

OCT 21 1971

NYTimes

8

C

## SENATE UNIT MAPS NEW CURB ON WAR

### Proposal Says Funds Can Be Used Only for Pullout

By JOHN W. FINNEY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Oct. 20—The Senate Foreign Relations Committee today tried a new legislative approach to end the Vietnam war by approving an amendment specifying that the President can use funds only for an "expeditious" withdrawal of all forces from Indochina.

The amendment, which the committee attached to the foreign aid authorization bill, also states that American forces could not engage in further hostilities in Indochina except to protect themselves against "imminent danger" as they withdrew.

The amendment was sponsored by Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, and Frank Church, Democrat of Idaho, and adopted by a vote of 11 to 5. Voting against the amendment were Senators John J. Sparkman, Democrat of Alabama; Gale W. McGee, Democrat of Wyoming; Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, Republican leader of the Senate; James B. Pearson, Republican of Kansas, and Karl E. Mundt, Republican of South Dakota.

The committee also adopted, by a 12-4 vote, a troop-withdrawal amendment by the Senate majority leader, Mike Mansfield, that the Senate had attached to the military procurement authorization bill. The Mansfield amendment, which the House indirectly refused to accept yesterday by a 215-193 vote, would establish as "policy of the United States" that all American troops would be withdrawn from Indochina in six months, provided only that all American prisoners of war were released by that time.

### Seen as Alternative

The Cooper-Church amendment was intended as an alternative to the Mansfield amendment, which now seems likely to be scrapped by the Senate-House conference committee on the military procurement bill. The immediate indications were that the Cooper-Church amendment would be opposed as strenuously by the Administration as was the Mansfield amendment.

The initial reaction of Senator Scott, presumably reflecting White House views, was that the Cooper-Church amendment would have a "disastrous impact" and "cause considerable confusion at the military level as to what constitutes action to protect troops as they are withdrawn."

The Cooper-church amendment states that funds appropriated for the military "may be used only for the purpose of withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Indochina and may not be used for the purpose of engaging U.S. military forces in hostilities in North or South Vietnam, Cambodia or Laos, except for actions necessary to protect said forces against imminent danger."

While not explicitly stated, the implication of the amendment is that the President could not use any funds to maintain a residual force in Indochina or make the withdrawal timetable contingent on the survival of the Saigon Government.

### 'Without Congressional Author

The underlying legal premise of the amendment, as stated in its preamble, is that with the repeal last year of the 1964 Tonkin Gulf resolution the President is "without Congressional authority for continued participation in the war in Indochina" and his only Constitutional authority as Commander in Chief is to protect the troops as they are withdrawn.

As interpreted by its sponsors, the Cooper-Church amendment would declare it to be "the policy of the United States to provide for the expeditious withdrawal from Indochina of all United States military forces." To enforce this policy, it would provide that funds could be used only for troop withdrawals.

Under the amendment, for example, the United States could not provide combat air support to Cambodian or Laotian troops and in Vietnam American forces could not engage in combat except to protect themselves against "imminent danger." As defined by Senator Cooper, "imminent danger" would be a situation in which American troops were faced "in a limited, specific way" with an attack that threatens their destruction.

The Cooper-Church amendment contains no deadline for "expeditious withdrawal," and thus presumably the White House could argue that the amendment was not in conflict with the Administration's declared goal of total withdrawal.