENT, REIGNING MONARCH, OR RULER). THE INVITATION IS ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. A STATE VISIT IS NORMALLY LIMITED TO A CHIEF OF STATE VISITING FOR THE FIRST TIME DURING A PARTICULAR U.S. ADMINISTRATION. THE VISIT NORMALLY LASTS SEVEN DAYS (TWO DAYS AND NIGHTS IN WASHINGTON AND FOUR DAYS
ELSEWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES) WITH THE VISITOR ARRIVING THE DAY BEFORE THE STATE VISIT BEGINS AND RESTING AT A LOCATION NEAR OR IN WASHINGTON. BLAIR HOUSE, THE PRESIDENT'S GUEST HOUSE, IS MADE AVAILABLE AS THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE DURING THE WASHINGTON PORTION OF THE VISIT.

(2) U.S. RESPONSIBILITIES:

OFFICIAL PARTY--

THE OFFICIAL PARTY IS LIMITED TO TWELVE, INCLUDING THE VISITOR AND SPOUSE, THE AMBASSADOR AND SPOUSE IN WASHINGTON, AND ANY SPOUSES OF ACCOMPANYING OFFICIAL PARTY MEMBERS. IN ADDITION, OTHER PERSONS SUCH AS SECRETARIES, VALETS, AIDES, ETC. ARE INCLUDED AS ACCOMPANYING MEMBERS OF THE PARTY.

AIR TRANSPORTATION--

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROVIDES AIR TRANSPORTATION FOR THE OFFICIAL PARTY FROM THE PLACE OF ARRIVAL WITHIN THE UNITED STATES THROUGHOUT THE SEVEN-DAY PERIOD, ENDING WITHIN THE UNITED STATES. IT CANNOT, HOWEVER, ASSUME ANY PORTION OF THE ACCOMPANYING MEMBERS' TRAVEL OR LIVING EXPENSES BEYOND THEIR STAY AT BLAIR HOUSE (EXCEPT TRAVEL ON THE SAME AIRCRAFT USED BY THE OFFICIAL PARTY WHEN THIS IS FEASIBLE).

LIMOUSINES--

IN ADDITION TO THE LIMOUSINE PROVIDED BY SECRET SERVICE FOR THE VISITOR AND POSSIBLY A LIMOUSINE(S) PROVIDED BY STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY FOR VISITOR'S SPOUSE AND/OR FOREIGN MINISTER, A MAXIMUM OF FOUR LIMOUSINES WILL BE PROVIDED DURING THE STATE VISIT.

OTHER USG EXPENSES--

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT BEARS ALL NORMAL LIVING EXPENSES OF THE OFFICIAL PARTY DURING THE VISIT. IF THE VISITOR STAYS IN THE UNITED STATES BEYOND THE SEVEN-DAY PERIOD, THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT DOES NOT PROVIDE AIR TRANSPORTATION NOR ASSUME FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR GROUND TRANSPORTATION OR LIVING EXPENSES. PROTOCOL SUPPORT IS PROVIDED THROUGHOUT THE VISIT.
(3) SCHEDULE:

FIRST DAY IN THE UNITED STATES--

THE VISITOR NORMALLY ARRIVES IN THE UNITED STATES THE DAY BEFORE THE STATE VISIT BEGINS AND EITHER STAYS OVERNIGHT AT A PLACE NEAR WASHINGTON, D.C. OR AT BLAIR HOUSE FOR A NIGHT OF REST. THE ARRIVAL WOULD BE LOW-KEY AS THE OFFICIAL ARRIVAL CEREMONY WOULD TAKE PLACE AT THE WHITE HOUSE THE NEXT DAY. HOWEVER, THE VISITOR WOULD BE GREETED AT THE AIRPORT BY:

OUTSIDE WASHINGTON, D.C.--

THE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL
THE COUNTRY'S AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES
THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO COUNTRY
LOCAL OFFICIALS
SPOUSES WHEN APPROPRIATE

IN WASHINGTON, D.C.--

THE SECRETARY OF STATE OR REPRESENTATIVE
THE COUNTRY'S AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES
THE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL
THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO COUNTRY
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE
COUNTRY DIRECTOR
COUNTRY DESK OFFICER
THE COUNTRY'S EMBASSY OFFICIALS
SPOUSES WHEN APPROPRIATE

SECOND DAY IN THE UNITED STATES--

UPON ARRIVAL AT THE WHITE HOUSE, THE VISITOR IS GREETED BY THE PRESIDENT, WHERE MILITARY HONORS ARE RENDERED AND REMARKS EXCHANGED.

