Y
4.F76/2
M57/8
978

DOCUMENTS

JUL 21 1981

FARRELL LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

GOVERNMENT

Storage

95th Congress
2d Session

COMMITTEE PRINT

EIGHTEENTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

REPORT OF THE SENATE DELEGATION ON THE EIGHTEENTH MEETING, HELD AT WASHINGTON, D.C.

BY

Senator LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Chairman

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 920305

DECEMBER 1978

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

35-140 WASHINGTON : 1978

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

SENATE DELEGATION

LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Texas, *Chairman*

MIKE GRAVEL, Alaska
ROBERT P. MORGAN, North Carolina
JOHN DURKIN, New Hampshire
DENNIS DE CONCINI, Arizona
PAUL SARBANES, Maryland

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York
JOHN TOWER, Texas
CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois

ROBERT D. BARTON, *Professional Staff Member (Policy)*
ABNER E. KENDRICK, *Professional Staff Member (Financial)*
JAN NOVINS, *Professional Staff Member (Administrative)*
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

A11206 222627

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

The Honorable WALTER MONDALE,
Vice President of the United States,
The White House,
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am pleased to transmit herewith a report on the 18th meeting of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, held from June 5–10 in Washington, D.C. and New York City.

The pattern of success and warm friendship that characterized the 18th Interparliamentary Meeting was established immediately after the arrival of our Mexican guests when they met with President and Mrs. Carter at the White House. The tone of mutual respect and determination to resolve outstanding problems, so evident in the President's remarks to the Mexican Parliamentarians, carried over into our two days of working sessions and made a significant contribution to the success of the Conference.

In a departure from past practice at these meetings, we invited and obtained the active participation of important Administration officials in the 18th Interparliamentary Conference. Secretary Blumenthal, Attorney General Bell, Ambassador Strauss, and Deputy Secretary of State Christopher appeared before working sessions of the group and shared their analyses of pending bilateral problems with our guests. Their willingness to give generously of their time and cooperate in the Conference was favorably noted by the Mexican Parliamentarians and was seen as an indication of high-level Administration concern for U.S.-Mexican relations. I would like to express my appreciation for their assistance.

This was the second Interparliamentary Conference at which I have had the honor to head the Senate delegation. My commitment to these Conferences is a function of my belief that there are few countries more important to the United States than Mexico. Indeed there are few countries where the opportunities for cooperation and the impediments to such cooperation are as vast and complex. When it comes to relations between the United States and Mexico, the traditional distinction between domestic and international policy frequently loses its relevance. With Mexico, we must share the inevitable problems of neighbors and make a conscientious and continuous effort to see that they are resolved.

Given the broad spectrum of issues between our two countries and the constant potential for misunderstanding, I firmly believe that the the open, honest, and informal exchange of views between elected officials that takes place at these meetings is an indispensable aspect of our overall relationship. To the extent that we, as legislators, can better appreciate the impact of our actions on our neighbor to

the South, to the extent that we can talk out problems with our Mexican counterparts before they become crises in our relationship, we we can better serve the American people and the cause of friendship on this continent.

I am certain that all participants in the 18th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference will attest to the fact that delegates from both countries approach this meeting with equal determination to narrow the differences and expand the area of common endeavor between Mexico and the United States, neighbors that share a border of 1,800 miles and a common destiny.

No report on the 18th Interparliamentary Meeting would be complete without an expression of thanks to Co-chairman de la Garza and other Senate and House Members of the delegation, their wives and their staffs, who gave so unstintingly of their time to make this Conference the success it was. I would like to express my personal appreciation to Senator Joaquín Gamboa Pascoe and Deputy Enrique Alverez del Castillo who led an outstanding Mexican delegation to the Conference and made an important contribution to improved relations between our two countries.

Sincerely,

LLOYD BENTSEN.

CONTENTS

	Page
Letter of transmittal	III
Background	1
Conference program	3
Committee reports:	
Committee I—Political and Social Committee	7
Bilateral relations	7
Cooperation to stop drug traffic	9
Undocumented Mexican workers	12
Inter-American relations	13
Human rights	15
Demographic policy	16
Law of the Sea: Outlook for negotiations, areas of agreements	18
Cultural interchange	19
Committee II—Economic Committee	23
Trade between Mexico and the United States	23
Multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations	25
Tourism	27
Agricultural cooperation	28
Fishing agreements	28
Energy and environment	29
Joint communique by heads of delegations	31
Appendices:	
1. Opening plenary session statement by Senator Lloyd Bentsen	35
2. Closing plenary session statement by Representative E. (Kika) de la Garza	39

BACKGROUND

On April 9, 1960, Public Law 86–420 was enacted which authorized United States participation in an annual parliamentary conference with Mexico. These meetings meet in even-numbered years in the United States, and in Mexico in odd-numbered years. The first was held in February 1961 in Guadalajara, Jalisco, United States of Mexico and the last prior to this was in Hermosillo, Sonora, Mexico.

The U.S. delegates appointed to the 18th U.S.-Mexican Interparliamentary Conference, held in Washington, D.C. and New York, N.Y., from June 5–10, 1978 were the following:

From the Senate

Lloyd Bentsen, Democrat, Texas, Chairman.
Jacob K. Javits, Republican, New York.
John Tower, Republican, Texas.
Charles H. Percy, Republican, Illinois.
Mike Gravel, Democrat, Alaska.
Robert Morgan, Democrat, North Carolina.
John Durkin, Democrat, New Hampshire.
Dennis DeConcini, Democrat, Arizona.
Paul Sarbanes, Democrat, Maryland.

From the House of Representatives

E. (Kika) de la Garza, Democrat, Texas, Chairman.
James C. Wright, Jr., Democrat, Texas, Vice Chairman.
Morris K. Udall, Democrat, Arizona.
Richard C. White, Democrat, Texas.
Abraham Kazen, Jr., Democrat, Texas.
Bill Alexander, Democrat, Arkansas.
Lester L. Wolff, Democrat, New York.
Lionel Van Deerlin, Democrat, California.
John H. Rousselot, Republican, California.
Benjamin A. Gilman, Republican, New York.
Robert J. Lagomarsino, Republican, California.
Eldon D. Rudd, Republican, Arizona.

Senator Joaquín Gamboa Pascoe from the Federal District and Deputy Enrique Alvarez del Castillo representing Guadalajara, Jalisco were the two co-presidents of the Mexican delegation. Licenciado Alberto Briceno Ruiz of the Mexican Senate staff, was their coordinator. The 25 official delegates from Mexico were:

From the Senate

Joaquín Gamboa Pascoe.
Jesus Cabrera Muñoz Ledo.
Alejandro Cervantes Delgado.
Euquerio Guerrero Lopez.

Oscar Baylón Chacón.
Martha Chávez Padrón.
Vicente Coral Martinez.
Morelos Jaime Canseco Gonzalez.
Arnulfo Villaseñor Saavedra.
Leobardo Ramos Martinez.
Humberto A. Lugo Gil.
Alberto A. Alvarado Aramburo.
José Luis Escobar Herrera.

Of these, Senators Canseco, Villaseñor, Lugo Gil and Escobar had participated in the 17th Conference in Hermosillo.

From the Chamber of Deputies

Enrique Alvarez del Castillo, Co-president.
Julio Zamora Bátiz.
Louis Priego Ortiz.
Sra. Martha Andrade de Del Rosal.
Hugo Diaz Velazquez.
Mario Hernandez Posadas.
Sra. Mirna Esther Hoyos de Navarrete.
Miguel Bello Pineda.
Hector Ximenez Gonzalez.
Francisco José Peniche Bolío.
Francisco Ortiz Mendoza.
Saul Castoreña Monterubio.

Of these, Deputy Zamora was the only one who had attended the Hermosillo Conference, although Mrs. Del Rosal had participated as a special coordinator from the Chamber of Deputies.

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

The Mexican delegation arrived in a specially chartered airplane at Andrews Air Force Base at 2:30 p.m. June 5, 1978. They were welcomed by the Co-Chairmen of the U.S. Delegation and various other United States delegates and their wives. A military honor guard and band were on hand, the latter to play the two countries' national anthems.

After transfer of the group to the Hyatt Regency Hotel, they reassembled for a tea party at the White House where President and Mrs. Carter welcomed each one individually. A press conference had been arranged for the Mexican journalists and other media personnel who had accompanied the Mexican delegation at which Senators Gamboa and Bentsen and Representatives Alvarez del Castillo and de la Garza responded to the warm welcoming words of the President. The day was completed with a buffet at the Hyatt Regency Hotel hosted by Senator Bentsen and Congressman de la Garza and the United States delegation.

The following morning at 9 a.m. the Group laid wreaths at the monuments to the national heroes of each country, Abraham Lincoln and Benito Juárez.

Immediately afterwards the delegates attended the opening plenary session in the Conference Room of the House Committee on International Relations in the Rayburn Building. The Speaker of the House, Representative Thomas P. O'Neill (D-Mass), Minority Leader John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz), International Relations Chairman Clement J. Zablocki (D-Wis.), and Senator Bentsen spoke for the American delegation with Representative de la Garza, Co-Chairman of the American delegation acting as the moderator. Senator Gamboa replied for the Mexican delegation.

The delegates were then taken on a brief tour of the Capitol led by Representative de la Garza, and proceeded afterwards to the Capitol Hill Club for lunch.

Dividing into two Committees, the Group went into closed sessions as per the rules of procedure adopted by the first Interparliamentary Group. Committee I, dealing with Political and Social Affairs, met in the Conference Room of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the Dirksen Office Building, while Committee II, dealing with Economic Affairs, met in the House Committee's chamber. Simultaneous translating services were provided in both by the Department of State. Departing from custom, the American delegation with the concurrence of the Mexican leaders, had invited special guest speakers from the Administration to meet with each group. On the first day, Robert Strauss, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations addressed the Economic Committee. Attorney General Griffin Bell

35-140—78——2

and Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher met with the Political Committee. After hearing their views and replies to questions by the Mexican delegates, each Committee turned to other items on their agenda for a discussion among the members. The agenda for each Committee was as follows:

Committee I.—Political and Social Committee

1. Bilateral relations.
2. Inter-American relations.
3. Human rights.
4. Law of the Sea: Outlook for negotiations; areas of agreement.
5. Undocumented Mexican workers.
6. Demographic policy.
7. Cooperation to stop drug traffic.
8. Cultural interchange.

