

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): No, I do not think so, Mr. Harkness. The first step is that there would be a disengagement, first of all, of both parties. That would mean stopping the bombing and stopping the infiltration. It would also mean, in the second instance, a freezing of all military events in Vietnam at the present level. In other words, it would be that the principal of parity is recognized in these provisions which are, as I say, taken from the Geneva Agreement itself.

Mr. HARKNESS: I think perhaps there is a difference of opinion on this matter; I will leave it for the moment.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): I could say, if I may, that I know these propositions would not be contrary to the position that the United States government have taken through Mr. Goldberg on September 22, 1966, mainly that the bombing would be stopped if there were some reciprocal military action taken on the other side.

Mr. HARKNESS: I would like to ask a question now with regard to the statement on page 15 which was referred to by Mr. McIntosh and which, I note, is the same statement which appears in your preface to the report for 1965; that is:

We have said consistently that we regard a purely military solution of the conflict in Vietnam is neither practicable nor desirable.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Yes.

Mr. HARKNESS: We will leave out the "desirable" at the moment, but as far as the practicability of this is concerned, what do you mean?

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): In the first place, this is not inconsistent with the public positions taken by the government of the United States. The President, in April of 1965, said that the effort of the United States was a limited one. Although there have been escalations, he has said that this continues to be a limited effort; it is not an all-out effort on the part of the United States. The President reiterated that only about a month ago. It is further supported by the statements made repeatedly by the President and by Mr. Rusk that the government of the United States is prepared to enter into peace talks whether or not there is a cessation of hostilities.

A purely military solution, involving an over-all victory, an over-running of this situation, could have exacerbating consequences of the most serious kind.

Mr. HARKNESS: Now you are getting on to the desirability.

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): Anything that would involve going beyond the 17th parallel could have the most serious consequences, and this has been stated and recognized by the United States.

Mr. HARKNESS: As I say, you are getting into the desirability of it; perhaps you will remember that I was limiting my question to the practicability. I think there is no question that what are generally referred to as the hawks in the United States at least, think it is a very practicable solution—

Mr. MARTIN (*Essex East*): I see what you mean.

Mr. HARKNESS: —and, as a matter of fact, the statement recently made by General Taylor, and various other statements made by Ambassador Lodge, by Mr. McNamara, and by Mr. Rusk, at one time or another, and by various other