MR. ANDERSON: I have two or three announcements for you.

There will be a signing ceremony today following the luncheon with the First Secretary scheduled for 2:30, at which there will be six U.S.-Polish agreements that will be signed. No statements are planned. And, of course, there won't be any questions and answers, and it will be basically a photographic opportunity, although the written press is welcome.

Following the ceremony here in the briefing room, there will be a backgrounder, at which time experts will be available to answer any questions you may have regarding the agreements.

Q Bob, where is the ceremony?

A I'm sorry, it's in the Benjamin Franklin Room on the 8th floor. Excuse me, I should have mentioned that.

And the text will be made available to you at the time of the signing.
First Secretary Gierek will attend the ceremony. The Secretary will be present and will sign two of the six agreements — one on science and technology, joint projects funding; and a tax convention. And I have the details on the others and the names of the experts who will be here to brief you available for you.

Q  Bob, what are the agreements beyond those two that you mentioned?

A  There is one on agriculture, which will be signed by Dr. Clayton Yeutter, Assistant Secretary; an agreement on coal research, which will be signed by Kent Frizzell.

Q  What kind of research, Bob?

A  Coal. (Laughter) Solicitor from the Department of The Interior. And then Russell Train, the EPA Administrator, will sign an agreement on environmental protection. And the last one will be the Secretary of HEW, Mr. Weinberger, who will sign a health agreement.

Q  I guess I missed one. But orignally you said science and —

A  Science and technology, joint projects funding. That's one of the agreements the Secretary will sign. And the other one is a tax convention that he will sign.
Q  Uh huh. I suppose these were all worked out in advance of the visit, weren't they?

A  I do not know whether they were all completely worked out in advance of the visit or not, to be honest with you.

At 2:30 -- at two o'clock, as you all know, Donald Easum, our Assistant Secretary for Africa, is testifying before the Subcommittee on Africa of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. His statement is available in the Press Office now for you.

I wanted to mention that the Secretary hopes to meet later in the day -- I do not have the time yet, but will get it to you when it is finally confirmed -- with Senators Jackson, Javits and Ribicoff up on Capitol Hill. And following that meeting the Secretary will see Senator Javits and Senator Pell with regard to their trip to Cuba -- also on Capitol Hill.

Q  Bob, didn't he see them last night?

A  No, he did not.

Q  Did he see Senator Jackson last night?

A  No. Senator Jackson had an engagement, I think, at six o'clock, and the meeting that the Secretary had with the President over in the White House was delayed,
so it was agreed they try and meet today.

Q When you say Capitol Hill, it's, I suppose, in one office or the other, isn't it?

A I have not got the details on that yet. But you might want to check up there.

Q Can you say whether the purpose of that meeting is just for their briefing of him or whether he has got something he has got to take up with them regarding legislation on Cuba?

A You're talking about the Javits-Pell meeting?

Q Yes.

A I wanted to say one thing here because there have been a number of reports in the press in the last week or so that the State Department opposed the visit of the two Senators down to Cuba, and I just wanted to say for the record that the State Department did not oppose the visit.

The Secretary knew about the visit in advance, and he had their passports validated. And he looks forward very much to meeting with the two Senators tonight to hear their report on their visit to Cuba.

Q What time is the meeting, Bob?
A I cannot give you the exact time. It will be after the meeting with Senators Jackson, Javits, and Ribicoff, at the end of the day.

Q Do you have the time of that meeting?
A No. As I said in the beginning, I haven't got the exact time. The end of the afternoon.

Q Is the sole purpose of the meeting for him to hear their report on their visit, or does he have something to take up with them?
A No, the purpose of the meeting with them is to hear their report of the trip down there.

Q Bob, I think the reports I had read were not so much that he opposed the visit but that he had serious reservations. You now have said that the Secretary opposed their visit. Let me ask you, did he welcome their visit to Cuba?
A I'll just say that he did not oppose their visit to Cuba.

Q Did he have reservations about it?
A No, he didn't have any reservations.
Q He had no reservation?
A No reservations.
Q  Bob, is it not accurate that the Senators wanted to go down earlier however and that the Secretary asked them not to go at the time that they had originally planned to go?

