

SENATORS REJECT 'END WAR' MOVE BY VOTE OF 55-39

War Curb Amendment Loses in Senate

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8

now go to a conference committee. The version the House passed authorizes \$20.2-billion.

Both Senator Hatfield and Senator McGovern said they had not considered what they might do next to place a limitation on the war in Vietnam. At one point, Mr. McGovern conceded that he did not "see any possibility of doing anything in this session of Congress."

Senators who opposed the amendment made it clear that they felt their victory, at the least, indicated a willingness on the part of the Senate to go along with the President's plans for Vietnamization, turning the fighting over to the South Vietnamese, and a desire to give him both time and support for his efforts at the Paris peace talks.

Backers Warn of Confrontation

Some of those who supported the amendment, offered to the military procurement bill, took a different view.

One Senate aide close to the effort said: "It shows the President that he has a narrow margin of support as long as he proceeds along the line has laid down. If he stops the withdrawals or goes back into Cambodia or escalates the war in some other way, there's going to be a confrontation with the Senate."

Those who took this view pointed out that some of the Senators who voted against the amendment, such as George D. Aiken, Republican of Vermont; John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, and Charles H. Percy, Republican of Illinois, openly oppose the war.

They voted against the amendment, presumably, to give the President a free hand at the negotiating table, without a Congressional deadline for withdrawal. Mr. Cooper said, "I believe that negotiations will have the better chance if the amendment is not adopted."

The amendment, in its final form, provided that no more than 280,000 troops could be kept in South Vietnam after April 30 of next year and that all American troops would have to be withdrawn by the end of next year.

It said, however, that in case of an "unanticipated clear and present danger," the President could keep American troops in Vietnam for 60 days beyond the end of the year end, if he thought it necessary, come back to Congress by Jan. 10, 1972, and ask it to authorize a new withdrawal date.

The hour of debate on the amendment this morning was

hardly dramatic, although it built up to one of the most outspoken speeches in recent Senate memory.

A clue to the importance of the vote came when many Senators began to file into the chamber and take their seats 20 minutes before the vote.

As they settled into their leather chairs, they heard Senator John Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, say, "This amendment is constitutional. Congress has the sole power to appropriate money. But, let's not stampe, let's go on down the road with whatever power our Chief Executive has as a negotiator, as a man of discernment."

Just before the end of the hour, Senator McGovern rose. "Every Senator in this chamber is partly responsible for sending 50,000 young Americans to an early grave," he said, "and in one sense this chamber literally reeks of blood. Every Senator here is partly responsible for that human wreckage at Walter Reed and all across this land—young boys without legs, without arms, or genitals, or faces, or hopes."

'This Damnable War'

"If we don't end this damnable war those young men will some day curse us for our pitiful willingness to let the executive carry the burden that the Constitution places on us."

Mr. McGovern's time ran out in the middle of his last sentence, and it was lost amid cries by Senator Griffin and Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, the minority leader, for order.

Thirty-two Democrats and seven Republicans voted for the amendment; 21 Democrats and 34 Republicans voted against it.

Vote in Senate

WASHINGTON, Sept. 1 (AP)—Following is the roll-call vote by which the Senate today defeated an amendment to the military authorization bill, offered by Senators George S. McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, and Mark O. Hatfield, Republican of Oregon, to set Dec. 31, 1971, as the deadline for the withdrawal of all United States military forces from Indochina:

FOR THE AMENDMENT—39

Democrats—32
 Bayh (Ind.)
 Burdick (N.D.)
 Church (Idaho)
 Cranston (Calif.)
 Eagleton (Mo.)
 Fulbright (Ark.)
 Gravel (Alaska)
 Harris (Okla.)
 Hart (Mich.)
 Hartke (Ind.)
 Hughes (Iowa)
 Inouye (Hawaii)
 Kennedy (Mass.)
 Magnuson (Wash.)
 Mansfield (Mont.)
 McCarthy (Minn.)
 McGovern (S.D.)
 McIntyre (N.H.)
 Metcalf (Mont.)
 Mandale (Minn.)
 Montoya (N.M.)
 Muskie (Me.)
 Nelson (Wis.)
 Pastore (R.I.)
 Pell (R.I.)
 Proxmire (Wis.)
 Ribicoff (Conn.)
 Symington (Mo.)
 Tydings (Md.)
 Williams (N.J.)
 Yarborough (Tex.)
 Young (Ohio)

Republicans—7

Brooks (Mass.)
 Case (N.J.)
 Goodell (N.Y.)
 Hatfield (Ore.)
 Javits (N.Y.)
 Mathias (Md.)
 Schweiker (Pa.)