Committee II.—Economic Committee

1. Trade between Mexico and the United States.
2. Multilateral trade negotiations.
3. Energy and environment.
4. Binational economic issues and initiatives.
5. Tourism.
6. United States and Mexico's measures relative to foreign trade.

Tuesday was completed with a dinner-dance offered by the American delegation and the United States representative to the Organization of American States, Ambassador Gale McGee, at the Pan American Union Building.

The two Committees continued their deliberations on Wednesday, June 7. Secretary of the Treasury, Michael Blumenthal, was the featured speaker before the Economic Committee that morning. After a luncheon in the Caucus Room of the Senate, Senator Bentsen took the Mexican delegation to the Senate floor to present them to Members.

Thereafter the closing plenary session convened. Senator Bentsen asked Deputy Alvarez del Castillo to present a summary of each Committee's findings, and Representative de la Garza brought the meeting to a conclusion in a warm speech of appreciation at which he presented the Mexican delegation with an American flag which he had had flown over the Capitol that same day. Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher offered the Group a reception that evening in the Benjamin Franklin Room of the State Department where he and other senior officials of the Administration mingled with the delegates.

As is customary, the visiting delegations are given an opportunity to visit a second city in the host country after ending the business meetings. This year New York City was selected as the host city and officials of the City and Federal Government spared no pains to be hospitable. The Group was flown to New York by the Air Force and was welcomed at a luncheon offered by the Center for Inter-American Affairs in its headquarters at 680 Park Avenue. The Chairmen of the U.S. delegation arranged for the visitors to attend the theater that night, and personally accompanied the two Mexican Co-Presidents.

Friday was left largely free for the delegates and their wives to visit museums, galleries, and other tourist attractions. The wives had been invited to the two plenary sessions and all social functions

while in Washington. They had also had an opportunity to visit Mount Vernon, Old Town Alexandria, and Smithsonian Institution museums. In New York at 5 p.m. the Mayor of New York, Edward I. Koch, and many Spanish-speaking officials offered the visitors tea at Gracie Mansion, the Mayor's official residence. Finally, that evening the American Co-Chairmen and Ambassadors to the United Nations Andrew Young and James F. Leonard gave a farewell party for the Group at the United States Mission to the United Nations.

The Mexican delegation departed from New York's Kennedy Airport by chartered plane Saturday, and the Americans returned to Washington that morning on an Air Force plane.

In accordance with established rules of procedure the U.S.-Mexico Interparliamentary Conferences do not take votes or pass resolutions, but do issue a joint statement covering the issues they discussed in the Committees. The joint communique issued Saturday, June 10, 1976, appears following the reports on the discussions held by each Committee. The opening and closing remarks of the two American Co-Chairmen are found as appendices to the report.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee I—Political and Social Issues

Senate members of the Political and Social Committee were Senators Robert Morgan, Dennis DeConcini, Paul Sarbanes, John Tower, and Charles H. Percy. Senator Jacob K. Javits also took part in some of the discussions on the second day, having attended the Economic Committee meeting on the first. House members were Representatives E. (Kika) de la Garza, presiding, Lester L. Wolff, Benjamin A. Gilman, and Eldon Rudd.

The Committee met on the afternoon of June 6 and the morning of June 7 in the hearing room of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. Each of the eight agenda items that had been agreed to in advance by the two delegations was discussed at length in an atmosphere of frank and open discussion and with a variety of opinions expressed.

Differing from previous Interparliamentary meetings was the inclusion at this one of two senior officials of the Executive Branch who discussed the goals and operations of their Departments insofar as they affect United States-Mexican relations.

Bilateral Relations

Attorney General Griffin Bell

The first of these to appear was Attorney General Griffin Bell who reviewed the history of the Department of Justice, its policies and goals.

The areas in which the Department of Justice works most closely with the Mexican Government, he said, were the issues of undocumented alien workers, border crimes, prisoner exchanges, drug enforcement, and extradition. He stressed that during the 17 months since he had assumed the office of Attorney General, he had met several times with the Mexican Attorney General and had not a single complaint to make about the coordination of efforts with the Mexican Government.

In the discussion which followed the Attorney General's presentation, the Mexican delegation observed that the transit of narcotics to American markets from the northern Mexican States, such as Sinaloa, has been a continuous and vexing problem. Mexico, however, is working hard to stop it and wanted assurances that the United States would continue its efforts just as vigorously. Attorney General Bell assured the Mexicans that as long as he was in office he would continue the fight without any slackening of effort.

Responding to an assertion that eight American states had stopped prosecution of marijuana consumers under the mistaken belief that it

was a harmless drug, Attorney General Bell said the Federal Government believes strongly in traffic control of marijuana and was doing all it could to convince state legislatures that they should not pass legislation permitting its use. He added that he personally knew of only two states that have stopped prosecuting consumers or persons arrested with small amounts of marijuana.

A Mexican Senator remarked that the fight against drug trafficking had made good progress as demonstrated by the enormous reduction in trafficking. He asked about the U.S.-Mexican Commission which had been established as a result of the Carter-López Portillo meetings. An American representative said the four U.S. delegates had been appointed, two from each House, and that it was expected that the first meeting would be taking place very soon in Mexico.

On the subject of illegal immigrants, General Bell said the Administration's policy was not to initiate a widespread round-up of undocumented workers nor to indulge in a massive deportation campaign. He felt that such action would be both inhumane and economically counterproductive since many undocumented workers were employed on United States farms and in other areas where their skills were much needed. To deport them would be highly damaging and unsettling to those agricultural areas.

Responding to a question about the Ku Klux Klan patrolling the border, the Attorney General said the KKK incidents had been blown vastly out of proportion. In fact, he said only 14 members of the Klan were involved, but that about 150 reporters had accompanied them, giving the Klan greater publicity than it deserved.

Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher

Mr. Bell was followed by the Deputy Secretary of State, Mr. Warren Christopher, who led off by remarking that the United States was blessed by having borders with only two neighbors, both friendly and closely interdependent with the United States.

He remarked briefly on the meeting of Presidents Carter and López Portillo in February 1977, and their agreement to establish a Consultative Mechanism which was inaugurated the following May when Secretary Vance met with Foreign Minister Roel.

Mr. Christopher then reviewed Secretary Vance's next visit to Mexico in May 1978, and the agreements which had been signed there: accords on fishing, civil aviation and tropical agricultural products. He commented favorably on the exchange of prisoners agreement which has removed an irksome problem for both countries and the cooperation received from the Mexicans on the drug trafficking problem.

Secretary Christopher praised the "very constructive influence" that Mexico exerts in multinational congresses and in Latin America as a whole. He promised continued cooperation by the United States in educational and cultural pursuits and in World Bank and International Monetary Fund economic improvement programs for Mexico.

Commenting on Mr. Christopher's opening statement, a Mexican Senator reminded the delegates that the Consultative Mechanism set up by the two Presidents was to operate in the fields of political, economic and social affairs. The political group had reviewed the problems endangering world peace, had analyzed U.S.-Mexican bilateral relations, and as a result had created a Subgroup on Frontier

Problems, which would meet at the Ministerial level to discuss each country's position at various international forums in an effort to assure better bilateral coordination.

The second group, working on economic affairs, had already prepared the way for trade, civil aviation and tourism agreements, and was continuing discussions on industrial, investment and financial matters.

The third group had concerned itself with undocumented migratory workers, not only in the economic and social context, but also in relation to the broader aspect of the disparity between the economies of the two nations. Also included in this group's agenda were environmental, cultural and educational issues. In addition, a subcommittee had been established to study drug control measures.

In conclusion, this Mexican delegate expressed his conviction that the U.S.-Mexico Consultative Mechanism had made a good start and was operating effectively. He proposed that the 18th U.S.-Mexican Interparliamentary Group officially recognize its accomplishments to date. At the same time he recommended that the Consultative Mechanism meet more frequently and that it periodically evaluate its work, both to assess progress in the implementation of past decisions and to identify other issues still remaining unresolved.

Mr. Christopher indicated that he would personally work to see that these suggestions were carried out. He praised the conferees for their candor and obvious determination to use these annual meetings to find solutions to long standing problems.

Cooperation to Stop Drug Traffic [1]

The review of bilateral issues in general was followed by an analysis of individual items of concern to both parties. Combatting drug trafficking stood out among these problems. Two United States Representatives presented papers on this issue which were responded to by the Mexican delegation.

The first of the American papers reviewed the efforts made at Hermosillo last year by the 17th Interparliamentary Group which resulted in the adoption by the conferees of the Declaration of Hermosillo on Narcotics Trafficking at the International Level.

An American delegate noted that the House of Representatives had passed unanimously House Concurrent Resolution 265 which calls on the Congress to endorse the Hermosillo Declaration, encourages other nations to adopt it, and urges the President to persuade other nations to cooperate in an international effort to eradicate narcotics trafficking and to eliminate the illicit production of opium. He expressed the hope that Senators on the American delegation to the 18th Interparliamentary Group would urge their colleagues to vote out the Concurrent Resolution in the Senate.

Nevertheless, he noted that both the Declaration and the Resolution must be bolstered by even stronger action. Sophisticated international criminal syndicates, he said, are netting from drug traffic $10 billion in the United States and even more internationally. The amount of heroin seized by United States authorities since 1969 is valued at over

---

[1] In order to accommodate Members who had competing engagements and commitments while the Congress was in session, agenda topics were often taken up out of sequence (i.e. as listed on page 4). This section summarizes the discussions in the order in which they actually took place.

$2 billion, cocaine over $1 billion, and marijuana over $2 billion. These seizures, however, represent only a small portion of the narcotics making their way across the border.

He examined next the conditions facilitating their entry; the multiple growing seasons for marijuana and opium, the ever-increasing number of clandestine airfields, the difficult terrain along the 2,000-mile common border, the ease with which small smuggling vessels can enter coastal waters undetected, and the huge number of border crossings made daily by cars and people. He claimed 165,000,000 individuals and 48,000,000 motor vehicles cross the border annually, which on the United States side is staffed by only 3,410 Customs inspectors, Border Patrol officers and Immigration and Naturalization Service agents.

Despite this lack of manpower, joint efforts have cut the amount of Mexican heroin entering the United States by 20 percent. The eradication of poppy fields represents a 50 percent increase in the amount of poppies destroyed during the last year, and joint efforts by the Mexican Federal Police and the Drug Enforcement Agency have resulted in some very dramatic seizures in 1978.

