

JUL 23 1970

TUES, THURSDAY, JULY 23, 1970

# Senate Vote Is Due Today on Controversial

By WARREN WEAVER Jr.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 22 — The Senate headed today for a showdown vote on the District of Columbia crime bill, with the odds favoring its approval but a stubborn band of opponents insisting that they have a chance of defeating the controversial measure.

The final vote is scheduled for 3 P.M. tomorrow, ending a week of debate. The bill cannot be amended but must be voted on in one piece because it is a conference report that has already been approved by the House.

The result will probably hinge on how successful Senator Sam J. Ervin Jr., the North Carolina Democrat who has sparked the attack on the bill, has been in rounding up fellow Southerners to vote against it.

"I think we're going to win with something to spare," a backer of the crime measure said today, "but if the South goes against us, we're sunk."

### Hard Total of 55 Seen

The bill's supporters, led by Senator Joseph D. Tydings, Democrat of Maryland, claim 65 to 70 votes for it, but their hard total today appeared to be nearer 55. One backer said that he did not realistically expect the result to be less than 30-40 in favor.

According to the Ervin forces, however, there are 35 Senators prepared to vote against the crime bill and about the same number for it, with the remaining 30 undecided and the result thus in doubt. The opponents conceded at the same time that it remains an uphill fight.

Among the controversial provisions of the bill are those authorizing "no knock" searches, forcible entry into a house by an agent with a warrant without any warning or necessity of identifying him-

self, and preventive or pretrial detention, under which an accused criminal can be jailed for 60 days between arrest and trial if he is regarded as dangerous.

A similar "no knock" provision relating only to Federal searches in narcotics cases was approved by the Senate last January and by a House subcommittee today. On the key vote to table the provision, which failed 44-40, 10 Southerners voted with Senator Ervin to drop the proposal.

One difficulty in producing

votes against the bill is getting Senators who are up for reelection to go on record against any law-and-order proposal.

To counteract this reluctance, the Ervin forces have made it known that if they can defeat the conference report, they will move immediately to bring to the floor a version of the bill that retains all its non controversial proposals for court reform, bail procedures, public defenders and the like, but not such provisions as "no knock" searches, preventive detention and wiretapping.

Thus, for political purposes,

## District of Columbia Crime Bill

a Senator who had helped kill the original measure could follow up swiftly with a vote for law enforcement.

Backers of the crime bill insist however, that the House will not accept anything different from the compromise measure that emerged from three months in conference, already considerably more liberal than the original House version.

### Bill's Backers Attacked

Virtually all the floor debate on the measure until today had

involved its critics, and Senator Ervin attacked its backers for failing to defend the conference report.

"Except for their perfunctory initial speeches," Mr. Ervin declared, "the proponents of this unconstitutional and unwise bill have been harder to find than hair on a frog."

"I cannot believe that members of the Senate supporting the bill are unconcerned about the constitutional rights of district citizens or of their own constituents for whom this bill is a proposed Justice Depart-

ment model. I must conclude that silence is their best argument."

As if in response, two Democrats, Senators Ernest F. Hollings Jr. of South Carolina and Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia, spoke in defense of the measure. Mr. Hollings called it a "practical and constitutional" method of dealing with the high crime rate in the District of Columbia.

Senator Byrd said the preventive detention provision was necessary to "reasonably assure the safety of the community."