A SUBSTANTIVE MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWS THE ARRIVAL CEREMONY.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND MRS. HAIG WILL HOST A JOINT LUNCHEON OR TWO SEPARATE LUNCHEONS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.
A STATE DINNER IS GIVEN BY THE PRESIDENT AT THE WHITE HOUSE. DEPENDING UPON THE SEASON AND THE DESIRES OF THE PRESIDENT AND/OR THE VISITOR, DRESS MAY BE WHITE TIE OR BLACK TIE.

THIRD DAY IN THE UNITED STATES--

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS AND VISITS TO PLACES OF INTEREST ARE ARRANGED AS DESIRED FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WASHINGTON VISIT. AMONG THE MORE FREQUENTLY DESIRED ACTIVITIES ARE:

--WREATH-LAYING CEREMONY AT THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY;

--MEETINGS WITH THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE AND HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE;

--LUNCHEON AND ADDRESS AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB;

--MEETINGS WITH SPECIFIC CABINET MEMBERS;

--MEETINGS WITH AMERICAN AND/OR FOREIGN JOURNALISTS.

ON THE EVENING OF THE SECOND DAY IN WASHINGTON, THE AMBASSADOR OF THE VISITING COUNTRY MAY HOST A DINNER OR A RECEPTION HONORING THE VISITOR.

FOURTH DAY IN THE UNITED STATES--

AT THE DEPARTURE, USUALLY IN THE MORNING, THE FAREWELL COMMITTEE IS HEADED BY A HIGH-RANKING U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL. MILITARY HONORS (HONOR CORDON/HERALD TRUMPETS/GUN SALUTE) ARE RENDERED. NORMALLY THERE IS NO EXCHANGE OF REMARKS.

VISITS TO OTHER PLACES IN THE UNITED STATES FOR FOUR DAYS ARE ARRANGED AS DESIRED.

(3) OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

(1) DEFINITION:

AN OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES CAN BE MADE EITHER BY A CHIEF OF STATE (PRESIDENT, REIGNING MONARCH, OR
RULERS) OR BY A HEAD OF GOVERNMENT (PRIME MINISTER, CHANCELLOR). AN OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES BY A CHIEF OF STATE (PRESIDENT, ETC.) IS NORMALLY A SECOND OR SUBSEQUENT VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES DURING A PARTICULAR U.S. ADMINISTRATION. THE INVITATION IS ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES. THE VISIT NORMALLY LASTS SEVEN DAYS (TWO DAYS AND NIGHTS IN WASHINGTON AND FOUR DAYS ELSEWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES) WITH THE VISITOR ARRIVING THE DAY BEFORE THE OFFICIAL VISIT BEGINS AND RESTING AT A LOCATION NEAR OR IN WASHINGTON. BLAIR HOUSE, THE PRESIDENT'S GUEST HOUSE, IS MADE AVAILABLE AS THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE DURING THE WASHINGTON PORTION OF THE VISIT.

(2) U.S. RESPONSIBILITIES:
SAME AS FOR STATE VISIT.

(3) SCHEDULE:
SAME AS FOR STATE VISIT.

(C) OFFICIAL VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(1) DEFINITION:
AN OFFICIAL VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C. IS MADE BY EITHER A CHIEF OF STATE OR A HEAD OF GOVERNMENT. THE INVITATION IS ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE VISITOR TO MEET WITH HIM FOR SUBSTANTIVE TALKS OR FOR A CHIEF OF STATE OR HEAD OF GOVERNMENT WHO HAS ALREADY RECEIVED A STATE/OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES DURING A PARTICULAR U.S. ADMINISTRATION. A VISITOR IN THIS CATEGORY IS CONSIDERED A GUEST OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT ONLY WHILE HE/SHE IS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., USUALLY FOR THREE OR FOUR DAYS. BLAIR HOUSE, THE PRESIDENT'S GUEST HOUSE, IS MADE AVAILABLE AS THE OFFICIAL RESIDENCE WHILE THE VISITOR IS IN WASHINGTON.

(2) U.S. RESPONSIBILITIES:
OFFICIAL PARTY -- SAME AS FOR STATE AND OFFICIAL VISITS
AIR TRANSPORTATION--

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PROVIDES AIR TRANSPORTATION
FOR THE OFFICIAL PARTY FROM THE LOCATION OF THE VISITOR
WITHIN THE UNITED STATES TO WASHINGTON AND FROM
WASHINGTON TO THE VISITOR'S NEXT STOP WITHIN THE UNITED
STATES. IT CANNOT, HOWEVER, ASSUME ANY PORTION OF THE
ACCOMPANYING MEMBERS' TRAVEL OR LIVING EXPENSES BEYOND
THEIR STAY AT BLAIR HOUSE (EXCEPT TRAVEL ON THE SAME
AIRCRAFT USED BY THE OFFICIAL PARTY WHEN THIS IS
FEASIBLE).

