SENATE UNIT BACKS WAR-FUND CUTOFF

-APR 1 8 1972

Deadline Would Be End of Year Provided Hanoi Freed Prisoners NYTimes

> By JOHN W. FINNEY all to The New York Tim

WASHINGTON, April 17-The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted today to back a cutoff of funds for all hostilities in Indochina after this year provided Hanoi releases all American prisoners of war.

Such a cutoff is considered unlikely to come about, both because of Hanoi's refusal to release the prisoners and because of Congressional obstacles - a close fight in the full Senate and resistance if the proposal reaches the House. But Senators saw its importance as symbolic, a gesture of protest against renewed American bombing of North Vietnam.

The cutoff plan was attached by the committee as an amendment to a bill authorizing funds for the State Department and the United States information agency at the suggestion Senators Frank Church.

Continued on Page 21, Column 1

Continued From Page 1, Col. 7

Democrat of Idaho, and Clifford P. Case, Republican New Jersey.

It would not take effect however, unless North Viet-nam agreed to release all American prisoners of war.

Meanwhile, in another show of rising antiwar sentiment here a nationwide campus strike was called for Friday by the National Student Associa-tion to protest the renewed [Page 20.]

Rogers Defends Policy

The action in the Foreign Relations Committee today came after it heard the Administra-tion's policy defended by Sec-retary of State William P. Rogers.

The fund-cutoff amendment, which now goes to the Senate floor for what is expected to be a close fight, was adopted by the committee by a vote of 9 to 2 with two Senators—William B. Spong Jr., Democrat of Virginia, and John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky—voting "present" but taking no stand on the issue. The fund-cutoff amendment.

Voting for the amendment, in addition to Senators Case and Church, were the Democratic Senators Stuart Symington of Missouri, Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, Edmund S. Muskie of Maine and J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas and the Republican Senators Jacob K. Javits of New York and Charles H. Percy of Illinois. H. Percy of Illinois.

Senator George D. Aiken of Vermont, the senior Republican on the committee, said he voted against the amendment because it would amount to "accepting North Vietnamese terms for a settlement."

Seen as Poor Timing

Senator Cooper said he voted "present" because he felt it inappropriate to advance such a proposal at a time when "we are engaged in a battle that could affect the fate of our forces." A similar reason was offered by Senator Spong for voting "present."

While not in direct retalia-tion for the Administration's decision to resume the air war over North Vietnam, the com-mittee's adoption of the amendwas admittedly influ-

enced by the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong over the weekend. The amendment had been under discussion for some weeks by Senators Case and Church, and Senator Case said "we decided to move a little sooner than otherwise planned" in offering the amendment in view of the events of the past few days."

Democrats Restrained

While the amendment was approved overwhelmingly by the committee, the stronghold of the Vietnam doves in the Senate, the defection of Senators Aiken and Cooper, two of the most respected Repblican doves, served to underscore a shift that seems to be develop
ing in the coalition of Vietnam bright refused to allow Mr. Rogers to read a prepared statement on the military aid program—the ostensible subject of the hearing. Over Mr. Rogers's sprotests, Senator Fulbright or dered the statement—almost identical to one already presented to the House Foreign Affairs Committee—placed in the committee were relatively restrained. Mr. Symington and Mr. Church briefly pursued indecisive lines of questioning and then departed, leaving Senator Fulbright was isolated in the Administration.

The hearing started on a constitution of Vietnam for its or ticks in the Senate.

The shift became noticeable during Mr. Roger's appearance.

The shift became noticeable during Mr. Roger's appearance.

The shift became noticeable during Mr. Roger's appearance.

The shift became noticeable during Mr. Rogers, appearance.

The shift became noticeable during Mr. Roger's appearance.

The shift became n

"massive invasion" of South Vietnam.

Apparently realizing that Mr. Rogers had stolen the initiative, the committee doves, with some prodding from their aides, regrouped at a closed-dor meeting later in the day around the cutoff amendment.

As explained by Senator Church, the amendment would use the Congressional power of the pursestring "to bring about an orderly withdrawal of American troops from Indochina." At the same time, he said, it would "put Hanoi on notice that release of the prisoners could lead to an orderly termination of the war."

The amendment, Senator Church said, was designed to carry out 'the general policy laid down in an amendment by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, adopted by Congress in modified form last year, calling for prompt withdrawal of American forces subject to the release of prisoners of war. Since President Nixon had chosen, to disregard the Mansfield amendment, he said it was decided to resort to the Congressional control of fund, to force a withdrawal policy.

Technically, the amendment only speaks about an end to American hostilities. But as interpreted by both Senators Church said, was designed to except military advisers.