AGAINST THE AMENDMENT—55

Democrats—21
 Allen (Ala.)
 Bible (Nev.)
 Byrd (Va.)
 Byrd (W.Va.)
 Dodd (Conn.)
 Eastland (Miss.)
 Ellender (La.)
 Ervin (N.C.)
 Gore (Tenn.)
 Holland (Fla.)
 Hollings (S.C.)
 Jackson (Wash.)
 Jordan (N.C.)
 McClellan (Ark.)
 McGee (Wyo.)
 Randolph (W.Va.)
 Russell (Ga.)
 Sparkman (Ala.)
 Spong (Va.)
 Stennis (Miss.)
 Talmadge (Ga.)

Republicans—34

Aiken (Vt.)
 Allott (Colo.)
 Baker (Tenn.)
 Bellmon (Okla.)
 Bennett (Utah)
 Boggs (Del.)
 Cook (Ky.)
 Cooper (Ky.)
 Citter (N.H.)
 Curtis (Neb.)
 Dole (Kan.)
 Dominick (Colo.)
 Fannin (Ariz.)
 Fong (Hawaii)
 Goldwater (Ariz.)
 Griffin (Mich.)
 Gurney (Fla.)
 Hansen (Wyo.)
 Hruska (Neb.)
 Jordan (Idaho)
 Miller (Iowa)
 Murphy (Calif.)
 Pearson (Kan.)
 Percy (Ill.)
 Prouty (Vt.)
 Saxbe (Ohio)
 Scott (Pa.)
 Smith (Maine)
 Smith (Ill.)
 Stevens (Alaska)
 Thurmond (S.C.)
 Tower (Tex.)
 Williams (Del.)
 Young (N.D.)

Not voting but announced as paired (pairs are used to denote the opposing positions of senators when one or both are absent): Moss, D.-Utah, For, Long, D.-La., Against.
 Not voting or paired but announced as against the amendment: Cannon, D.-Nev., Mundt, R.-S.D., Packwood, R.-Ore.

Amendment by Hatfield and McGovern Would Have Set Withdrawal Deadline

A 'MORAL VICTORY' SEEN

SEP 2 1970

Ban on Sending Draftees to Combat Is Also Beaten as Military Bill Passes

By ROBERT M. SMITH

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 1—The Senate defeated today the Hatfield-McGovern "amendment to end the war."

By a vote of 55 to 39, an alliance of Republicans and Southern Democrats turned down the proposal by Senators Mark O. Hatfield, Republican of Oregon, and George S. McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, to withdraw all American soldiers from Indochina by the end of next year.

Supporters of the amendment came within two or three votes of the number they had said privately they would get. Since it was clear they were going to be defeated, the significance of the votes they would get became an issue even before Senators answered to their names on the roll-call this morning.

Senator Robert P. Griffin of Michigan, the Republican whip, said the only question would be "the psychological impact of the debate."

'Support for President'

"There is an effort now to portray the defeat of this amendment as some kind of victory for the sponsors," Mr. Griffin said. "It is a vote of support for President Nixon."

Just after the vote, Senator Hatfield stood under the television lights in a jammed conference room and said: "We had a moral victory."

Before passing the \$19.2-billion military procurement bill, the Senate also rejected, 71 to 22, a proposal that would have forbidden the Army to send draftees to South Vietnam against their will; defeated, 87 to 7, an amendment that might have restricted military aid to Israel, and killed, 62 to 29, a proposal that might have split a \$2.5-billion Navy contract for 30 destroyers between yards in Maine and Mississippi instead of having them all built in Mississippi.

The procurement bill must

Continued on Page 10, Column 2