The American delegate pointed out that for years DEA agents have been working hand-in-hand with the Mexican police in front-line narcotics interdiction. Suddenly, in early 1978, the Drug Enforcement Agency was notified that its agents would no longer be invited to participate in the Mexican spraying operations.

He stated that it is "extremely important" that both nations' drug enforcement officers participate in drug preventative operations since they can learn from one another and operate an inter-American intelligence network more effectively.

While recognizing that some Mexicans were sensitive to American agents "looking over the shoulders" of their Mexican counterparts, he asked the Mexican delegates to reconsider their view on this matter and adopt a more effective cooperative course of action. He urged the implementation of a joint anti-narcotics commission that had been approved by former Presidents Ford and Echeverría that has now become a subgroup of the U.S.-Mexico Consultative Mechanism. He claimed that, although other subgroups have become operational, this one has still not been implemented, despite constant appeals. He concluded by saying that if we are to win the war on drug abuse we must work with greater dispatch on this vitally important issue.

Another United States delegate deplored the long delay in activating the drug control subgroup, but added that he was hopeful its first meeting would take place sometime in June, 1978, "two and a half years after the agreement in principle was reached." He added that, while the United States would never intrude in the sovereignty of the United Mexican States, the issue of narcotics begins as a domestic issue in Mexico, ends up as a domestic problem in the United States, and in between is a major foreign affairs concern of both countries. He recommended that the 18th Interparliamentary Group begin discussions of "a comprehensive income substitution program for the Mexican peasants who are currently growing opium poppies and see little alternative means for support." He differentiated between this and a crop substitution program which he felt would not provide sufficient new income.

The American delegate said that following this conference he would take up with the State Department, with the Agency for International Development, and with the United States delegates to the international financial institutions the possibility of focusing an income substitution program in the poppy producing areas in Mexico. The ongoing drug control effort, he said, should include continued use of DEA agents in Mexico, more patrolling by Mexicans on their side of the border, the inducement of Mexican poppy farmers to plant other crops, and a Mexican initiative to influence other Latin American nations to stop drug trafficking.

Two Mexican delegates responded to these statements by the United States Representatives. Both praised the cooperation that prevailed in the battle against drugs, and observed this cooperation was based on various international conventions, such as the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and its 1972 Protocol, the Psychotropic Substances Convention of 1971, and complementary bilateral agreements.

The first Mexican delegate cited as areas of concern to Mexico the localization and destruction of opium plantations, socio-economic studies in rural areas to determine what crop substitution programs could be implemented, the investigation and prosecution of illegal traffickers, and the interdiction of cocaine, amphetamines and barbituates which are not produced locally but which enter Mexico en route to other destinations. He listed the specific resources utilized in this work: 35 helicopters, 28 airplanes, 55 radio stations to maintain contact with radio-equipped jeeps and other vehicles, infrared processing for aerial photographs of poppy fields, and laboratories for the analysis of various drugs. This equipment, he said, had led to the extensive destruction of many more poppy fields than had previously been possible.

He remarked that the cooperation of the United States Government had been a significant factor in the program's success. It also represented a magnificent example of the type of international cooperation which respects the sovereignty of each participating nation and the principle of national responsibility. As such, he concluded it could serve as a model for similar agreements with other countries.

The second Mexican delegate spoke on the controversial issue of paraquat, an herbicide which has been used in the widespread destruction of poppy and marijuana fields in Mexico. He mentioned that paraquat has been extensively used in various countries to protect agricultural products against various plagues, and that in the view of the Mexicans it was harmless to humans. He claimed that obviously the two countries could not combat the traffic of marijuana through the destruction of the plant and at the same time guarantee that the contaminated herb would not be smuggled into the United States as the scarcity of pure marijuana became more acute.

Within the American delegation certain differences of opinion emerged over the use of paraquat. A Congressman claimed that the United States had been using it since 1960 and had found that it does not remain in the soil. He conceded that in concentrated form it is relatively toxic, but it has the advantage of killing a plant sprayed with it within 48 hours. In his opinion, marijuana itself is a poison. An herbicidal spray could not be expected to make poisonous marijuana "safe" for human consumption.

A Senate delegate, however, expressed great concern over the use of paraquat and asked if Mexico could still reduce the drug supply or carry out effective eradication programs without using it.

A Mexican delegate responded that Mexico was now adding a dye to the paraquat spray so that marijuana introduced into the United States after being sprayed could be identified. As for finding a substitute spray, he suggested that it would be up to the United States to find one which would be as effective. The discussion, which also touched on the subject of an American organization called NORML (National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws) bringing suit against the United States to prohibit the use of paraquat, was concluded by an American delegate observing that up to the present the United States Government had made no official protest to the Mexicans about the use of paraquat.

Undocumented Mexican Workers

The question of Mexican workers in the United States without proper documentation was considered to be one of the most difficult, complex and challenging problems facing the López Portillo and Carter administrations.

A Mexican delegate stated at the outset that no solution to the problem could be taken unilaterally and that bilateral action must be based on practical solutions recognizing individual dignity and social justice. "In a world in which the economic abundance of some countries conditions, the poverty of others, and in which the universal desire is to realize human rights," he continued, "there is only one way to maintain peace and international concord: that is through a series of agreements that assures just treatment among unequals."

He claimed that the migratory invasion of the United States is generated by the attraction of its economy, although in reality it often results in grave disillusionment, maltreatment, injustice and humiliation for the migrant. The long frontier obviously contributes to the uninterrupted flow of alien workers, but other factors also play a part; inflation; the closing of the frontier to certain Mexican products; and job offers by United States employers, especially during periods of cyclical fluctuations, when cheap labor is much in demand.

The Mexican delegate mentioned that lack of information about the actual situation had generated an adverse public reaction in the United States regarding Mexican workers. He said that these unfounded allegations include the belief that undocumented workers displace American workers, and that the Mexicans become a social burden of the state, by abusing the social and public assistance programs of the areas in which they work.

Frequently overlooked are the benefits derived from the presence of undocumented workers, such as their contribution to the country's productivity, their tax and social security payments, and their purchases within the United States.

He felt that an equilibrium in trade between Mexico and the United States would help reduce Mexican unemployment and consequently the flow of emigrants. He repeated a Mexican position that Mexican products should be allowed a preferential tariff rate and that more

border industries should be encouraged. He noted that President López Portillo has already put into effect a national program called the *Alianza para la Producción* in which all sectors of the economy are involved in increasing productivity through greater employment. Additionally, the Mexican Congress has recently approved a federal plan intended to increase employment by 3,700,000 over the next five years. Part of this overall design involves creating new jobs in the rural areas by placing more industries there and by improving its infrastructure.

Finally, the Mexican Government has announced a demographic policy designed to reduce within five years its population growth rate from 3.2 percent to 2.5 percent annually.

The Mexican delegate asked that Mexican workers in the United States not be treated as criminals. He concluded by saying that Mexico, still in the development process, is coping both with ancestral problems and with complicated new ones. These Interparliamentary meetings have allowed such problems to be discussed frankly and openly, and it is in that spirit that he called upon the United States to uphold its own traditions and values in the search for justice within the framework of liberty.

This theme was expounded by another Mexican delegate who claimed that greater interdependence and improved technology link states in such a way that all nations must assume the responsibility of improving economic conditions of the world and, particularly, of the less developed countries. It must be recognized, he stated, that undocumented workers merely seek greater economic opportunities in the United States. U.S.-Mexican trade relations must include assurances that Mexico will receive a fair market price for its goods so that the Mexican laborer will find an equal economic opportunity in his own country.

An American delegate responded by noting that economic issues nowadays more often than not govern the political debate. He agreed that the United States must work more assiduously to equalize economic opportunity. At the same time, he took note of Mexico's high birth rate and attributed the resulting increase in the numbers of Mexican immigrants to that factor.

Another American representative observed that while the issue of undocumented Mexican workers cannot be ignored, their dedication to work and the work ethic should also be recognized. He concluded the discussion on this subject by emphasizing that the Mexican contribution to agriculture production was much appreciated by farmers in his own state.

Inter-American Relations

Leading off on the theme of inter-American relations, one American delegate praised the strong Mexican support for efforts to secure Senate approval of the Panama Canal Treaties. He said that Mexico's stand had been extremely useful to the Senate leaders who fought for the treaties on the floor and had often been cited as a paramount reason for having them passed.

The same United States delegate next mentioned the serious problem of stopping the proliferation of nuclear weapons around the world and especially within the hemisphere. He called attention to

the leadership of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in this regard, and noted that the President had recently sent to the Senate Protocol I to the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America (Treaty of Tlatelolco). He said he foresaw prompt approval of the Protocol by the Senate. The Treaty of Tlatelolco, which was signed in 1967, constitutes the first successful attempt to establish a nuclear weapon-free zone in any populated area of the world, and has been signed by all nations of the western hemisphere except Cuba and Guyana.

The United States has already signed Protocol II which calls on the nuclear weapon nations to respect the Latin American Nuclear Free Zone and to refrain from either threatening the use of any such weapons or contributing in any way toward the violation of the Treaty's terms.

Protocol I is open to all countries having international responsibility for territories lying within the zone and obligates them to adhere to the Treaty as it pertains to their territories. In the case of the United States, Protocol I would affect Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone (until entry into force of the Panama Canal Treaties) and our military base at Guantanamo. The delegate praised Mexico for its leadership among the lesser developed countries of the world and in the United Nations for advocating nuclear non-proliferation and arms control measures.

A U.S. delegate said he believed Mexico and the United States should stand together on the issue of Cuban involvement in Africa. He noted that the United States and Cuba had made progress during the past year toward normalizing their relationship, and that he had been optimistic about a partial lifting of the trade embargo, but asserted that Cuban activity in Africa was gravely jeopardizing this process. Cuba must recognize this fact and then decide whether its adventures in Africa are worth the price, he said.

None of us favors a return to the cold war or a new confrontation to arise between the superpowers, but Cuba must realize that the United States cannot sit back on the sidelines and see colonialism, which has been thrown off in Africa, reimposed by Cuban-Soviet intrigue there.

Another American delegate also spoke of the mutual satisfaction both governments had derived from the passage of the Panama Canal Treaties.

