

U.S. Hints

'Useful'

EXTRA

Viet Talks

PARIS — (AP) — U.S. Ambassador David Bruce started today what he said could be "a useful dialogue" with the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong at the Paris peace talks.

He told newsmen he had replied to four questions put to him by the Viet Cong's Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh last week and in turn posed five questions of his own about her new peace plan.

Different Versions

But the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegates told newsmen later that Bruce had "not given a concrete response" to the Viet Cong's seven-point peace plan and had "raised a series of diverse questions to elude and avoid a response."

Bruce in turn told newsmen that he had tried to "elicit clarification of their proposals without any response or answers to the series of questions" he put to them.

Bruce's mention of a cease-fire was a reiteration of a long-standing U.S. proposal.

President Nixon himself called for a cease-fire in his television address to the nation last October, saying: "First, I propose that all armed forces throughout In-

—Turn to Page 7, Col. 7

'Useful'

New Talks In Paris

—From Page 1
dochina cease firing their weapons and remain in positions they now hold. It would be a 'cease-fire in place.'"

Bruce also suggested a cease-fire throughout all of Indochina while discussions of the latest Communist peace proposals proceed.

He called again for a restricted, nonpublic meeting to discuss the Communist plan.

Bruce, who will soon be leaving his post for health reasons, told the Communist side:

"First, you asked whether we agree to consider your seven points as a basis for negotiations. Our answer is that we are willing . . . to consider for negotiation any proposals that have been or may be put forward here by your side, as well as our own . . .

"Second, you ask which of your seven points we agree with and which we do not, which points we consider positive and which are unacceptable to us. In order to make a full response we will need much more explanation

S.H. Examiner—Page 7
July 15, 1971 ☆☆☆☆

from you as to what your various points actually mean.'

He said the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese deal with the complex issue of troop withdrawal and prisoner release "in a highly superficial and misleading manner. You gloss over the fact that you still seem to be asking acceptance by us of the same fundamental objectives you have always sought here — the total, unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces without any previous negotiation on the subject, and our acquiescence in your demand that we impose a government on the South Vietnamese people.

"Third, you ask whether we are prepared to set immediately a date in 1971 for the total withdrawal of our forces from South Vietnam. The answer is that we have long been ready to negotiate a timetable for a complete withdrawal date as part of an over-all settlement. But the fixing of a withdrawal date must be the result of a genuine negotiation to begin, not a unilateral action we must take because you so dictate.

"Fourth, you ask about our intentions regarding the government of the Republic of Vietnam, our answer to this has always been perfectly clear