A  I do not know. I honestly don't. I just don't know at what point they may have talked in the last few months.

Q  Bob, why didn't you make this denial before their visit? That's when most of the stories were being printed. You didn't come forth then and say the Secretary did not oppose or didn't have any reservations about the visit.

A  To my knowledge, I don't believe I was ever asked.

Q  You weren't asked now either, Bob.

Q  We didn't ask you today either.

A  Well, to be very honest with you, one of the Senators telephoned and said that he had read all these reports that the State Department opposed the visit, so I wanted to just put something on the record setting us straight.

Q  Which Senator was that?
Q But the Senators also said that they had applied several times previously and had received no permission.

A To my knowledge, there was never any question of them not being allowed to go to Cuba, the question of their passports being validated. They can be validated, in accordance with the law, at any time they want.

Q Bob, just so we can get the record straight on this, the story, as I understand it, was that the Senators had applied for validation of their passports, that Secretary Kissinger had told them that if they insisted he would, of course, agree to have their passports validated, but that he asked them not to go at the particular time that they requested. Now, if you don't know the answer to that would you please check on it?

A I'll try and check on it, because I don't know the answer.

Q Bob, the reason I am interested in this and bring this up is because I distinctly remember his letter to Pat Holt when Pat Holt asked to go to Cuba. And the letter had very strong reservations about Pat Holt going
to Cuba. Now, I didn't read any correspondence on Javits and Pell, but it would take a remarkable shift of position for him to welcome Javits and Pell going to Cuba so soon after he told Mr. Holt that he thought it was a terrible idea.

A I don't know of any correspondence between the two Senators and the Secretary. To my knowledge, there was none.

Q Which Senator called, Bob, asking that the record be set straight?

A I would rather just leave the private conversation between the Department and Senator --

Q Bob, you just made public the conversation by disclosing the contents of it. I don't think it's unfair for us to ask then who was the one who protested the news story.

A I'm not going to go into which Senator it was. If you want to check you can.

Q Bob, did the Secretary call Senator Kennedy quite recently and ask him to withdraw his amendment to the Foreign Assistance Bill?

A I don't know.

Q Could you check on that, Bob?
A I will do what I can, yes.

Q Bob, there is an item on FBIS this morning quoting Mavros to the effect that the Secretary will be going to Ankara. Is that going to be on the tail end of the upcoming trip, or is that going to be at the end of the extended trip at the end of this month?

A Well, on that let me say this. There was a plan for the Secretary to pay a visit to Ankara. And this plan is now postponed for two reasons: Number 1, one is in the process of forming a government in Turkey. And the second reason is that the ambiguity of the situation here is such that it makes it rather difficult to determine in what framework any useful talks could be carried on.

Q What situation here?

A The situation with regard to Turkish aid. And on that, if any of you haven't already gotten it, I refer you to a statement issued by the President today at the White House.

Q When was he supposed to go to Turkey?

A There was no specific timing set on that. But it is postponed.
Q Was the original plan for him to go during the Middle East trip or during the following trip?
A There was nothing tied down on it, because the question of the formation of a government in Turkey has now been going on for -- what? -- a week or ten days.

Q When was the plan postponed, or when was the trip postponed? When was that decision made?
A Well, first of all, I said it was never tied down specifically, but because of the two developments that I just mentioned it was deemed wise and more useful to postpone it for some point in the future.

Q I understand that. But when was that decision made? It had to be conveyed to the Ankara Government at one point or another. This isn't the first announcement of it, making them aware of it through us?
A I can't tell you exactly what day it was.
Q Recently?
A Yes, recently.
Q A couple of days? Two or three days?
A I don't know the exact time it was done.
Q It was tied down recently, or upset recently?
A No, the question of not going was determined recently, but I have not got a specific day or date on when it was decided.
Q  Bob, this is puzzling; but the formation of a new government in Ankara, you've just said, has been going on for a week to ten days.

A  Yes.

Q  A week ago, from this podium, a spokesman for the State Department told us there is no plan for him to go to Turkey -- in fact, there is no consideration being given to him to go to Turkey.

A  Yes.