On the subject of inter-American relations, he made an analogy to a happy marriage where quarrels can be resolved through discussion and compromise rather than letting them lead to divorce. He expressed the hope that this would be the case with the Mexico and the United States who are mutually attached to each other by a long and peaceful border.

A Mexican delegate, responding to these statements, called the consent of the Senate to the ratification of the Panama Canal Treaties "a great step forward" toward the achievement of full sovereignty for Panama over all of its territory. With regard to Cuban intervention in Africa, he said Mexico regrets the recent deterioration in United States-Cuba relations over this issue. He expressed the hope that all disagreements would be peacefully resolved taking into

account the necessity of respecting each country's national sovereignty and integrity.

Human Rights

A Mexican delegate read a paper expressing Mexico's position on the important subject of human rights. The American delegation, after hearing his statement, unanimously concurred in the views expressed and adopted it without further discussion.

The Mexican thesis was that after years of struggle, men and nations have acquired basic principles that govern human coexistence, many of which are incorporated in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mexico, however, has recognized these same human rights ever since the beginning of its struggle for independence when its national heroes fought to share more equally the wealth of the nation with all citizens, to promote individual liberty, and to increase educational opportunities. Human rights, it recognized, can only flourish when a nation has independence and complete self-determination. Even so, no violation of basic human rights by a government can ever justify one nation's intervention in the affairs of another. The basic principle of non-intervention stands above all others, he stated.

The Mexican delegate went on to say that if justice is the supreme goal of law, then reciprocity in international transactions is the fundamental rule which must govern the acts of nations. When one country has become developed, its friendly attitude towards other countries still in the development process is a sign of its true friendship towards those countries.

In trade relations between nations, the principle which must guide international relationships is that the prices which prevail in the world markets must be the basis for setting Mexican prices. Human rights include basic economic guarantees and the promulgation of the Universal Declaration on those rights has been interpreted to mean that true justice is to treat equal countries equally and to treat unequally those countries which are unequal.

It is the Mexican belief that the understanding of the content and meaning of fundamental human rights must be understood and recognized by all so that the future of mankind can be advanced. Given the good will between Mexico and the United States, we can look forward to a period of full understanding. Just as Lincoln and Juárez coincided in their fundamental political philosophies so, the two nations today, guided by the same humanistic spirit, can find a better solution to the questions which separate them and can easily find new ties to unite them.

An American delegate, responding to this, recognized that human and economic rights are a matter of general concern to the two nations represented in the conference as well as to the rest of the world. He pointed out that he was particularly pleased by the expeditious ratification of the prisoner exchange treaty by the Mexican Congress, and said that the return of American prisoners from Mexican jails for the completion of their sentences in United States prisons had been a source of great satisfaction to many families in this country. He thanked the Mexican delegation for its initiative and cooperation in this matter.

Demographic Policy

The earlier discussion of undocumented alien workers had ended on the note that Mexicans coming to the United States were simply searching for a fundamental human right, namely, the right to search for a better and more productive life. Perhaps, it was observed, they have violated certain immigration laws, but they are not criminals. In coming to the United States they have shared the motivation of previous waves of immigrants, that is to find economic prosperity through honest and hard work.

This led members of the American delegation to comment on the demographic growth being experienced in Mexico and to express the hope that it would be dampened somewhat by industrial growth in the country and the boost to the economy anticipated from newly discovered oil reserves. Underlying the discussion was the question of whether an economic "renaissance" in Mexico would lead to a diminution in the flow of Mexican immigrants to the United States.

Two Mexican delegates replied to this, one by giving a frank and complete discussion of Mexico's family planning activities, and the other by discussing at some length the PIDER program. Although this subject had not been discussed by the 17th Interparliamentary Group, Mexico has realized its importance for some time, has collaborated with international organizations concerned with population growth worldwide, and has associated its own national program with the global development policies which respect constitutional and individual rights of individuals.

At the time of the 1910 Revolution, stated the first delegate, Mexico had a population of 15 million and a population growth rate of one half of one percent. The new, popular government had encouraged a policy to populate the country, which resulted in a growth rate of 1.7 percent between 1920 and 1940 and 20 million inhabitants by 1940. By 1950, Mexico had 26 million inhabitants; by 1960, 35 million; and by 1970, 48 million. It now has a population growth rate of 3.5 percent annually, one of the highest in the world. At present rates of growth today's population of 65 million will almost double every 20 years.

Recently, the Mexican Government has begun to inform its people of the consequences of a population growth rate that will produce 80 million citizens by 1983 and 110 million by the year 2000.

The delegate affirmed that a new demographic policy, which takes into account the human rights of every individual, has been put into practice. Nevertheless, the results of any such policy cannot be fully realized for two generations.

In 1973, Mexico turned from a policy of stimulating population growth to "a more rational one", and the next year established a National Population Council. Its basic tenet was that every couple has the right to decide in a free, responsible and informed manner how many and at what intervals it would have its children. Last year Mexico held its first Conference on Demographic Research. It found that the nation's growth rate had decreased to 3.1 percent annually and that due to its family planning programs 280,000 less children had been born. However, this reduction was found to be mostly in middle class rather than in rural families.

Mexico desires to maintain a growth rate that will support the work force necessary for the harmonious development of the country, said

this delegate. At the same time, Mexico must respect the rights of each couple. "For ourselves there is no such thing as a surplus human. What is needed is to accelerate the nation's economic and social development so that new generations can augment both production and consumption and the full expression of the country's culture." This will require, said the representative, an active, productive and participatory population, internal and external migratory mobility, and a population growth which keeps pace with economic development.

In effect, added another Mexican delegate, this means a demographic policy to complement a development policy which will generate more jobs and educational opportunities. Now that the birth rate has slowed down, Mexico hopes it will decrease to 2.5 percent by 1982 and to one percent by the year 2000.

The same Mexican delegate then explained the purposes of PIDER, a Spanish acronym for the Program of Rural Development Investments. Begun in 1973, PIDER was funded at the federal level, but also received supplemental loans from the World Bank in 1975 and 1977 and from the Inter-American Development Bank in 1976. These loans supported PIDER operations and underwrote the establishment of a Research Center for Rural Development. (CIDER) Nevertheless, these funds only represent 7 percent of the total 10.5 billion pesos which Mexico's Federal Government has put into the two programs. Individual states and some labor unions have also made separate contributions.

PIDER's goal is to create a self-sustaining process which will transform and improve the economic, social and political structure of rural communities. It asks them to participate fully in the organization and administration of PIDER projects.

PIDER has concentrated 70 percent of its efforts in productive works, 20 percent on efforts to increase productivity, and 10 percent on social welfare programs. PIDER operates in 873 villages with populations between 300 and 3000 and which inherently contain a potential for productivity.

In sum, said the Mexican delegate, PIDER is a program that together with others embodies an integrated internal policy for a programmed, coordinated and evaluated development effort based on the ideals of the new international economic order.

The American delegates, replying to these statements, said that the United States has similar rural development problems and would follow with interest the Mexican experiments in this field.

Another American representative observed, however, that the flow of undocumented workers from Mexico may be coming into the United States faster than this country's ability to absorb them. While he agreed that there is no such thing as "a surplus human being," he wondered how many people Mexico could actually accommodate within its own borders.

The Mexican delegation again referred to the government's projection of a total population of 110 million by the year 2000, but pointed out that Mexican emigration could not be explained exclusively in demographic terms. Economic, social and even political factors were also involved, he claimed.

Family planning, it was agreed, is a subject which is of major concern to both countries. A United States delegate pointed out, for instance, that amendments along this line which have been attached

to various appropriations bills, have been extensively debated by recent Congresses. Continued attention to this topic in the future, he felt, was therefore clearly in order.

Law of the Sea: Outlook for Negotiations and Areas of Agreements

Consideration of this topic was begun by a United States delegate, who observed that the two governments were in a position to assume the leadership of the U.N. Law of the Sea Conferences. The likelihood was very great, he stated, that Congress would act on deep seabed mining legislation this year. The United States has put forward serious proposals on that subject which he hoped the Mexicans would carefully consider. Mexico could play an important role, he said, in encouraging other countries participating in the Conference, to consider seriously the United States position.

A Mexican replied that Mexico would see to it that all constitutional principles are taken into account during the debate on maritime rights at the Conferences on the Law of the Seas. He assured the American delegation that Mexico and, he hoped, all other countries, would at the same time observe the principle of national sovereignty as well.

Another Mexican delegate mentioned that, with the passage of U.S. Public Law 89–658 on October 14, 1966, the United States had established a fishing management and conservation zone, which in effect was really an exclusive economic zone. Mexico believes that this legislation recognized the urgent need for governments to protect their marine resources.

Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution established sovereign and jurisdictional rights over an exclusive economic zone which extends 200 nautical miles from the mainland. The same international law, which is observed by the United States, allows for control and jurisdiction in these waters of all renewable and non-renewable natural resources, living or mineral. Thus, the two countries are working together to achieve a rational management of these resources, which can be seen in the fact that they recently signed two marine fishing agreements.

Mexico, he reminded the American delegation, is well aware that these national zones do not include all seas or seabeds currently available for exploitation by advanced technological means. Areas outside national zones, he claimed, are the common heritage of mankind whose exploitation should be regulated for the benefit of the international community.

Moreover, he stated, the seas must be protected from contamination. He noted that the Gulf of Mexico could be changed into a dead sea through excessive industrial and human waste pollution. Oceanic pollution and contamination, he said, concerns Mexico deeply. Mexico is thus more than willing to join with the United States and other nations to develop a mutually beneficial policy based on a rational and complete use of all the seas.

The American delegation gave its wholehearted endorsement to this statement. One delegate, however, asked for the Mexican delegation to intercede in another issue of concern to American Gulf fishermen. The U.S.-Mexican Fishery Agreement, allowing Mexican boats to fish in the Gulf, is in force and is working well, he observed. The other

U.S.-Mexican Agreement allowing American boats access to Mexican waters is working well with one exception.

This agreement, as it pertains to shrimp fishing in Mexican waters, allotted only a limited number of licensed boats per year to fish for shrimps. That number diminishes to zero next year. The American delegate said he had no quarrel with this formula if its purpose is to conserve the species, but he has been told that the legitimate quota will not be caught. As a result of this provision, a valuable economic income might be lost to American fishermen and an equally valuable protein to American consumers.