LIMOUSINES--

IN ADDITION TO THE LIMOUSINE PROVIDED BY SECRET SERVICE
FOR THE VISITOR AND POSSIBLY A LIMOUSINE(S) PROVIDED BY
STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY FOR VISITOR'S SPOUSE AND/OR
FOREIGN MINISTER, A MAXIMUM OF FOUR LIMOUSINES WILL BE
PROVIDED BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT IN WASHINGTON ONLY.

OTHER USG EXPENSES--

THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT WILL NOT ASSUME
RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSPORTATION OR LIVING EXPENSES IN
WASHINGTON OR ELSEWHERE IN THE UNITED STATES BEYOND THE
OFFICIAL PERIOD.

(3) SCHEDULE:

UPON ARRIVAL IN WASHINGTON, THE VISITOR IS GREETED BY THE
PRESIDENT AT THE WHITE HOUSE, WHERE MILITARY HONORS ARE
RENDERED AND REMARKS EXCHANGED. A SUBSTANTIVE MEETING
WITH THE PRESIDENT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWS THE ARRIVAL
CEREMONY. NOTE: IF THE VISITOR HAS ALREADY BEEN A GUEST
DURING A PARTICULAR U.S. ADMINISTRATION AND HAD A FULL
WHITE HOUSE ARRIVAL CEREMONY, THERE WOULD NOT BE A SECOND
ARRIVAL CEREMONY.

THE PRESIDENT NORMALLY GIVES A WHITE HOUSE DINNER IN THE
VISITOR'S HONOR, THOUGH A LUNCHEON AT THE WHITE HOUSE
MIGHT BE SUBSTITUTED. THE SECRETARY OF STATE HOSTS A
LUNCHEON IN THE VISITOR'S HONOR AT THE DEPARTMENT OF
STATE.

REMAINDER OF WASHINGTON SCHEDULE REMAINS AS IN STATE AND
OFFICIAL VISITS.
(D) OFFICIAL WORKING VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(1) DEFINITION:
SAME AS FOR OFFICIAL VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(2) U.S. RESPONSIBILITIES:
SAME AS FOR OFFICIAL VISIT TO WASHINGTON, D.C.

(3) SCHEDULE:

Upon arrival in Washington, the visitor is greeted by the Secretary of State or his representative; limited military honors are rendered; and possible remarks exchanged. The President's involvement in this type of visit includes a substantive meeting usually followed by a working luncheon.
(E) PRIVATE VISIT

(1) DEFINITION:

THE PRIVATE VISIT INVOLVES A CHIEF OF STATE OR HEAD OF GOVERNMENT COMING TO THE UNITED STATES AT HIS/HER OWN INITIATIVE FOR PRIVATE BUSINESS PURPOSES, FOR MEDICAL TREATMENT, OR TO ATTEND THE U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY, ETC. THIS TRAVEL IS NOT INITIATED BY AN INVITATION ISSUED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.


(2) U.S. RESPONSIBILITIES:


IN THE EVENT OF A MEETING BETWEEN THE VISITOR AND THE PRESIDENT AT THE WHITE HOUSE, THE FOLLOWING EVENTS ARE POSSIBLE:

--AN HONOR CORDON WILL BE IN PLACE AT THE WHITE HOUSE.

--USUALLY, A VISITING CHIEF OF STATE OR HEAD OF GOVERNMENT ARRIVES AT THE WHITE HOUSE VIA THE SOUTHWEST GATE TO THE DIPLOMATIC ENTRANCE.

--POSSIBLE MEETINGS WITH THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND OTHER U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

AIR TRANSPORTATION--
ANY REQUESTS FOR AIR TRANSPORTATION, FROM THE POINT OF ARRIVAL IN THE UNITED STATES TO WASHINGTON, MUST BE SUBMITTED TO THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF PROTOCOL FOR CONSIDERATION.

BLAIR HOUSE--

BLAIR HOUSE, THE PRESIDENT'S GUEST HOUSE, IS GENERALLY NOT AVAILABLE ON PRIVATE VISITS. PERMISSION MUST BE GRANTED BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS ADVISER.

3. GIFTS:

THE OFFICE OF PROTOCOL ASSISTS WITH OFFICIAL GIFTS PRESENTED AND EXCHANGED DURING VISITS. ON STATE AND OFFICIAL VISITS, THE PRESIDENT AND FIRST LADY ROUTINELY EXCHANGE GIFTS WITH THE CHIEF OF STATE/HEAD OF GOVERNMENT AND SPOUSE. ON SUCH VISITS, FURTHER EXCHANGES (E.G., WITH THE VICE PRESIDENT AND THE SECRETARY OF STATE) ARE NOT CUSTOMARY.

