SENATE ASKS CURB ON SECRET PACTS

Bill, Passed 81-0, Requires All Foreign Agreements to Be Submitted to Congress NYTimes

By JOHN W. FINNEY

Special to The New York Time WASHINGTON, Feb. The Senate, in a step aimed at restricting secrecy by the executive branch on foreign commitments, unanimously approved legislation today that would require all international agreements to be submitted to Congress for its information.

The legislation, opposed by State Department and adopted by the Senate by an 81-to-0 vote with no controversy, was put forward by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as "a significant step toward redressing the imbalance between Congress and the executive branch in making of foreign policy."

A similar measure was passed unanimously by the Senate in 1956, but it died in the House of Representatives. The current legislation was introduced by Senator Clifford P. Case, Republican of New Jersey, in February, 1970, following the discovery of previously secret executive agreements signed in the nineteen sixties with Ethiopia, Laos, Thailand, South Korea and Spain.

Bipartisan Call-Up

The Case bill, which was reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last month, was called up today by the Democratic and Republican leadership of the Senate as noncontroversial legislation tha could fill a gap in the legislative schedule. As such, it was said, it was only coincidental that action was taken on the eve of President Nixon's de-Continued on Page 7, Column I

SENATE ASKS CURB ON SECRET PACTS

Continued From Page 1, Col. 5

parture for China.

parture for China.

La the House, where a similar bill has been introduced by Representative T. Bradford Morse, Republican of Massachusetts, Representative Thomas E. Morgan of Pennsylvania, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, said the legislation would be given "prior consideration."

It appeared from today's 81-

eration."

It appeared from today's 81-to-0 Senate vote that the Nixon Administration had made no concerted effort to block the Case bill on the Senate floor. One possibility was that the Administration was expecting the bill to die in the House, just as the 1956 legislation did. At the White House, a spokesman said there would be no immediate comment on the

no immediate comment on the Senate action. Under the legislation ap-

Senate action.

Under the legislation approved today, the Secretary of State would be required to transmit to Congress the text of any international agreement—other than a treaty—within 60 days after it is signed, with the provision that any correct the provision that any secret agreement be submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Com-mittee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee.
The legislation is particularly

aimed at the practice of the executive branch of entering

executive branch of entering into executive agreements about which Congress sometimes is not informed.

Under existing law, the State Department periodically publishes all nonsecret international agreements, but on occasions the executive branch haw withheld from Congress secret agreements that it regarded as diplomatically or militarily sensitive.

The Senate bill makes it clear that under its provisions secret

that under its provisions secret agreements affecting national security would be given to the two committees in secret and

two committees in secret and under conditions designed to protect the security. The agreements that the State Department would be re-

State Department would be requested to transmit are primarily executive agreements, which do not require the Senators' approval, as treaties do. They thus would be submitted largely for the information of Congress and its committees. The argument of the Foreign Relations Committee was that only by requiring the submission of such agreements could Congress begin to break down the secrecy of the exectuive branch and impose an obligation on the executive to report its foreign commitments to Congress.

its foreign commitments to Congress.

While Congress under the legislation could not disapprove or negate the agreements, the Foreign Relations Committee contended that at least Congress would be kept informed foreign commitments and be in a spoitton to challenge them at the time they were made.