

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTY-FOURTH MEETING OF THE JOINT REPUBLICAN
CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS CALLED FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1964, AT
9:00 A.M. IN THE CAPITOL OFFICE (S-230) OF THE SENATE MINORITY
LEADER, THE HONORABLE EVERETT MC KINLEY DIRKSEN

Present:

Senators Dirksen, Kuchel, Morton, Hickenlooper
Congressmen Halleck, Brown, Byrnes

Absent:

The Presiding Officer, William E. Miller
Senator Saltonstall
Congressmen Arends, Ford, Wilson

Also Present: Robert Humphreys, Harry Brookshire, Robert Allett,
Mark Trice

Senator Dirksen called the meeting to order at 9:12 A.M. and stated
that the agenda for the meeting was as follows:

Viet Nam in an Election Year

Soviet Consular Treaties

Legislative Matters

VIET NAM IN AN ELECTION YEAR

Senator Dirksen asked Congressman Halleck to read the prepared
statement on this subject, which he did. The statement was approved as
read and a copy is attached.

SOVIET CONSULAR TREATIES

Senator Dirksen then read his prepared statement on this subject
and the statement was approved as read. A copy is attached.

LEGISLATIVE MATTERS

It was stated that the House was taking up the Debt Ceiling, Excise
Taxes and the Pay Raise legislation and that the House had scheduled its
next hearing on Social Security for June 22. It was thought that late in
the session legislation would be reported for a 5% increase across the

board and include amendments to the Kerr-Mills Act.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:58 A.M.

J. Mark Price.
Acting Secretary

[June 11, 1964]

Establishment of U.S.-Soviet consulates is not new. Consulates existed in Vladivostok, New York and San Francisco and were opened under the FDK-Litvinov 13 agreement without the benefit of formal convention. Set up on the basis of an exchange of letters, the old consulates were closed on Soviet initiative in 1948. The State Department wanted a formal agreement this time.

Consulates offer assistance and protection to citizens abroad, promote trade perform notary services, process birth and marriage certificates, certify wills, expedite travel documents, provide translation services, advise on local laws and can represent citizens and business in dealings with the host government.

The U.S. wanted a provision in the consular convention requiring notification of American authorities within three days of the apprehension of American nationals accused of violating Soviet laws, and access to the prisoner within four days. In years past the Soviets have held Americans totally incommunicado as long as nine months and only last November Professor Frederick C. Baghorn of Yale was held incommunicado for 13 days. In exchange the Soviets insisted on diplomatic immunity for consular officers and staff nationals.

The New York Times reported "The Justice Department was wary of extending blanket immunity, not only because it feared difficulties in policing the Soviet officials, but also because dozens of other nations could now legitimately demand the same arrangement under most-favored-nation agreements." Nevertheless, the Times added "The consular convention is expected to become the model for similar agreements with other Communist countries."

The consular convention, Article XIX, Section 2 reads: "Consular officers and employees of the consular establishment who are nationals of the sending state shall enjoy immunity from the criminal jurisdiction of the receiving state."

J. Edgar Hoover, testifying in January with apparent dismay at the increase in Soviet bloc official representation in this country, said that "as of Jan. 1, 1964 there were 724 Soviet bloc personnel in this country...accompanied by 1,099 dependents some of whom have intelligence assignments." This total of 1,843 is up 36 percent from 1960 (1,358) and promises to increase still more if the Soviet consulates and projected Romanian embassy are established.

New York Times, May 24, 1964, Arthur Krock column:

"He (Johnson) is acutely aware of disaster factors in the involvement of the United States in Southeast Asia that a strong Republican campaigner could successfully attribute to Administration policy, and could require him to make the fateful decision he hopes to postpone until the election is over."

New York Times, May 24, 1964, Hedrick Smith story out of Washington:

"But so far at least, President Johnson, who may be facing his own 'Cuban crisis,' has not made the hard decisions. The Administration is moving with the usual caution of an election year though many here doubt that the critical choices in Southeast Asia can be put off until November."

Washington Post, June 1, 1964, John Maffre story out of Saigon:

"Vietnamese sources forecast increased field activity in Viet Nam and Laos, but say it will stop short of a direct challenge that might force the U.S. to take some face-saving action it would prefer to avoid during an election year.

"This feeling was summed up in a recent front-page editorial in the Saigon Post. It noted that the Communist Viet Cong rebels are not hampered by any election campaign and concluded that 'what is worse, they damned well know we have our hands tied until November!'"

Washington Star, May 15, 1964, Richard Fryklund interpretive report:

"The McNamara 'audit' of the war in Viet Nam showed that a decision on expansion of the war to the north probably need not be made until the end of this year, Government officials said today...

"Some American military leaders believe that the signs of success or failure could come in a few months. Gen. Khanh is said to look to late fall for the turning point. American officials, however, believe a decision probably need not be made until December or later."

New York Times, June 2, 1964, Max Frankel story out of Honolulu:

"The (high Administration) officials hope now to stretch over a longer period of time a program of less dramatic political and military moves designed to combat doubts about Washington's commitment to the region -- and especially to South Vietnam."

Washington Post, June 3, 1964, Robert Ibrahim (UPI) story out of Honolulu:

"A top-level conference of U.S. policy makers reached a conclusion today with a spokesman reporting they will recommend no basic change in the U.S. military role in South Viet Nam."