ON PRIVATE VISITS, THERE IS NO EXCHANGE OF GIFTS AND UNILATERAL PRESENTATION OF GIFTS BY THE VISITOR IS TO BE DISCOURAGED.

ALL INFORMATION CONCERNING POSSIBLE GIFTS FOR PRINCIPAL AMERICAN OFFICIALS AND THEIR SPOUSES SHOULD BE RELAYED TO THE OFFICE OF PROTOCOL.

4. ALTHOUGH COORDINATION OF THE DETAILED SCHEDULE ON A STATE OR OFFICIAL VISIT WILL BE HANDLED PRIMARILY IN WASHINGTON BETWEEN THE COUNTRY'S EMBASSY AND THE DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC POSTS WILL BE CALLED UPON TO ASSIST. FOLLOWING IS THE BASIC INFORMATION THAT WILL BE REQUIRED FOR THE DETAILED PREPARATIONS ON A VISIT:

(A) OFFICIAL PARTY LIST (12) -- FULL NAMES, TITLES, AND ORDER OF PRECEDENCE;

(B) ACCOMPANYING PARTY -- FULL NAMES, TITLES, AND ORDER OF PRECEDENCE;

(C) TRAVELING PRESS -- FULL NAMES, PRESS AFFILIATION, PASSPORT NUMBERS, DATE AND PLACE OF BIRTH (NEEDED FOR PRESS ACCREDITATION);
(D) AIRCRAFT INFORMATION, IF OTHER THAN COMMERCIAL FLIGHT -- TYPE OF AIRCRAFT(S), TAIL NUMBER, CALL SIGN, AND NAME OF COMPANY THAT HAS BEEN CONTRACTED TO SERVICE AIRCRAFT;

(E) PASSPORTS - WHO IN VISITOR'S PARTY WILL HAVE PASSPORTS IN HAND FOR CUSTOMS FORMALITIES;

(F) DIETARY OR RELIGIOUS RESTRICTIONS/PREFERENCES, MEDICAL PROBLEMS, AND OTHER USEFUL INFORMATION, I.E., FLOWERS, COLORS, ETC.

(G) ENGLISH LANGUAGE CAPABILITY OF OFFICIAL PARTY MEMBERS.

5. SECURITY

PROTECTIVE SECURITY FOR THE CHIEF OF STATE/HEAD OF GOVERNMENT WILL BE PROVIDED BY U.S. SECRET SERVICE THROUGHOUT THE VISITOR'S STAY IN THE UNITED STATES (REGARDLESS OF THE TYPE OF VISIT) UNLESS A SIGNED LETTER DECLINING SUCH PROTECTION IS RECEIVED.

PROTECTIVE SECURITY BY STATE DEPARTMENT SECURITY FOR THE SPOUSE OF THE CHIEF OF STATE/HEAD OF GOVERNMENT, THE FOREIGN MINISTER, OR OTHER CABINET OFFICIALS IN THE PARTY, MUST BE REQUESTED BY THE COUNTRY DESK.
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MEMORANDUM

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

April 16, 1981

MEMORANDUM FOR: RONALD K. PETERSON
FROM: ALLEN J. LENZ
SUBJECT: Foreign Missions Act of 1982

The National Security Council Staff strongly endorses the Foreign Missions Act of 1982 (Tab A).
Memorandum

National Security Council

April 15, 1981

Action

Memorandum for Allen J. Lenz

From: Robert M. Kimmitt

Subject: Foreign Missions Act of 1982

OMB requests our views on the Foreign Missions Act of 1982 (Tab A).

This important diplomatic reciprocity bill is one on which we and State have been working with the Congress for over a year, and it now appears that passage is a real possibility. We should concur quickly to OMB.

Recommendation:

That you sign the concurring memorandum at Tab I.

Attachment

Cc: Bill Stearman
TO: Legislative Liaison Officer -
Department of State
Department of the Treasury
D.C. Government
National Capital Planning Commission
General Services Administration
National Security Council
Office of Personnel Management
Central Intelligence Agency

SUBJECT: S. 854, the "Foreign Missions Act of 1982." (We understand that the Congress will very likely enact some form of a Foreign Mission Act and the Administration may need to comment on this bill on short notice. A similar bill has been amended to the State authorization in the House.)

The Office of Management and Budget requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

A response to this request for your views is needed no later than C.O.B., Friday, April 17, 1981.

Questions should be referred to Tracey Cole Lawler (395-4710), the legislative analyst in this office, or to Pat Schluster (395-4580).