Furthermore, he had been informed that the American boats may be replaced by Cuban shrimp boats. The delegate claimed that these were historic fishing grounds for Texan shrimp fishing boats. Cuba, on the other hand, has historically fished in the straits between Cuba and Florida and has not until recently fished for shrimp. The U.S. delegate noted that he has been in contact with the Mexican Embassy in Washington to explore the possibility of annually reviewing the fishing agreements. If Mexico finds that U.S. boats should be excluded to preserve the species, no objection would be raised. If, on the other hand, Mexico was allowing Cubans to fish in the Gulf and at the same time was denying fishing rights to Americans who are complying with Mexican laws and regulations, that would create a difficult political situation.

The Mexican delegation said it would notify the Mexican Administration of the American delegation's concern.

United States–Mexico Cultural Exchanges

The Mexican spokesman on this last item on the agenda examined three separate aspects of the U.S.-Mexico educational and cultural exchange program.

The first related to programs already in effect, which were administered by diplomatic mechanisms established for that purpose and by joint commissions. While these programs were making good progress, he felt that they could be expanded. He recommended that these on-going programs be evaluated at the next meeting in June 1979.

Future cooperative programs, the second category of exchanges, should include a study on how the recommendations of the U.S.-Mexico Consultative Mechanism might be implemented with respect to the common border area. The Mechanism reported recently that agreement had been reached on a program which would study cultural and educational opportunities in that zone and attempt to assign greater emphasis to the quality of bilingual education. Local needs would be evaluated and suggestions presented for meeting them.

Thirdly, the Lincoln-Juárez Scholarship program was cited as an example of a very effective effort. In July 1978, the delegate said, the Binational Commission on Cultural Cooperation would focus on the program. As a point of departure, he recommended that the Commission use the guidelines established by the Consultative Mechanism—namely those calling for special attention to the border area, the review of on-going programs and the expansion of the Lincoln-Juárez exchanges.

The delegate then addressed the specific topic of bilingual education. Since 1776, he noted, the United States has sought to protect the human rights of its population, whether it be composed of Italians, Irish or "chicanos." He declared that the spoken and written word is

indispensable for the promotion of thought and culture. This was recognized, he said, by the Supreme Court which, in the case of *Brown* v. *The Board of Education*, had rejected the concept of segregated schools. More recently, the United States has recognized its obligation to provide bilingual education to school-age children whose language is not English. On May 5, 1970, he said, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare had decreed that bilingual educational programs be established in every school district where at least five percent of the population did not speak English. HEW had also budgeted funds to support such programs.

The Mexican delegate viewed these bilingual programs as a stimulus to the education of Mexican immigrants. Without them, he claimed, many social problems could arise—especially juvenile delinquency. He requested that this type of program be extended to secondary schools. He added: "In the Second World War we fought fascism based on racial supremacy. Now we are fighting poverty and ignorance with respect to both our cultures. We must respect the words of President López Portillo when he said that in a free world, freedom must be expressed by a free exchange of ideas from all countries."

Continuing, the Mexican delegate called the U.S.-Mexican Interparliamentary mechanism a meeting of friends and colleagues. He asked this Eighteenth Conference to recommend to the respective governments that the Federal Educational Bilingual Act be maintained—especially Section 772 of that act, which recognized the rights of children who do not speak English well and who have a different cultural background. He asked that the Interparliamentary Group recommend that this law be extended to higher education for Spanish-speaking students. In this way, he maintained, each nation can develop a reservoir of educated people who can serve their less fortunate compatriots and thus save them from delinquency.

Members of the United States delegation expressed general satisfaction with the progress of the binational educational and cultural exchange programs. One member cited examples of the kind of expanded border exchange activity he had witnessed over the years: more school bands and dance groups, a greater exchange of athletic teams, and an increase in the number of professors and students. He mentioned also the beauty of the exhibit of Mexican art which had been presented at the Smithsonian Institution and was at the moment in New York City. He observed that in September the National Endowment on the Arts would conduct a symposium on Mexico which would bring some thirty educators and artists from that country to meet with their American colleagues.

Another delegate, however, had reservations about the extent to which the United States should proceed with bilingual education. He agreed that other languages should be taught in educational institutions, but he emphasized that the United States, a nation of immigrants speaking many different languages and from many diverse cultures, had become a union through the teaching of English. An immigrant to a specific country, he felt, had the duty to learn that country's language. That general philosphy, he conceded, was not easy to live with in the United States, which had become the fourth largest Spanish-speaking country in the world. It was nevertheless

important, he argued, to encourage Spanish-speaking residents to learn English—the key to prosperity and advancement within U.S. society.

In this connection, a Mexican delegate noted that until 1917, when Mexico's new Constitution was promulgated, French had been the language of preference for the secondary and professional schools. Thereafter, Spanish was so designated by the educational authorities, but nevertheless Mexico still offers many facilities and opportunities to learn English—in its college preparatory schools, in its universities and in its post-graduate courses. While everyone did not learn to speak fluent English as a result, they were helped in this way to understand better the culture, the way of life, and the very special features of their neighbor to the north. The Mexican delegate asked that the United States respond in kind by offering the same opportunities to its most recently arrived immigrants, those from Mexico.

On this note, the two Chairmen concluded the deliberations of Committee I by thanking all delegates for their active and constructive participation in the discussions.

COMMITTEE II—ECONOMIC ISSUES

Trade Between Mexico and the United States

The June 6 meeting of the Economic Committee opened on a positive note by a United States Senator noting that Mexican freight cars had traditionally benefitted from Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) treatment and entered this country duty-free. However, due to the fact that the United States was no longer able to import freight cars from Canada, Mexico had become the sole foreign supply source and had exceeded the GSP 50 percent limitation. Mexican freight cars, as a result, became dutiable at 18 percent on March 1, 1978. Continuing, he said that in light of the pressing freight car shortage in the United States and the urgent requirement to foster employment opportunities in Mexico, it made little sense to place an 18 percent duty on cars the United States urgently requires and Mexico urgently needs to produce. He suggested that he would be prepared to introduce legislation exempting Mexican freight cars from duty for either a two or four year period.

This proposal was enthusiastically endorsed by the Mexican delegation, which expressed its appreciation for the Senator's initiative and commended him for his willingness to help find mutually acceptable solutions to outstanding bilateral problems. This attitude, he said, is entirely consistent with the purpose and spirit of the Interparliamentary meetings and does much to strengthen U.S.-Mexican friendship.

Ambassador Robert Strauss, the President's Special Trade Representative, who addressed the Committee shortly after this opening discussion, noted the growing importance of economic and trade relations between the United States and Mexico. He suggested that trade between the two countries is destined to increase in volume and significance. Given the importance of our trading relationship, Ambassador Strauss suggested that failure to discuss and resolve problems before they became crises could have a severe negative impact on bilateral relations.

The Ambassador pointed out that Mexico had become a major factor in international trade and would gain even greater prominence in coming years. He suggested that Mexico might shoulder a greater share of the responsibilities in this area by becoming a member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

The Ambassador stressed that the United States recognized the importance of providing a market for Mexican exports and was making an active effort in this regard. He pointed out that the United States had traditionally shown a substantial surplus in its trade account with Mexico. In 1977, however, the balance of trade between the two countries was roughly in equilibrium. Mexico had closed the gap.

Ambassador Strauss also emphasized that Mexico had benefitted from GSP treatment of its exports to the United States to an unprecedented degree during the previous year. In 1977, Mexico was the fourth largest beneficiary of GSP, with duty free treatment accorded to over $350 million in imports. Ambassador Strauss pointed out that this represented a 45 percent increase in GSP benefits over 1976. Mexico, however, still does not take full advantage of GSP opportunities; only about 30 percent of Mexican exports potentially eligible for GSP treatment actually benefitted from the provisions. The Ambassador suggested that Mexico should make a major effort to utilize fully all existing GSP opportunities.

While stressing the unique nature of the relationship between the United States and Mexico and our desire to be responsive to Mexican economic and development requirements, Ambassador Strauss also noted that the United States operates under its own domestic pressures and constraints. It suffers from substantial unemployment, inflation, and agricultural problems of its own.

Domestically, substantial opposition exists, for example, to the ready access provided Mexican fruits and vegetables, particularly tomatoes. The Mexican delegates, he said, were well aware that many segments of the labor movement in this country strongly oppose the "border plants" which operate under Sections 806 and 807 of the U.S. Tariff Code. There are, in short, limits to this country's ability to be responsive to Mexico's concerns. We are, however, making a major effort in this direction.

To the extent that Mexico reciprocates by making it easier for United States firms to export to Mexico free from cumbersome licensing requirements, his task will be that much easier, he added.

The Mexican delegation pointed out that Mexico is moving inexorably away from licensing and toward tariffs. Some of these duties may seem high at first, but they will be gradually reduced as the domestic industries adjust. The American delegates applauded this trend. One pointed out that domestic protectionist policies result inevitably in inefficient and uneconomical enterprises with the final cost being borne by the consuming public.

Finally, Ambassador Strauss referred to the precedent-setting Agreement on Trade Matters signed by the United States and Mexico on December 2, 1977. He pointed out that, in concluding this treaty, the first negotiated under the authority of the Trade Act and in the current round of the multilateral trade negotiations (MTN) both the United States and Mexico had made important concessions and received significant benefits. The effort, he said, was indicative of our determination to increase trade opportunities in a mutually satisfactory manner. Ambassador Strauss expressed regret that Mexico had not yet ratified the treaty and expressed the hope that this could be accomplished without undue delay so that both parties could begin to benefit from its provisions.

Responding to some of the points made by Ambassador Strauss, the Mexican delegation pointed out that the improvement in Mexico's balance of trade in 1977 was attributable primarily to deflationary domestic policies which has the effect of decreasing Mexican imports from the United States. An increased demand for Mexican energy resources was also a factor. The 1977 improvement in the trade picture

with the United States, while obviously welcome, is not necessarily permanent.

The American delegation also suggested that remittances from Mexican workers employed in the United States are a significant but largely unrecorded factor in the bilateral relationship.

In regard to the Trade Agreement with the United States, the Mexican delegates stressed that failure to ratify the treaty was attributable to parliamentary rather than substantive problems. The Mexican Senate had simply not had time to act on the treaty before adjournment. The Mexican delegation predicted prompt ratification once the Senate was back in session.