Q  There is only one conclusion: that he was considering -- even planning -- a trip to Turkey, when were were being told otherwise. Can you tell us why we were misled?

A  I do not consider that you were misled at all here, frankly. What I said, to those of you who were in New York, and what I said here -- because everyone was asking me -- "Is he going to go? Is the Secretary going to go to Ankara or Athens or Cyprus on this trip?" -- et cetera -- and I said, "There are no plans for that." And I told you again today that no definite date was ever set. The idea was being discussed during all these
conversations that you all have been told about in New York with the Greeks and the Turks up there, but nothing was ever set. So I do not consider that I misled you in any way whatsoever.

Q No; I didn't say you did, but I guess we all should be used to this by now -- but the questions last week were put in terms of "Is he considering?"

A No.

Q Not a plan only. The State Department was asked if the Secretary of State is considering. Not even considering a trip to Ankara, Athens or Cyprus -- or considering seeing any of those leaders someplace --

A Well --

Q -- and we were told at this time he is not considering such a visit.

A Well, frankly, on this, maybe we're getting into a question of semantics.

Q Well, it's a question of honesty.

A He hasn't any plans to go; and I've tried to explain to you, as forthrightly as I can, he had no plans to go. I was not going to go into, at the time that informal discussions were taking place with the Foreign
Ministers of Turkey and Greece -- as you know in New York, the Secretary was not going to go into the contents of those discussions. But what I said was absolutely accurate at the time as far as having any plans to go.

Q There's another aspect of this that confuses me a little, Bob. You cite as the two reasons for these tentative plans having been cancelled: (a), the ambiguity of the situation; and, (b), the fact that new elections are being held in Turkey.

Now, both those factors have been present for at least the past week or ten days, so I really don't understand why anything has been changed.

A Well, on that -- and I don't want to get into the different resolutions that have been presented up on the Hill; you have the record of that -- but you can refer to the Presidential statements on this subject. But at one point the President announced that a resolution that was proposed by, I believe, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee -- that it was felt that we could work with that resolution.

Now, since that resolution has been proposed, certain developments have now taken place up on the Hill, which you know about as well as I do.
Q Well, the Hill -- the Senate hasn't acted yet. If the ban is removed, will the Secretary then reconsider going to Turkey? Is that the message we're supposed to deliver?

A I do not know. Let us wait until the Senate vote is over, and then the Secretary will consider that.

Q Well, on that same point --

Q I don't understand the second point, because the President has already said he would veto passage of the amendments he doesn't like. So, therefore, either one of two things would happen: Either Turkey would continue to get military aid because of what the Senate votes, or it will continue to get aid because of the Presidential veto -- assuming it's not overridden.

A Well, on this, Bernie, I don't want to take it any further than we are right now. The Senate has not acted. The President issued a statement this morning and I think you should read what he said on it.

Q Bob, why did you make this announcement today? Why did you disclose to us that there -- quote -- was a "plan" for the Secretary to visit Ankara? I don't care what you --
you know, the distinct impression that we all had in New York from you and the Secretary was that there was no possibility of his making a visit to Ankara, Athens or Cyprus in the near future at all. Why do you tell us there there was a plan now? Is this another strong arm on the Senate to frighten them into going along?

A Ken, I think I've said enough on this subject. Anything I say will just be repeating what I've already said. I just have nothing to add.

Q Bob, at the time there was a plan for the Secretary to visit Ankara, was there also a plan for him to visit Athens and/or Cyprus; and are those also postponed?

A Any visit to Athens would not have occurred until after a visit to Ankara, and there was nothing definite planned on that -- nor to Cyprus, as far as I know.

Q Bob, I conclude from what you say that one of the reasons that the Secretary is not going to Ankara is because whatever ideas he might have had to visit
Athens was not acceptable to the Athens Government. Is this right?

A No. I don't think it is right, no.

You had something else?

Q Yes. You said that any visit to Athens would not have occurred until after a visit to Ankara and that there were no definite plans for a visit to Athens or Cyprus -- which puts us back in the same position that we were in vis-a-vis Ankara. Was there discussion about going to Athens and Cyprus as well?

