

I wish to study what you have said today before responding fully tomorrow.

~~You have mentioned to us the importance of a new ICBM on both sides. Your statement also indicates the importance you attach to the issue of the Backfire bomber.~~

I would note that positions of the sides appear still to be far apart but express the hope that later meetings this week will bring us closer together.

Before ending my remarks today, I want to respond to the charge that it is the U.S. which is delaying the completion of the agreement. What you refer to as new issues are primarily differences

What we have proposed
 are clarifications on ^{these} issues
 with a view to prevent misunderstandings
 in the ~~future~~ future

interpretations of earlier
 discussions.

[We have proposed recently
 a ban on the sales of
 depreciated transport ICBM's but
 it is our feeling this is
 a simple proposal but equally
 in the interest of both sides

We feel that the Soviet
 Union has frequently raised
 new issues which have
 slowed up the completion of
 the agreement. eg. today you
 have for the first time raised
 the ~~same~~ ~~same~~ proposal of limiting
 heavy vehicles on light ICBM's
 to be]