RONALD K. PETERSON FOR
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference

Enclosures
cc: Lee Dowd, GC
Hilda Schreiber, FPP
Brad Kyser, BRD
Bill Coleman, OFPP
Jim Barie, IAD
Bill Paterson, OFPP
In the meantime, the condition of the millions of needy people who depend on these programs for their income and health care continues to deteriorate. The National Urban League's black America 1980 reported that 25.9 percent of those on Medicaid, as well as 26.2 percent of those on Medicare, were living below the poverty line. In the case of the elderly, the proportion is even higher, with 35.1 percent of those on Medicare, as well as 42.7 percent of those on Social Security, living below the poverty line.

In New York, the basic cash allowance for a family of four was set at $258 a month—exclusive of shelter—in 1974. It remains $258 today. In that same year, consumer prices had increased by 64 percent. Sensible this erosion, the State Senate, upon Gov. Hugh Carey's urging, approved a 15 percent increase in AFDC benefits. This hardly compensates for the large drop in the benefits' real value. But even this small rise will cost the State an estimated $250 million a year.

That is merely the beginning. Only to illustrate this do I mention that data I have published in the spring 1981 issue of the Journal of Socioeconomic Issues show that dependency has increased astonishingly. Permit me to quote from that:

It appears that one-half of the children now being born are likely to be in female-headed households at some point prior to their 18th birthday. This includes 60 percent of black children and 75 percent of minority children.

Two-thirds of female-headed households with children now receive AFDC payments. Before 1981, only one-third of all children now being born are likely to live in a female-headed household receiving AFDC payments.

One-third of all children, a third of our children dependent upon their State governments—which set benefit levels for an even less adequate level of subsistence. Inadequate not because these governments are mean spirited, but because they cannot afford anything more.

The bill I introduce today would fundamentally change this. It would remove the burden of these programs, and transfer the financing from local governments, and would substantially ease the burden on State governments. But this higher level of Federal reimbursement is available only to those States that provide AFDC and food stamp benefits in excess of three-quarters of the federally determined poverty line.

The bill's hold harmless provision insures that State costs will not increase because of this minimum benefit level. If the State is depriving the minimum benefit level, the Federal Government is responsible for the difference. States will be able—will be encouraged—to provide a decent level of health care for their neediest residents.

This is an easily understood bill, similar to legislation I introduced in the 96th Congress. It simply changes the minimum Federal reimbursement level under the "welfare formula" (which governs both the Medicaid and AFDC programs) from 50 percent to 75 percent in fiscal 1982. Rising to 90 percent in fiscal 1985 and thereafter. The bill requires that the additional Federal funding be "passed through" to localities in those States that now require local cost-sharing in amounts sufficient to eliminate the local share. When fully implemented, the State (or State-local) share of the costs for Medicaid would be only 10 percent (down from the present average of 49 percent) and the State (or State-local) share of AFDC cash benefits would also be 10 percent (down from the present average of 46 percent).

The essential purpose of this bill, the welfare and medical fiscal assistance program, is to assign the primary responsibility to the Federal Government for paying for both welfare and medical services. It is fully consistent with the stated policy recommendations of the National Governors Association. It is not a complete transfer of fiscal responsibility, for so long as the States retain the task of administering these programs (and setting cash assistance levels, above a federally-prescribed floor) they must retain a fiscal stake in them. The 10 percent share envisioned in this bill is quite sufficient for that purpose.

I would add, however, that I would welcome continued assumption of the administrative and fiscal responsibility for both sets of activities. That is how social security, disability, SSI and medicare work is, I believe, the proper permanent locus for cash assistance to dependent children and for medical care for the needy as well. Short of that large structural change, a realignment of fiscal responsibility would constitute a major improvement.

I urge its favorable consideration and its enactment.

By MR. PERCY:

S. 854. A bill to promote the orderly conduct of international relations by facilitating the operation of foreign missions abroad by promoting the secure and efficient operation of the U.S. missions abroad; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

FOREIGN MISSIONS ACT OF 1982

MR. PERCY. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which I call the Foreign Missions Act of 1982. An identical bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman DAWNS FASSELL of Florida.

This legislation is designed to provide the means to remedy a serious and growing imbalance between the treatment accorded to the missions of the United States abroad, and that made available to foreign government missions in the United States. At present the Department of State lacks authority compared to that enjoyed by many other governments to enforce reciprocity in an appropriate manner.

In an increasing number of countries, for example, the United States is denied suitable locations for our missions of long-term rights to property or facilities, often little more than security, excessive or discriminatory costs, or inadequate facilities that significantly reduce the effectiveness of our missions.