A principal concern expressed by the Mexican delegation throughout the session was the fact that Mexico is denied substantial GSP benefits in its trade with the United States because of the "competitive need" limitations contained in U.S. law. They pointed out that GSP treatment is withdrawn if the value of exported items exceeds $33 million or constitutes more than 50 percent of U.S. imports of a particular product.

The Mexican delegates also pressed for changes in the "value added" provisions of U.S. law. It stipulates that at least 35 percent of the cost of processing materials be done in the country of origin in order for a product to receive GSP treatment. The "value added" problem is of particular concern in regard to the *maquiladoras* or border industries.

It was pointed out that in 1977 Mexico lost GSP treatment on approximately $500 million in exports because of competitive need limitations and over $350 million in duty-free treatment due to the value added provisions.

The United States delegates, while expressing sympathy for the difficulties caused Mexico by the value added and competitive need limitations, were nevertheless unable to hold out the prospect of legislative relief in this area. They noted that the manner in which the provisions were currently written and implemented already gave rise to strong domestic opposition in this country. The American delegation stressed, however, that there was a great deal more Mexico could do to take fuller advantage of existing GSP opportunities, and noted the dramatic increase in utilization of these provisions in 1977.

Multilateral and Bilateral Trade Negotiations

After Ambassador Strauss' departure, the discussion focused on certain specific trade issues such as beef, steel, and ceramic tile.

A U.S. delegate described the purpose and provisions of the recently introduced countercyclical beef import bill emphasizing that it did not include the importation of live cattle, an issue of primary importance to Mexican beef exporters. He stressed that the United States has the world's most accessible beef market and is willing to continue to share that market. The intent of the legislation is not to restrict beef imports but to stabilize them and make them more responsive to domestic requirements.

The Mexican delegation expressed appreciation for this explanation, with one delegate pointing out unilateral actions by the United States can quickly disrupt international commodity markets. Whether the

issue be beef, cotton, or any other commodity, it is, he claimed, important to avoid drastic disruptions in the market and maintain prices at a tolerable level.

Other actions that might tend to restrict bilateral trade are certain decisions handed down by the International Trade Commission. The Mexican delegates expressed relief at the recent ITC finding that slab zinc imports from Mexico were not considered to injure the domestic industry. One delegate pointed out, however, that the mere fact that the ITC holds a hearing on a commodity item, such as zinc, tends to have a disruptive effect on the market. There is inevitably a period of uncertainty, with future purchases postponed until the question is resolved.

The American delegation acknowledged the validity of this point, but noted that investigations such as those conducted by the ITC must be publicized, held in open session, and thoroughly investigated. It was agreed, however, that some consideration should be given to means by which the disruptive potential of an ITC investigation could be ameliorated.

The Mexican delegation expressed the hope that refined copper products would not become liable for additional duties as a result of ITC action. The American delegation pointed out that this was not a legislative matter, but an issue pending before the Commission.

Discussing the trigger price mechanism for steel imports into the United States, several Mexican delegates pointed out that Mexico warranted special consideration since its steel was shipped by land, rather than by less expensive sea routes. The American delegation stressed that the trigger price procedure should not be considered a measure in restraint of trade since its sole purpose was to prevent unfair trade practices such as dumping. It was stressed that trigger prices are not minimum import prices, but an indicator of possible sales at less than fair value. Antidumping duties will not be imposed on Mexican steel as long as Mexican producers can demonstrate that they are marketing their product at fair market value.

Discussion of the issue of tomato imports from Mexico in many ways symbolized for the delegates both the problems and potential of trade between the two nations.

Several American delegates, particularly those from border areas, noted that Mexican producers had virtually put U.S. tomato growers out of business in many regions. Although the issue is currently most visible in regard to tomatoes, it extends to other fresh fruits and vegetables. It was suggested that a requirement for more orderly marketing of Mexican produce in this country was needed.

Mexican delegates stressed the vital importance of such exports to the United States and maintained that they had made an honest effort to respond to American interests. Concern was expressed over recent demonstrations by American farmers at entry bridges who had protested the importation of Mexican produce.

Throughout the discussion, the Mexican delegates stressed the vital importance of being able to export produce such as tomatoes to the United States. To place new restrictions on this market could have severe consequences for the Mexican economy and throw thousands of people out of work. Any such controls, it was noted, would increase the price of produce to the United States consumer.

United States representatives said they were sympathetic to the Mexican point of view. They must, however, also be concerned with domestic producers who are frequently unable to compete with the cheaper labor costs in Mexico.

Both delegations expressed the hope that unilateral measures to restrict imports could be avoided, and that the bilateral talks on the tomato problem, to be held shortly in Washington, would produce a mutually satisfactory solution to the problem by meeting the legitimate needs of both nations.

Tourism

On the question of tourism, the Mexican delegation voiced concern over the adverse impact of provisions of the 1976 Tax Reform Act which limit the number of foreign conventions for which business expenses may be deducted from taxable income. These provisions, together with limitations on the amounts that can be deducted and the imposition of cumbersome record-keeping requirements, have caused a dramatic decrease in the number of conventions being scheduled in Mexico. The Mexican delegates pointed out that the number of foreign conventions held in Mexico had dropped from over 600 in the year prior to the changes in U.S. law to only 66 in 1977. This sharp fall in the number of conventions had obviously had a negative effect on Mexico's tourism earnings.

A U.S. delegate responded that these provisions had been enacted in order to combat flagrant abuses of tax deductible overseas conventions, many of which had effectively become subsidized vacations for the wealthy. He suggested that the limit on the number of overseas conventions that could be listed as tax deductible was not as much of a problem for Mexico as the record-keeping requirements levied on the convention-goers. Another United States delegate noted that the Administration had recently introduced proposals to modify the provisions and eliminate the record-keeping requirements for conventions that for legitimate reasons could best be held in foreign countries.

Despite the abuses of the past, several American delegates expressed sympathy with the problems convention limitations had caused for Mexico and expressed a willingness to support modifications in the law that would exempt Mexico and Canada from the limitations. One noted that in the past he had voted against the Goldwater Amendment to exempt Mexico, but would support it if it were offered during the current session of Congress.

The Mexican delegates also inquired about the status of legislation designed to increase the duty-free exemption for returning tourists from the current figure of $100, which they felt was unrealistically low.

They were informed that the Customs Procedural Reform Bill, which had passed the House of Representatives, raised the exemption to $250. The Senate Finance Committee, however, had suggested a $500 limitation. It had, in other words, become apparent that the exemption would be increased at least to $250, and very possibly higher depending on the actions of the Conference Committee. The Mexican delegates expressed their satisfaction with these actions.

Both delegations took note of and praised the bilateral agreement on tourism signed by Mexico and the United States on May 4, 1978.

Agricultural Cooperation

The Economic Committee also reviewed the joint efforts undertaken to combat agricultural pests such as the Mediterranean fruit fly, screw worm fly, citrus black fly, and coffee rolla. The problem of hoof and mouth disease was also discussed at length.

It was generally agreed that Mexico and the United States had achieved notable and substantial successes in the area of agricultural cooperation. There was some question as to the status of funding for a joint Hoof and Mouth Disease Research Center located in Panama; the American delegates promised to look into the matter.

Given the vital importance of agriculture to both the United States and Mexico and the destructive potential of the pests and diseases in question, it was agreed by the participants that continued high priority should be accorded joint efforts at control. The importance of cooperation in this field is illustrated by the case of the Mediterranean fruit fly, which is spreading from Guatemala to Mexico. Left unchecked, the Medfly could infest the winter vegetable production areas of Mexico, necessitating strong quarantine measures. Since Mexico supplies some 40 percent of the winter vegetables consumed in the United States, any quarantine would lead directly to higher prices in this country. If permitted to spread to the United States, the Medfly could occasion losses as high as $280 million to United States fruit and citrus producers.

The United States, Mexico, and the Central American governments are currently engaged in a cooperative effort to produce sterile fruit flies at a facility near Tapachula, Mexico, which should eventually lead to the elimination of this pest in the area.

Fishing Agreements

As had the Political Committee, this one also expressed an intense interest in fishing questions, with the Mexican delegation stressing that this matter deserves careful review in an effort to develop a rational policy regarding the harvesting of various species.

Reference was made to the 1976 bilateral fisheries agreement between Mexico and the United States, and the more recent agreement of August, 1977, which addresses Mexican interest in fishing in the U.S. 200-mile fisheries zone.

The American delegation pointed out that under agreements in force U.S. shrimpers will no longer be permitted to fish off Mexico after 1979. Several United States delegates expressed the hope that some way might be found to permit United States shrimpers to continue fishing in Mexican waters after 1979. One United States delegate also expressed the hope that a similar accommodation could be made for U.S. tuna fishermen operating from the West Coast, and noted that the United States permits Mexico to harvest tuna in U.S. waters.

A Mexican delegate said it was also important to understand that it was not only the United States, but other countries such as Japan, that are fishing in Mexican waters. He suggested that new fishing quotas must be negotiated and respected.

Given the parallel nature of Mexican and United States' concerns with respect to fishing rights (i.e., the U.S. desire to continue at least

limited fishing in Mexican waters and the Mexican desire to fish in U.S. waters), the delegates expressed the hope that new arrangements could be negotiated that would preserve a proper level of marine life in the region and still meet the requirements of both parties.

It was agreed that potential tension over fishing questions could be minimized if both parties would act with restraint when it became necessary to seize or detain one another's fishing vessels.

Energy and Environment

On the question of Mexico's energy resources, the United States delegation emphasized the point that it is for the people and the Government of Mexico to determine how, when, and in what manner these reserves should be exploited. The United States hopes to be a customer for Mexican energy in the future. Both delegations agreed that Mexican oil and gas, despite its vast potential significance for the Mexican economy and standard of living, should not be viewed as some magical cure-all for Mexico's economic and developmental problems.

The delegations took note of the current inability of the United States and Mexico to agree on a price for Mexican natural gas, with the United States delegates suggesting that the situation might become clearer after Congress finished its consideration of the President's energy proposals.

During the discussion of nuclear issues, both delegations stressed their commitment to the concept of non-proliferation, with the Mexican delegation expressing satisfaction that President Carter had forwarded Protocol I to the Treaty of Tlatelolco to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for consideration and eventual ratification. The United States delegation paid tribute to Mexico's leading role in development of the Treaty, which has the effect of banning nuclear weapons throughout Latin America, and expressed the hope that it would be brought before the Senate without undue delay.

