

## 2 on Senate Panel Now Back Bombing

By RICHARD L. MADDEN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 25 — The unanimity of the Senate Appropriations Committee on cutting off funds for bombing in Cambodia has crumbled a bit.

A Republican who voted against funds for bombing in the committee on May 15 and a Democrat who was absent when the committee approved the provision, 24 to 0, now plan to oppose it when the full Senate takes up the measure next week.

The two Senators, Roman L. Hruska, Republican of Nebraska, and ale W. McGee, Democrat of Wyoming, have declared in a joint statement in the committee report accompanying the measure that a fund cutoff "could have a profound effect on future developments in Southeast Asia."

### Dignity and Greatness

They added: "It illbefits an institution of greatness to allow its movements to respond to the immediate tempests of time and politics, while ignoring the perspective of true national interest that has through history given Congress its dignity and its true leadership."

The two senators said that President Nixon was "striving to achieve a cease-fire and withdrawal of foreign forces from Cambodia in accordance with the Paris agreements, and to secure the lasting peace in Indochina, for which so many people have sacrificed so much. Let us carry out our responsibilities with this clearly in mind."

A spokesman for Mr. Hruska

acknowledged that the Senator did vote for the anti-bombing provision in committee, but planned to change his vote on the floor.

"The Senator doesn't consider himself to be an obstructionist and felt strongly that the issue was important and should be sent to the floor for full consideration," he explained.

An aide to Mr. McGee said that he was attending another committee meeting when the Appropriations panel took its vote and probably would have voted against the Cambodia provision had he been there.

Despite Mr. Hruska's switch, the votes against the bombing by Republican conservatives, such as Milton R. Young of North Dakota, Norris Cotton of New Hampshire and Hiram L. Fong of Hawaii, were regarded as a significant shift in Congressional sentiment.

### 'Another War' Opposed

All three have generally supported the Administration's policies in Indochina, and all three voted to attach a provision cutting off the funds for bombing in Cambodia to a bill providing \$2.2-billion in supplemental appropriations to various Federal departments.

"My major reason was a fear of being dragged into another war," said Mr. Young, the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee. "I considered how important it is to keep Cambodia from becoming a strong military bastion of North Vietnam," he said, but added that Cambodia would require "lots of assistance" to have chance of holding on.

"It was not too difficult," Mr. Young said of his vote. "I'd been thinking about it. I had

supported the President in getting us out in an honorable way. This was accomplished. This whole war has been a hopeless adventure."

Asked if the Watergate case had an impact on the way that some Senators had voted, Mr. Young replied: "I think it had something to do with some senators, probably feeling they have to go it alone more than in the past." Asked why he replied, "The President right now couldn't be too much help to them to get re-elected."

### Fears More P.O.W.'s

Mr. Fong said that despite the "flagrant violation" of the Paris agreement by the North Vietnamese, "I decided I could not support the continued bombing of Cambodia" and gave these reasons:

"There are no more American troops in South Vietnam, and our P.O.W.'s have been released. The continued bombing of Cambodia will lead to more losses of American pilots and crew members, more American P.O.W.'s and a possible recurrence of our sad experience in Vietnam. We have no binding commitment to defend Cambodia."

On the day that the committee acted, Mr. Cotton said that with American troops and prisoners home from Vietnam it was "a new ball game." He added: "As far as I am concerned, I want to get the hell out of there just as quick as possible, and I don't want to fool around to the point that they might take more prisoners."

A spokesman said that covered the Senator's views on the subject and that there wasn't much elaboration to be