For example:

In the Soviet Union and East European countries, the United States is barred from purchasing office and residential properties and is required to obtain all facilities through government controlled sources. In many cases these are either inadequate, excessively costly, or both. For example, the Department of State, United States, these governments are allowed to purchase both types of property in Washington, D.C. All own either office or residential space.

Venezuela will not allow the Department of State to purchase a housing unit in the capital city, which imposes difficulties on the functioning of the mission, but the Venezuelans are purchasing housing in the greater Washington metropolitan area for official purposes.

Kuwait, Bahrain, and the United Arab Emirates do not allow the United States to purchase badly needed staff housing sites which would allow residential construction and elimination of exorbitant short-term lease charges. Yet these same governments own residential units in our capital area. For example, in the City of Doha, Qatar, it costs the U.S. Government $333,000 per year to lease living quarters for a single secretary.

In Indonesia, the government has determined that the U.S. Government may not purchase or lease property in Jakarta and is now in the process of converting these to long-term leaseholds. The new ground rents will be considerable. Indonesia is free to buy, lease, and sell in the United States.

In Israel, a prior expropriation of U.S. property remains unresolved. Our present facilities are very inadequate and our efforts to secure long-term office and residential properties have met with negative results.

Our Embassies in the Soviet Union, East European, and other countries with state directed economies are required to deal through service organizations within the Ministries of Foreign Affairs for practically all administrative support and services, that is, housing, maintenance, utilities, insurance, tickets for cultural and athletic performances, travel, et cetera. These organizations often impose a substantial surcharge for often unnecessary or unwanted "services." The total cost to the U.S. Government in the United States amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. For example, the Soviets charge diplomatic personnel but not tourists a "fee"—equal to one night's lodging—for holding a hotel reservation. Thus, a traveler is required to pay the equivalent of a night's lodging regardless of the amount of time the room was occupied.

In many areas of the world, both the U.S. Government and its employees encounter serious iniquities regarding the import or export of privately owned vehicles and other personal effects. Employees of these governments' foreign missions in the United States do not face these same restrictions; problems exist, for example, in Mexico, Venezuela, Singapore, Pakistan, and at many Embassies in the Near East.

At the same time, missions of those same countries are allowed in the United States to acquire property and goods freely or obtain benefits or public services, often without limitation. The U.S.
Government and its personnel are often confronted by serious inequities concerning the payment of taxes on goods and services obtained in the host country. For example, in Malta the Embassy is not exempt from the payment of a gasoline tax of 45 cents and 23 cents per gallon, respectively. In Yugoslavia the Embassy is required to pay a 2.15 percent tax on heating oil.

In most cases, conditions also require a transaction tax on certain construction materials. An example is Portugal where the imposition of this tax may greatly increase the cost of the new embassy being constructed in Lisbon. In New Zealand, a country which offers support staff and specialized staff such as Library of Congress personnel do not receive duty-free import privileges and are not exempt from customs inspection and imposition of certain taxes, despite their participation in official functions for the United States.

In most cases, the Department lacks authority to impose similar restrictions or conditions on those or other countries in the United States. Instead it can only take as far as extreme actions such as direct punishment of hosts. The authority to control the use of property it may acquire or declaring some persons persona non grata. These remedies are not suitable for such situations and are therefore rarely used.

The proposed Foreign Missions Act provides for the adequate funding and ongoing operation of foreign missions in the United States and the benefits available to them from Federal, State, and local authorities, public utilities and private persons may be cleared through the Federal Government and adjusted according to U.S. needs abroad as well as national security interests at home.

In this way, the conditions under which foreign missions operate in the United States can be made to reflect the conditions under which the United States is required to operate in the countries represented by such foreign missions. As a result, the foreign governments represented by mission in the United States will have an incentive to provide fair, equitable and nondiscriminatory treatment to U.S. missions and personnel in their territory, thus contributing to significant savings in the costs of operating U.S. missions, improved working conditions for U.S. personnel, and mutual respect in our foreign relations.

The bill's authorities may also be applied to international organizations to a limited extent where necessary to give effect to the policy of the bill. Specifically, the bill sets up an independent Office of Foreign Missions within the Department of State. The Office is to be headed by a Director appointed by the Secretary of State. The Director will carry out his or her responsibilities under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary is prohibited from delegating supervisory authority over the Director to any official below the rank of Under Secretary.

This organizational structure seeks to reconcile two competing policy interests. On the one hand, the operation of foreign missions in the United States is an important aspect of the conduct of foreign affairs and should be directly under the supervision of the Secretary of State. On the other hand, responsibility for the hard decisions to deny or impose conditions on benefits desired by foreign missions should be somewhat insulated from the operating bureaus in the State Department which deal with foreign affairs and operations on a daily basis. These concerns will be met effectively by placing the responsibility in the State Department and by precluding supervision of its exercise by any of the operating bureaus. The Office will be staffed by Foreign Service members, other Government employees, experts and consultants as necessary.

