frontion, it cannot be expected, for the time being, that the neutralization of Southeast Asia will be guaranteed by the US. China has recently announced that they will uphold or respect the same idea. Also, the US, which maintains military bases in two ASEAN countries, may suddenly enter a period of confrontation, and is withdrawing from Vietnam militarily. We think it may become possible for Southeast Asia to be neutralized by the big countries some time in the future.

Isn't it most important for Southeast Asia, which must adapt to the 'new cold war' to establish diplomatic or relations or improve the existing relations with China, first of all? We can understand that the Southeast Asian countries have a sense of urgency as we are not the only ones. The tension of resident Chinese merchants in their territories, are anxious about the complicated problems to be brought about by the normalization of relations with China. Under such a new situation created by the termination of the Vietnam War, however, it is necessary for these countries to overcome these problems. For this reason, we think Malaysia's establishment of diplomatic relations with China ahead of other ASEAN nations, which is scheduled to take place in the near future, has significant meaning. We hope that relations between Malaysia and China will develop further, because it is said that the adjustment of views on the China problem has been the major import of a series of regional summit conferences which have been held frequently among Southeast Asian countries since this summer.

Furthermore, Burma began to move for participation in regional co-operation, after the conclusion of the Paris Agreement. Burma, which is the non-ASEAN state in the region, visiting Indonesia, that "The nations in this area should confer together to discuss how to attain our common purpose," It can be said that the movement to establish ASEAN is significant because it means that Burma will put an end to the policy of seclusion it has maintained for ten years, and will take part in ASEAN or in the conferences which have been held frequently among Southeast Asian countries which ASEAN is planning to hold under its leadership.

Expectations on Japan mixed with suspicion

It is natural that the Southeast Asian countries must maintain their relative stability by "taking advantage" of the cold war in their respective ways, are starting efforts to meet the new situation, at this time when new relations between the US and the Soviet Union and between the US and China are becoming clear.

One important goal, which the Southeast Asian countries must attain hereafter, is the realization of "peaceful and free neutrality" not to be threatened by intervention by big countries. Another important goal is the stabilization of the internal political and social conditions through the attainment of economic independence and the improvement of the people's livelihood. Regarding the economic expansion, the gap will necessarily loom large in connection with the latter goal, because Japan and Southeast Asian countries are dependent on each other economically, though to varying degrees.

Japan relies, for instance, on Southeast Asia for most of the tin and rubber it needs. Japanese investment in southeast Asia is more than one third of the total volume of Indonesia's foreign trade, and one-third of that of Thailand and the Philippines.

Such an interdependence between Japan and Southeast Asian countries may serve as a foundation for good neighborly relations between the two, if it develops favorably. However, if this situation continues, it will become a source of ceaseless friction and trouble, as can be seen from the boycott movement against Japanese goods which occurred last year under the leadership of Thai students. According to the results of the opinion polls conducted by the New York Times, in Indonesia, the peoples of these two countries are almost equally divided between those expecting an improvement of relations with Japan and those who think that relations between Japan and their countries will worsen hereafter. This indicates that the peoples of these countries are suspicious or distrustful toward each other, and expectations on the future role of Japan.

This fact is also indicative of the necessity for Japan to answer the expectations of Southeast Asian countries correctly and correctly, and at the same time, endeavor to eliminate the feeling of suspicion or distrust harbored by these countries toward Japan. It is true that unshakable good neighborly and friendly relations with Southeast Asian countries.

For this purpose, it is essential for Japan to realize an adequate official, the present actual conditions in the respective Southeast Asian countries instead of only pursuing immediate interests as in the past, with sufficient consideration for the positions and interests of these countries in all such fields as Governmental assistance, foreign trade, private investments and personal and cultural exchange.

A MAJOR CONSTITUTIONAL CONFRONTATION IN OUR COURTS

Mr. MONDAL. President, the refusal of President Nixon to produce the White House tapes, which both the Senate Watergate Committee and Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox wish to review threatens to produce a major constitutional confrontation in our courts.

Perhaps, just as importantly, this refusal threatens to further undermine the faith of the American people in their President and foster the feeling that there is indeed something unseemly which the President is attempting to hide through his refusal to reveal taped recorded information.

Mr. President, I commend a recent editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NIXON ON WRONG COURSE

President Nixon's position on release of the White House tapes inevitably increases public suspicion that he is concealing evidence of his own involvement or knowledge of illegal activity. By refusing to make these tapes available to either the Senate Watergate committee or to the Department of Justice's own special prosecutor, Mr. Nixon is both the Legislative and Judicial branches of the United States government.

In his letter to Sen. Sam Ervin, chairman of the Senate Committee, Mr. Nixon said: "I fear release of the tapes would settle the central questions at issue in the Watergate Inquiries, then their disclosure might serve a substantial public interest."

But then Mr. Nixon says that he has personally decided the tapes "would not finally settle the central issues" and consequently no one else will be given access to them. That is, of course, the President, who stands accused by John Dean, his own former White House counsel, of involvement in criminal activities. Yet this accused President declares himself, in his role of deciding whether the taped evidence available is to be concealed and suppressed. The common sense indication is that what is being concealed would reflect adversely on Richard Nixon's claims of innocence.

Mr. Nixon tries to justify his position by his blanket claim of privilege under the doctrine of separation of powers among the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of the government. But Special Prosecutor Cox's position is that Mr. Nixon's blanket claim of privilege to withhold this evidence from a grand jury is without legal foundation. He adds that "happily, ours is a system of checks and balances which will ensure that access to the tapes will be determined in the courts." In that event, the tapes would be made available to the White House records to the Senate committee and to Prosecutor Cox. It is not too different from such action. Influential members of the Republican party might yet be able to persuade Mr. Nixon to review his position and agree to an acceptable compromise, if he has not completely isolated himself from outside advice.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. HANSEN, Mr. President, I was very enthusiastic Thursday when I read the President's message about Federal spending for fiscal year 1973. Although Congress had voted to keep spending for the last fiscal year at a level of $250 billion, only $346.8 billion was actually spent. This means that the actual budget for the past fiscal year was $8.4 billion—much smaller than the $24.8 billion deficit projected by the President in his budget message last January. This amount of deficit is still cause for alarm, but it is encouraging to learn that the projected budget deficit was reduced by $10.4 billion.

I am also pleased that the President has, as Secretary Shultz so aptly put it, "returned to that old-time religion" of striving for a balanced budget—balanced in the sense that Federal expenditures should not exceed the collected revenues. That is the only way to prevent the country from becoming overburdened with debt. The deficit of $8.4 billion represents part of the $19.8 billion surplus goal of both the administration and Congress during this fiscal year and each of the succeeding fiscal years. For that reason I have joined with the distinguished Senators from North Carolina (Mr. HARGROVE) and Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.) in sponsoring legislation re-