

# Wilson Urges Commons to Await All Facts on Incident at Songmy

By JOHN M. LEE

9 DEC 69

Special to The New York Times

LONDON, Dec. 8 — Prime Minister Wilson, opening a two-day debate on foreign policy, asked an aroused House of Commons today to withhold judgment on the United States, on the reported massacre at Songmy, South Vietnam, and on other such incidents until the facts are known.

If the events took place, Mr. Wilson said, it would be Britain's duty to condemn them, and she would be doing so "in common with the American Government and American people."

"If the latest alleged atrocities were to be condoned or brushed aside, and it is in my mind unthinkable," he said, "it will lead to a crisis in Anglo-American relations."

The Prime Minister spoke

with deep concern to a commons deeply divided and distressed over the issues of Vietnam and Nigeria. He said there were no clear moral imperatives in either case.

Observers remarked on Mr. Wilson's skill in keeping one eye on his trip to Washington next month while expressing the horror of the British people at the reported incidents. In the end he simply reaffirmed existing policies on both Vietnam and Nigeria.

The left wing of the Labor party in particular has been distressed by reports of atrocities and has put pressure on the Government to dissociate itself from American policies in Vietnam. However, the left ap-

Continued on Page 4, Column 3

Vietnam. However, the left appeared partly mollified by other foreign developments.

Mr. Wilson, in his speech, said the Government would be ready to consider offering

relief to the besieged enclave of Biafra. However, he rejected any suggestion that Britain, which has been aiding Nigeria, lead an arms embargo against her. He also held out no hope of placing the issue of the two-and-a-half-year-old civil war on the United Nations General Assembly's agenda.

The Prime Minister also reiterated that Britain would vote to suspend Greece from the Council of Europe this week unless the military government in Athens voluntarily withdrew or underwent a sudden change of heart and established a short, specific timetable for "the restoration of human rights and democracy."

The day's debate was devoted primarily to obligations regarding United States activities in Vietnam and emotions ran high.

George Brown, former Foreign Secretary under Mr. Wilson, drew cheers from Conservatives and angry shouts from Labor back-benchers for his defense of American actions.

## Brown Explains Stand

He commented that the reason he said "stop weeping" in a previous speech was that "the more the Americans appear to be showing uncertainty, the more they seem to be baring their chests and going into the confessional, the more will Hanoi be encouraged to be obdurate."

One of Labor's left wing, Stanley Orme, attributed courage to those Americans who protested the United States' involvement in the war. Yet, he added bitterly, "all we get from our Foreign Secretary is the meek acceptance of every American statement."

The sense of the Commons seemed more accurately reflected by the former Transport Minister, Richard Marsh, who said, "I believe that the war in Vietnam is reaching a stage where it is destroying the very principles and values in which we all believe."

"The only realistic solution," he continued, "is for the United States to negotiate a new coalition in Saigon simultaneously with a planned withdrawal."

## REMEMBER THE NEEDIEST!

### 'Await the Outcome'

Conservative members were less critical of Washington.

Richard Wood, the first Opposition speaker, said, "it would be wise and just to await the outcome of the present investigations by the Americans."

Prime Minister Wilson recalled that his first reaction to the reports on Songmy was to say that "if they were one-quarter true, they would be grave atrocities." He then approvingly quoted a newspaper comment: "Even if they are substantiated to the extent of 1 per cent, they would leave forever a blot on American military honor."

Mr. Wilson said the Commons would reject any suggestion that massacres, if they had occurred, were part of any higher direction of the war.

"But if, at any lower level," he went on, "systematic murder is established to be part of a policy, combined with concealment from the President, and if this were to be established as necessary to the war, I would agree with the editorials in the British press that the Americans deserve to be told they have lost the war."