The Secretary of State will set the terms and conditions under which benefits may be granted or denied a foreign mission. Such actions will be governed by the need for reciprocity or other factors in our relations with other nations. The purposes served include the following:

Facilitating relations between the United States and a sending State.

Promoting the interests of the United States abroad.

Adjusting for costs and procedures of obtaining benefits for missions of the United States abroad.

In carrying out the provisions of the bill, the Director is authorized to assist Federal, State, and municipal governments with regard to ascertaining and according benefits, privileges and immunities to foreign missions. The activities covered include the execution or performance of any contract or agreement, the acquisition or retention of any real property, or the application for or acceptance of any benefit, including benefits of a personal, official, or governmental nature, under a legal or statutory authority, or any entity providing public services; for example, utility and telephone company.

The bill specifically provides that the terms and conditions set by the Secretary may include a requirement to pay the Director a surcharge or fee, which would be deposited in the working capital fund of the Department of State to be used in carrying out the provisions of the bill. In addition, the Secretary may require a waiver by any foreign mission of any recourse against any government or federal, state, or local government authority, or any entity providing public services for example, utility and telephone company.

The bill also provides that issues concerning the location of foreign missions in the District of Columbia be settled by the National Capital Planning Commission, on which Federal, city, and citizen interests are represented. In order to assure full discussion, public hearings are required.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, which is designed to achieve more balance between the treatment accorded U.S. missions overseas and that given foreign missions in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

§854

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 is amended by striking out "The Secretary" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE I—GENERAL AUTHORITIES

"Section 1. The Secretary",

"(a) That Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE II—AUTHORITIES RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS

"DECLARATION OF FINDINGS AND POLICY

"Sec. 201. (a) The Congress finds that the operation in the United States of foreign missions and public international organizations and the official missions to such organizations, including the permissible scope of their activities and the location and size of their facilities, is a proper subject for the exercise of Federal jurisdiction.

"The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States to support the secure and efficient operation of United States missions abroad, to facilitate the discharge of their responsibilities in the United States of foreign missions and public international organizations and the official missions to such organizations, and to assist in obtaining appropriate benefits, privileges, and immunities for those missions and organizations and to require their observance of corresponding obligations in accordance with international law.

"(b) The assistance to be provided to a foreign mission in the United States shall be determined after due consideration of the benefits, privileges, and immunities provided to missions of the United States in the country or territory represented by that foreign mission.

"DESTRUCTIONS

"Sec. 202. (a) For purposes of this title—

"(1) 'benefit' (with respect to a foreign mission) means any acquisition, or authorization for an acquisition, in the United States by or for a foreign mission, including the acquisition of—

"(A) real property by purchase, lease, exchange, construction, or otherwise;

"(B) public services, including services relating to customs, importation, and utilities, and the processing of applications or requests relating to public services;

"(C) supplies, maintenance, and transportation;

"(D) locally engaged staff on a temporary or regular basis;

"(B) travel and related services, and

"(F) protection, medical care, and such other benefits as the Secretary may designate;

"(2) 'chancery' means the principal offices of a foreign mission used for diplomatic or related activities and amenities to such offices (including auxiliary offices and support facilities), and includes the site and any building on such site which is used for such purposes;

"(3) 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Foreign Missions established pursuant to section 203(a);

"(4) 'foreign missions' means any official..."
A reading of the page reveals a legislative section of the Congressional Record, focusing on Title II of the COMPACT Act—a comprehensive legislation addressing U.S. policies towards the United Nations and other international organizations. The text provides a detailed review of the Act's provisions, particularly Section 206 and 207, discussing restrictions on the use of real property owned by foreign missions in the United States. Other sections are also mentioned regarding the powers of the Secretary of State, the United States Foreign Service, and the role of the diplomatic, consular, and other official personnel in enforcing these provisions. The Act also includes provisions on the protection and use of the United States' interests abroad, ensuring the proper use and disposition of real property owned by foreign missions in the United States. The text is rich with legal terminology and references to other sections of the legislation, illustrating the text's complexity and the intricate nature of international policy and regulations.
Section 4 of such Act (22 U.S.C. 2564) is amended—

(A) by inserting "the mission, the" immediately after "immunities for"; and

(B) by striking out "as defined in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961" and inserting, in the meanings of the words "immunities for" and "privileges and immunities," the meaning of section 2(3) of the Diplomatic Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 2344(3)).

