

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Secretary, I am glad that this resolution is before the Congress. I think it is a good step to take. I am glad, also, that the Chiefs of State meeting is in the offing for Latin America, but I am wondering why, in view of all the difficulty we have had in NATO, we haven't had a NATO Chiefs of State meeting since 1958.

It would seem to me that Western Europe is a matter of even greater concern to our national security as well as our well being in other respects, and yet I haven't heard a word about the possibilities of a Chiefs of State meeting of NATO.

Can you give us any indication as to when such might occur?

Secretary RUSK. Well, this has been considered from time to time over the past 6 years, but for a variety of reasons, usually different reasons at any particular time, it has not seemed appropriate to have such a meeting.

There has been some discussion recently of a Chiefs of State meeting of the signatories of the treaty at Rome, and whether or not that will materialize, I don't know. This is not an idea we reject in principle. I think the question would be the suitable occasion, and the subjects to be taken up, and whether or not there would be a constructive result.

Mr. FINDLEY. In 1969 it will be the 20-year milestone for the NATO Treaty, and countries might take the option a year ahead of that to withdraw, so it would seem that this year and next year will be crucial years for NATO, and I can't see why a Chiefs of State meeting is not contemplated.

Secretary RUSK. It is an interesting suggestion, sir; and I assure you will give that some thought. We have on other occasions in the past considered the possibility.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Just one more question.

Can you tell us what the minimum obligation on the part of other countries will be in exchange for our commitment of \$1.5 billion? In other words, what is the minimum reciprocity we will insist upon as a condition for our full participation?

Secretary RUSK. I think, Mr. Findley, it would be useful for me to submit a statement for the record on that, because it is a question in which many will be interested, and it varies somewhat in different aspects.

For example, we can spell out, I think, the kinds of steps that they have in mind taking on the integration and the approximate point at which these steps would amount to a reason for use to come in with such assistance as we can provide.

(The following was subsequently submitted:)

MINIMUM OBLIGATION OF OTHER COUNTRIES IN EXCHANGE FOR OUR COMMITMENT OF \$1.5 BILLION

Our commitment of \$1.5 billion will be governed in its application by the overriding principles of self-help and demonstrated need. Specifically, it is anticipated that the approximately one-quarter to one-half billion dollars over a 3- to 5-year-period proposed as the U.S. contribution for integration adjustment assistance will be matched by a Latin American contribution of approximately the same size.

The proposed increased contribution of approximately \$150 million over a 3-year period proposed for the Inter-American Development Bank's Fund for