A discussion of nuclear cooperation for peaceful purposes between the United States and Mexico ensued. The arrangements are being negotiated through the International Atomic Energy Agency rather than through simple bilateral agreements. The Mexican representatives stressed the importance of their continued ability to obtain nuclear equipment and fuel from the United States on the basis of agreements previously entered into. They emphasized throughout the discussion that Mexico, a staunch proponent of non-proliferation and arms control, had no desire to use nuclear energy for other than peaceful purposes.

The United States delegates pointed out that, while they fully appreciated and supported nuclear cooperative arrangements between the two countries, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 recently passed by the Congress requires that all importers of United States nuclear fuel meet certain criteria before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission can authorize its export. Although the trilateral arrangements currently in force with Mexico do not meet all the relevant criteria, the American delegates expressed confidence that they could be brought into conformity with the law without disrupting cooperation in this important area.

The problem of atmospheric and water pollution on both sides of the border was a matter of concern to the two delegations.

Given the broad spectrum of pollution problems along the border—for example, air pollution in the El Paso-Juarez area, the problem of the Tijuana waterworks, and ocean pollution in the Gulf of Mexico,—the delegates noted with satisfaction the announcement made even while they were meeting that the United States Environmental Protection Agency and its Mexican counterpart had signed June 7, 1978 an agreement to consult on pollution problems all along the border. The agreement excludes border water pollution, which is under the authority of the International Boundary and Water Commission. One U.S. delegate suggested it would be useful to conclude a bilateral treaty on international pollution problems that would address issues such as the El Paso-Juarez problem. Another noted that, under terms of legislation recently enacted by the Congress, a $3 million study would be undertaken to determine the effects of photochemical oxidents in the atmosphere over Houston. The results of this study, which extends into the Gulf of Mexico, should be of interest and relevance to the Mexican authorities.

The Mexican delegation was particularly concerned about the discharge of pollutants into the Gulf of Mexico which could endanger the quality of the water in the area to the detriment of all concerned. United States delegates stressed the El Paso-Juarez problem and the issue of the Tijuana Waterworks. It was pointed out that air-borne pollutants from Juarez blow over into El Paso, and as a result El Paso has real problems complying with EPA standards. Mexican delegates noted that lead pollution from El Paso into Juarez was also a major point of concern. It was noted with satisfaction, however, that the levels of lead pollutants from El Paso had recently been significantly decreased, to the extent that they no longer constitute a health hazard.

In summary, it was agreed that a maximum long-term effort at bilateral consultation and cooperation would be required if border pollution problems were to be resolved satisfactorily. Both parties praised the effectiveness of the International Boundary and Water Commission in responding to problems of mutual concern. The recently concluded agreement to consult regularly on pollution problems was also welcomed as a constructive and necessary step.

The second working session of the Economic Committee was concluded with the appearance of the Honorable Michael Blumenthal, Secretary of the Treasury, who spoke to the group about the floating exchange rate and international monetary policies as they affect U.S.-Mexican bilateral relations. During the course of his remarks, Secretary Blumenthal responded to a number of questions from the Mexican delegates and praised the close working relationships that had been established between Mexico and the United States on international fiscal and monetary matters.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE

With Senators Joaquín Gamboa Pascoe and Lloyd M. Bentsen (D-Tex) acting as co-chairmen and Deputy Enrique Alvarez del Castillo and Representative E. (Kika) de la Garza (D-Tex) as vice chairmen, the 18th Interparliamentary Meeting reflected a new stage in Mexico-United States relations, the foundations of which were laid by Presidents José López Portillo and James Carter, who, in their February 1977 meeting at Washington, worked out a new and more realistic means to analyze problems between the two countries.

The Delegations reaffirmed that bilateral relations, the result of a shared historic experience, are based on the principle of nonintervention, recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination, and the legal equality of nations. Similarly, their countries' national histories, the character of the two peoples, and the vitality of their cultures have traditionally been a motive for reciprocal understanding and mutual respect.

In the course of the meeting a detailed discussion of the tasks jointly performed and the evolution of the study and consultation mechanisms that the two governments have established permitted the Delegations to note that, despite differences between the two countries regarding the means to solve some specific problems, the general state of their relations is excellent.

The Delegations agreed to inform the authorities responsible for the operation of the ministerial-level Mexico-United States Consultation Mechanism of the satisfaction at the 18th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Meeting regarding its accomplishments, and expressed the opinion that the experience gained indicates that this procedure for dealing with issues of mutual interest to the countries removes mistrust and increases the certainty that the closer relations thus achieved between them will promote better understanding and friendship among peoples of the region and within the international community.

Both Delegations vigorously affirmed that curbing the arms race, supporting the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and encouraging negotiations to limit or prohibit the use and transfer of strategic weapons are an immediate imperative, not only to maintain peace, but also to release funds that should be used for economic and social development.

In commenting on the substantial advance recently made in the implementation of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, shown by, among other things, President Carter's decision to submit Protocol I to the Treaty to the United States Senate for ratification, the Delegations recognized Mexico's right to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes involving solely the acceleration of its people's economic and social development.

The Delegations praised the effort that the Government of Mexico, with the cooperation of the Government of the United States, is making in the campaign against the cultivation of, and illicit traffic in, narcotic drugs. They recommended that this joint effort be continued with vigor.

With regard to cultural cooperation, the Delegations resolved to support the proposal that their Governments make the "cultural and educational development of the border region" the basic topic of the meeting which, under the Cultural Cooperation Agreement in force, will be held in Mexico this coming July.

In examining commercial issues, both Delegations agreed on the advisability of removing tariff and other restrictions that impede the free trade of products. In this regard, emphasis was placed on the importance of the Mexico-United States Trade Agreement concluded in December 1977, and the hope was expressed that the current multilateral negotiations being held under GATT auspices would bring about a substantial reduction of tariffs and reach agreement on a program to remove nontariff barriers.

The Delegations discussed the Generalized System of Preferences and expressed their interest in expanding its application by suspending unfair restrictions and administrative measures that hamper its effectiveness.

The Delegations welcomed the announcement, made in the interparliamentary meeting, that in the near future a proposal will be submitted to the United States Congress to eliminate taxes now levied on railway cars produced in Mexico.

The Mexican Delegation also hailed as a sound precedent the decision not to impose additional taxes on zinc exports; it was noted that similar treatment should be granted to refined copper products, and that, with respect to steel imports, the United States should consider Mexico's special geographic and transport situation.

Both Delegations reiterated their conviction that trade in agricultural products should be expanded and expressed their satisfaction regarding the outstanding results achieved through both countries' cooperative efforts to combat certain pests.

The two Delegations agreed that increased tourism would be a means to improve international understanding. The Mexican Delegation expressed its satisfaction regarding the measures being discussed by the United States Congress to increase the duty-free imports of United States tourists who visit Mexico and urged the American delegation to support legislation that would exempt Mexico from restrictions pertaining to foreign conventions. The United States Delegation hoped that Mexico would grant similar facilities to Mexican tourists returning from the United States.

In analyzing the question of undocumented Mexican migrant workers, the Delegations recognized that this is a phenomenon with characteristics of a social, economic, and political—and not only demographic—nature, which cannot be ignored by either of the two countries. They affirmed that this problem demands understanding from both sides; that it must be considered as a whole and that, therefore, its solution must also be dealt with as a whole. They also recognized that migrant workers must be treated with regard for their civil

and human rights. They likewise took note of the two Governments' intention to devote their utmost effort to finding a just and equitable solution to the problem.

Both Delegations listened attentively as such high officials of President Carter's administration as Attorney General Griffin Bell, Secretary of the Treasury Michael Blumenthal, Special Representative for Trade Negotiations Robert Strauss, and Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher discussed various items on the agenda.

The Delegations warmly received the remarks addressed to them by James Carter, President of the United States of America, during their special meeting with him, which contributed to the cordial climate of relations between the two nations.

The Mexican Delegation expressed its sincere appreciation to the Congress of the United States of America for its support in arranging this meeting.

Senator LLOYD BENTSEN.
Senador JOAQUÍN GAMBOA PASCOE.
Representative E. (KIKA) DE LA GARZA.
Diputado ENRIQUE ALVAREZ DEL CASTILLO.

APPENDIX I

Senator Lloyd M. Bentsen's Opening Remarks to the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference

En nombre de la Delegación de Los Estados Unidos, quiero saludarlos y también tomar un momento para decir que es un privilegio singular para mi poder expresar el honor que me da de estar nuevamente entre amigos de tan distinguida presencia.

Senador Joaqúin Gamboa Pascoe, Diputado Enrique Alvarez del Castillo, estimados amigos y colegas de ésta, la décimoctava reunión parlamentaria, los recibimos con alegría. Como siempre les ofrecemos no solamente un abrazo fuerte pero también nuestro respeto y aprecio.

Quiero que se sientan como en su propria casa durante esta reunión y que disfruten a lo maximo su visita a mi país.

Bienvenidos! Bienvenidos amigos y colegas! Que viva siempre la amistad entre México y los Estados Unidos! Que viva el respeto al derecho ajeno—el rasgo distintivo de nuestra conferencía durante los ultimos diez y ocho años!

Pero amigos, ya será muy obvio que mi empeño a la amistad de nuestras naciones es más profundo y castizo que mi habilidad con el castellano y por eso, con su permiso, les hablaré—como amigo—en inglés.

I think we might well begin our conference today with a question:

What is it that brings us together in Washington, and what do we hope to accomplish during the 18th Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference?

I want to respond to that question as honestly and as frankly as I can. For if we can agree on the motives that have brought us together, we shall set the stage for a productive and successful meeting.

We are here to discuss the inevitable problems of neighbors. If anyone doubts that they exist, I respectfully refer you to the agenda for our working sessions this afternoon and tomorrow.

We are here, as elected representatives of our people, to help establish an environment in which we can work together to solve our problems and exploit to the fullest the opportunities inherent in the unique relationship between our nations.

We are here because we understand that the United States of Mexico and the United States of America share a continent, a border, and a common destiny. We cannot deal with each other at arm's length because we do not exist at arm's length. We have no choice but to learn to live together as neighbors who know, understand, and respect one another.

We are here because we recognize that the traditional distinction between domestic and foreign policy has little relevance for our nations.