(a) Section 206(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, relating to foreign missions, is amended—

(1) in section 6 by striking out "(a)", and by striking out subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e); and

(2) in section 16 by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In addition, families with one of this Act shall not apply to any real property to which section 206(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, relating to foreign missions, is applicable."

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 855. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to revive the AFDC and medicaid matching formulas for States which meet certain minimum AFDC benefit requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICAID MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1981

Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. President, I am today introducing the Medicaid Modernization Act of 1981. It is intended to rectify four serious shortcomings in the Medicaid program embarrassed in the Social Security Act, the formula by which the Federal matching share is determined for State outlays under both medicaid and the program of aid to families with dependent children. The existing formula is:

Federal share of AFDC/Medicaid = .45 X State per capita income/national per capita income

It is, to be blunt, a perverse and inequitable formula.

Per capita income is used as the unqualified measure of a State's ability to pay for medicaid and AFDC. In 1979 there was certainly one gage of a State's economic condition, but it is not the only measure and it is certainly not the most accurate measure of a State's fiscal capacity. It ignores the sizable cost-of-living differences among States, resulting in the unfair treatment of areas with higher living costs. A family residing in New York City, for instance, needs approximately 25 percent more income to maintain itself at the same standard of living as a similar family in Dallas or Houston.

The squaring mechanism exacerbates the distortions. It was intended to assure greater Federal financial assistance to States with the least ability to pay. However, meaning its original purpose, it is now seen that the squaring mechanism no longer makes sense. There is no evidence that a State's need for Federal matching funds is geometrically related to the ratio of its income to national income levels; nor is there evidence that an unqualified ratio would not allocate Federal moneys in closer proportion to the true needs of the mission, their families, and diplomatic couriers shall enjoy the privileges and immunities specified in the Vienna Convention."
April 15 '81

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

Dr. Bob Kissmehl,

Thank you for the chance to comment. I already studied the bill, discussed it with Harold Burman (State/4), and cannot sign up for it.

Bill

Heann
Bill Stearns:

Given your remarks at Monday's staff meeting, I thought I would solicit your views on the attached "Foreign Missions Act of 1982."

I have been working with State/L and OMB on this issue for over a year, and I believe we are near to striking paydirt.

Note the short response.

Thanks -

Bob Kennett
The National Security Council Staff strongly endorses the Foreign Missions Act of 1982 (Tab A).
MEMORANDUM FOR RICHARD V. ALLEN
FROM: Allen J. Lenz
SUBJECT: Heads of State/Government Correspondence (U)

Here is summary of Heads of State/Government correspondence from March 26-April 3:

Presidential letters signed/messages sent:

-- National days for Senegal President Diouf and Hungarian President Losonczi
-- Argentine President Viola (2) for inauguration and for his gifts; former outgoing President Videla
-- Condolences for Schmidt on father's death and Trinidad President Clarke on death of Prime Minister Williams
-- Congratulations on inauguration of Central African Rep. President Dacko
-- Birthday wishes to Queen of Denmark
-- Trip letters for Haig to carry to Sadat, Begin, Hussein and Khalid
-- OAU Chairman Stevens on Namibia

Incoming letters/messages received from:

Numerous foreign leaders on shooting (separate listing)

-- Norwegian Prime Minister Brundtland thanks for election wishes
-- Grenada Prime Minister Bishop on US reservations international airport project
-- Netherlands Prime Minister van Agt thanks for hospitality
-- Romanian President Ceausescu on CSCE Conference
-- Jamaican Prime Minister Seaga thanks for Harvard Chair
Overdue/Pending:

Zimbabwe Prime Minister Mugabe on Namibia
#1416 (with President)

Upper Volta President Zerbo on economic assistance
#319 (with President)

Reply to Duarte on El Salvador
#1033 (with President)

Reply to Brezhnev
#630 (with you)

Guatemala President Garcia on Belize
#1429 (with you)

Costa Rican President Carazo on IMF (no reply at this time)
#371 (with you)

** Sultan of Oman urging Haig stopover during ME trip (Haig leaves today)
#1602 (with you)

ROC President on President/VP inauguration via David Kennedy
#1060 (with you)

Reply to Senegal President Diouf on candidate for International Court of Justice
#1289 (enroute to you)

Proposed message to Suharto of Indonesia on Garuda hijacking
#1499 (with staff)

Trudeau on Summit arrangements
#1006 (with State)

Austrian Chancellor Kreisky re IIASA
#935 (with State)

Senegal President Diouf contributions to IDA
#773 (with State)

Sgt. Doe invitation to Liberian 1st anniversary (April 12)
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Jamaican Prime Minister Seaga on assistance drug eradication
#1481 (with State)
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