A To my knowledge, there was no discussion about going to Cyprus; and I know of no discussion of any definite plan to go to Athens.

Q There was some discussion?

A Yes, there was some discussion --

Q Bob, what is the State Department --

A -- but no definite plans though.

Yes?

Q What is the State Department attempting to say here -- that as long as there is any restriction of language in Congressional resolutions that the Secretary of State can not conduct any negotiations on the Cyprus
issue? Is that what you mean by the "ambiguous situation"?

A Well, let me put it this way: The situation is ambiguous for the reasons that I stated. And I think that one has to reassess the situation to see what useful role we could possibly play in trying to help bring about a peaceful solution to the Cyprus problem, insofar as the parties to the problem wish us to be helpful.

Q Well, Bob, let me try to dot a couple of "i"s here. In the event that the ambiguity on the Hill were resolved, would the fact that the Turks are holding elections there -- would that restrain the Secretary from going -- or is it really the ambiguity that we're on?

A No. I gave you two reasons. Both of those are the reasons for postponing any plan to go. And and as to when the Secretary might go will depend upon changes in the two points that I made earlier.

Q But that's what confuses me, because the fact that elections were going to be held has been known for a long time.

Q No -- no elections.

A There are no elections at all. You're in the
wrong country.

Q  Yes.
A  There will be elections over in Greece, but this is a question of the formation of a government -- as I said -- and one will have to wait for that to occur.

Q  On another subject --
A  Yes, sir.
Q  -- does the State Department have anything to say in explanation of the United States position on the entry of naval vessels in the Japanese water with nuclear weapons aboard -- which reports have occasioned a large furor in Japan?

A  Well, you all are aware that it is this Government's policy -- our Government's policy -- of very long standing, not to confirm or deny reports concerning the presence or absence of nuclear weapons -- whether it's at sea, in this country, or anywhere else; and we're not going to deviate from that policy.

Q  Does the State Department have any explanation as to why U. S. submarines and missile vessels are suddenly leaving Japanese waters? (Laughter.)
A  I was unaware of that fact.
Q The Statement then will make no attempt to discuss this issue with the Japanese Government concerning retired Admiral Laroque's testimony?

A I believe our Embassy has had conversations with the Japanese Government on this subject.

Q Thank you.

Q Wait a minute -- the whole briefing?

(Laughter.)

Q I wanted to ask you if the Senate -- I guess the Senate hasn't voted. But should this Turkish aid thing be resolved before we take off tonight, is there any chance the Secretary will consider a trip to Athens, Greece -- or Cyprus -- on this trip?

A I do not see it. No; there is no -- let me put it this way again, and I don't want to be accused of misleading you: Right now, there are no plans for any visit to Ankara. And, as I have just said, any visit to Athens would take place after visiting Ankara.

Q Yesterday, you --

A And, in addition, there is a question -- as Ted mentioned earlier -- of elections coming up in Greece. So there is that question also that one would
have to bear in mind if one wants to consider having an appropriate time to visit Athens. But as of now there is no plan at all to visit these capitals that you just mentioned.

Q But, of course, we were told the same sort of thing last week; so we do remain somewhat skeptical.

Q Bob, when you get to Algeria, is there any chance that there will be negotiated, or signed, or agreed to in any way, shape or form, a change in the relationship between the United States and Algeria?

A I don't know. I have no answer to that.

Q Are we going directly to Egypt or are we going to make a refueling stop?

A A refueling stop at Torrejon.

Q Are there any other countries being added to the list --

A No.

Q -- apart from the ones the Secretary mentioned?

A No. All I have are the ones -- the four
the four you were given, plus the three the Secretary mentioned yesterday.

Q    Can you give us any more detail on the itinerary? -- because yesterday you put out an itinerary. Then the Secretary, at his press conference, added three countries. Can you --

A    I posted something after the Secretary's press conference on the three countries.

Q    Oh. I'm sorry I missed that.

A    But I cannot give you -- this is FOR YOUR GUIDANCE only -- I cannot give you the date and time, for instance, for the visit to Saudia Arabia, because the details are still being worked out.

Q    Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 1:59 p.m., the briefing was concluded.)