Mexico's policy on rural development; Mexico's policy on population planning; Mexico's decisions on how and when to exploit its enormous energy resources, are matters for the Government of Mexico to determine. They are your problems, your opportunities, your decisions. You shall deal with them in the manner that best suits your national interests.

But you know, and we know, that your policies on these issues have a direct and important bearing on our lives.

The same is true on this side of the border. Many of our domestic concerns are your international concerns. The policy of my Government on illegal immigration is of vast significance to the people and Government of Mexico. The extent to which you are permitted or denied access to our markets will help determine the degree to which you are able to prosper and develop as a nation.

The repercussions of our fiscal, labor, agricultural, and economic policies—policies we determine primarily for domestic reasons—are frequently felt, deeply and directly, by our neighbors.

As legislators who will help formulate these policies, it is imperative that our vision extend beyond our borders. We must be aware of you, and you of us.

As we consider the incredible complexity of our relationship, it is apparent that we cannot meet the challenges it poses or exploit the potential it offers by pursuing narrowly defined national interests. We must rely instead on our ability to establish an honest dialog between people of good will—people who appreciate the unique nature of our relationship, understand our problems, and share a determination to resolve them on the basis of equity.

In the past, interparliamentary meetings between Mexico and the United States have served as an important sounding board for discussion of emerging problems. We have been able to recognize and discuss potential problems—such as the Chamizal and Colorado river salinity, drug control and prisoner exchange—before they became major irritants to our relations.

Through these meetings we have created a community of concern about impending issues, such as bilateral trade, which has improved the legislative environment for new initiatives such as the trade agreement concluded last year.

Our 18th Interparliamentary Conference is evidence that we seek to broaden the community of interest between our two great nations. I can say with some assurance that our discussions over the next few days will not resolve the problems that trouble our relationship. That is not the purpose of our meeting. I can, however, say with equal assurance that we shall make an honest effort to understand each other's concerns and how our actions as legislators relate to these issues. To the extent that we succeed in better understanding one another as people, we shall be better equipped to deal with one another as nations.

Our meeting is important because it focuses on the present and looks to the future. Because we have come to understand that between Mexico and the United States our past cannot be prologue to our future. As we ponder the issues of today, we cannot look back for inspiration. We can, however, determine to improve on the past and look to the future.

If we were to adopt a theme for our meeting, I think we might find inspiration in the words of President López Portillo, when he addressed the people of Mexico earlier this year:

"Reconocer nuestros errores nos enoblese. Repetirlos nos degrada."

The past is replete with our errors, and it has created an historical legacy of distrust that is still an underlying factor in our relationship. Let us acknowledge that fact, but let us also determine, as we open this meeting, that we shall not permit the problems of the past to stand as an obstacle to a new tomorrow of progress, cooperation, and mutual respect between Mexico and the United States of America.

Our meeting will be a success if we can lay one more stone in the foundation of true friendship between our peoples.

Mexico is incredibly rich in monuments to the glories of its past. Anyone who has visited your country can attest to the creativity, the vitality, and the achievement that is your impressive monument to the present.

Our meeting will be a success if Mexico and the United States demonstrate that we can continue to work together; to weave a fabric of trust, mutual concern, and cooperation in an effort to build a better life for the peoples of this hemisphere that will stand as our most enduring and most compelling monument to the future.

Our meeting will be a success if our guests depart Washington with the firm understanding that the United States of America honors and respects its neighbor to the south.

Our meeting will be a success if you understand that we are prepared to join with Mexico as equal partners in the search for just solutions to problems of common concern.

Our meeting will be a success if our friends acknowledge our friendship and the spirit in which it is offered. We shall ask you, in return, for your patience and your understanding of our own problems and the constraints under which we formulate policy.

We too, must export. We too, must find productive employment for milllons of our people. We too, have problems with inflation.

We have an energy problem that is bleeding us dry. We hope, in the future, that we can look increasingly to Mexico to help us contend with that crisis. However, I cannot emphasize too strongly that we recognize Mexico will market and develop its energy resources as Mexico sees fit. Your energy is *your* treasure, *your* legacy, an important element in *your* future. The day is long past when the United States of America would be inclined or permitted to interfere in Mexico's energy policy. We are prepared to purchase your energy on mutually acceptable terms, but we levy no demands and ask no favors of our friend.

As we look to the future, we understand that our interests and objectives will not always coincide with those of Mexico. Your interests and objectives will not always coincide with ours. We acknowledge our ability to disagree and remain friends. The fact that we exist as sovereign, independent neighbors along a frontier that extends for 1,800 miles does not imply that we should agree in every instance.

It does, however, argue for clarity and frankness in our relationship. When we differ, we must understand the basis of our disagreement.

And, together, we must make an honest effort to reduce the areas of potential conflict and expand the field of common endeavor.

We are prepared to make that effort, and that is my pledge to you as we begin our conference.

As part of the effort to achieve the greatest measure of understanding on the issues between us, I have arranged for a series of distinguished guests from the administration to address us this year on subjects of primary importance. Attorney General Bell will discuss the problem of undocumented workers; Treasury Secretary Blumenthal will address our fiscal policy as it relates to Mexico; Ambassador Robert Strauss will talk of the vitally important matter of trade, and Deputy Secretary of State Warren Christopher will discuss bilateral relations between our countries.

I recognize that the appearance of cabinet level officials at our working sessions represents a departure from past practice at these meetings, but I believe that the subject matter they will address is so important to the future of our relationship that we will all benefit from the views of our colleagues in the policymaking process.

My friends, I extend a special welcome to the new members of both delegations to this year's conference. We welcome you to a series of meetings that began in 1961, in Guadalajara, at a time when my nation had a new young president, a new commitment to idealism, and a new attitude toward this hemisphere known as the Alliance for Progress. Our meetings began in an atmosphere of hope and progress. They have been sustained by a record of substantial achievement, enhanced friendship, and improved understanding.

In the very first speech delivered at Guadalajara 18 years ago, Senator Guillermo Ramirez Valdes, citing President López Mateos, said:

"Mutual understanding, goodwill, mutual respect, the common decision to work together in the highest interests of human destiny for all noble causes and just aspirations, are the basic premises upon which the structure of friendship between men and countries is built and rests."

That has been the constant theme of our meetings for almost two decades. I can think of no statement that better expresses what we have stood for and worked for. I can think of no more fitting point of departure for our meetings this week.

It is my pleasure and my honor to welcome the members of the Mexican delegation to what is surely one of the most beautiful and very possibly the most exciting city in our nation. You are our guests at a time when the land is green with the fresh rains of spring. We welcome you with a spirit and a transparent friendship that is as warm and as noble as the city that surrounds us. We are honored by your presence among us, and we look forward to working with you this week to strengthen the bonds of friendship between our two countries.

Muchas gracías, amigos, y bienvenidos a Washington.

APPENDIX II

Representative E. (Kika) de la Garza's Concluding Remarks to the Eighteenth U.S.-Mexico Interparliamentary Conference

As I said in English,[1] briefly, with the greatest respect to the interpreters, I wish to deliver my speech in Spanish, breaking all protocol, so as not to lose the feeling of what I want to express today.

First of all, we are grateful for your presence, and the leadership of your group by Senator Gamboa and Diputado Enrique Alvarez Del Castillo. We would like to thank you for the hard work you've done in the working meetings. We are very grateful for your continuing interest in making these meetings increasingly valuable in the attempts to bring the United States and Mexico into a closer and more productive working relationship. If we follow the reference of the first meeting, our relations could become increasingly solid from year to year through these parliamentary exchanges.

I don't think I need to relate once again what has been reported by Diputado Castillo; instead I will do the easiest thing which is to endorse and adopt the report which Diputado Castillo gave. With unanimous consent by both delegations, we adopt his report.

The only task now remaining is the closing of the formal meeting. And how might this be done? I thought perhaps the most sincere and expeditious action I could take from the depth of my heart would be the following.

First of all, I'd like to tell you a bit about our flag; our national standard. This flag represents the heart and soul of our country. The cloth is not the finest; it is only cotton. Its meaning is what counts. A lady in Philadelphia named Betsy Ross was the one who first had the inspiration for the original idea of the Stars and Stripes. Flying over a battle ship, this flag inspired Frances Scott Key to write our national anthem.

This flag flies throughout the world: on embassy buildings; everywhere where the presence of the President of the United States is required; on all warships and on all military bases. There is a custom that the casket of a soldier who dies on the battle field is covered with a flag when his remains are delivered to his family, or to his home town, or when he is buried overseas. Also the flag covers coffins of civilian political heros. The flag covered the coffin of Lincoln in his sepulcher which lay in state under the Capitol dome. It covered both Kennedy brothers, Jack and Bob. It covered Lyndon B. Johnson and Senator Hubert Humphrey, and maybe someday de la Garza, too.

---

[1] Mr. de la Garza's remarks were delivered in Spanish, and lose some of their original flavor in this rather free translation.

This flag has gone to your country in one of the very sad incidents in our history, leading an infantry platoon on a battle mission. This flag was flown off the coast of Vera Cruz from one of our battleships. Yet a few years later it was in Tampico on an aircraft carrier saving the lives of Mexicans after very serious tidal waves. It was in Tamalipas to save Mexicans, very humble and poor Mexicans, who were caught in the floods of 1967.

I'm telling you all this because I want you to go back to your Congressional building with this flag which is the heart and soul of our people. Please take it home with you, not as in past years, but with the affection and the admiration and the respect which our people, individually, and we in our Congress, in particular have, for you, the Mexican people.

I know that from time to time there might be a need for this flag for ceremonial purposes in your Congress. So this morning I took this flag and I asked the Capitol Architect to fly it on top of the Capitol. It has now been flown over the Capitol dome of the United States, at the same moment that we were on our way to lunch, passing through that very place. The Architect has given me a certificate attesting to the fact that on June 7, 1978, this flag flew over the U.S. Capitol and it was to be presented to the Mexican delegation on behalf of our delegation.

Thus Senator Gamboa and Diputado Castillo, on behalf of my colleagues, it is an honor to give the two of you the heart and soul of our people. Please take it back to your people for us and tell your people and your Congress that the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives did everything we could to go along with your ideas and recommendations in our meetings.

But above and beyond this, the inspiration in these meetings was such that we are asking you to go home and say that the U.S. Congress sent this flag, a humble present, which is really our heart and soul, and a gift of peace and good will.

○