

# Senate Votes to Ban All Bombing Money

## Lopsided Defeat For Nixon

Washington Post Service

Washington

The Senate, spurred by fears the United States will become entangled in another lengthy Indochina war, voted 63 to 19 yesterday to cut off all funds for bombing of Cambodia and Laos.

The fund cutoff was the first absolute anti-war prohibition ever voted by either chamber of Congress in the 13-year history of the Indochina war.

Sponsored by Senator Thomas F. Eagleton (Dem.-Mo.) with strong support from Appropriations Committee chairman John L. McClellan (Dem.-Ark.), the anti-bombing amendment was attached to a \$3.7 billion supplemental appropriations bill.

The bill was then passed by a roll-call vote of 73 to 5. It will now go to conference with the House, which has passed a weaker anti-bombing provision. The Nixon administration hopes to kill the Eagleton amendment in the conference or on the House floor.

### DEFEAT

Approval of the Missouri senator's amendment — particularly by such a wide margin — was a major defeat for President Nixon.

The President opposed the amendment, and Senator John Tower (Rep.-Texas) and other administration spokesmen argued that continued U.S. bombing is the only way to stop North Vietnam from using Cambodia and Laos as staging grounds for attacks on South Vietnam that could upset the fragile peace accords.

GOP Senate leader Hugh Scott and others also contended that passage of the anti-bombing provision would undermine the bargaining position of White House negotiator Henry A.

See Back Page

### From Page 1

Kissinger when he goes to Paris June 6, to negotiate for improved peace arrangements with North Vietnam.

### SHIFT

However, the vote revealed that there has been a decisive shift in Senate opinion on the war. While less sweeping anti-war proposals passed the Senate in past years by one or two votes (only to die in the House), yesterday's vote was no contest.

At the heart of the shift of feeling is the belief that now that U.S. troops and prisoners are safely out of South Vietnam, the U.S. must decisively break off its involvement in the war regardless of what happens there, lest it slide into another Vietnam conflict in Cambodia.

This is the basic argument made by McClellan, a former presidential supporter who played a major role in helping steer anti-war language through the appropriations committee before the bill came to the floor.

Yesterday, one senator after another rose to denounce the bombing and voice fears that continued Cambodia bombing could draw the U.S. into an endless further combat role in Indochina prolonging a war that has lasted over a decade.

"What difference does it make if we prop up the Lon Nol government for six more months?" demanded Frank E. Moss (Dem.-Utah). "We want no more of this insane war in Southeast Asia."

Eagleton and Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield contended failure to cut off war funds would be equivalent to a new Gulf of Tonkin resolution in reverse authorizing step-by-step reinvolvement of the U.S. in Cambodia to shore up that nation's faltering anti-Communist government.

Failure to cut off bombing funds Eagleton argued would give the President "a new authorization . . . to bomb, bomb and bomb ad infinitum."

### SANCTION

Opponents of the bombing also argued that it represents a unilateral presidential act of war not sanctioned directly by Congress or through any international treaty approved by Congress.

They said if Congress is to reassert its power to decide equally with the President when the nation shall go to war, then it must end the present "presidential usurpation of the congressional constitutional authority to wage war," in the words of Senator Stuart Symington (Dem.-Mo.).

"If there is a need for further U.S. military activity in Indochina," said Harry Flood Byrd Jr. (Ind.-Va.), who backed Eagleton, "the President should submit the case to Congress. This is not a time for unilateral action by the executive branch."

As initially passed by the House May 10 by a 219 to 188 vote, the anti-war provision simply barred any funds in the supplemental appropriations bill from being used for Cambodia bombing.

However, then-secretary of Defense Elliot L. Richardson told the Senate Appropriations committee that the House provision wouldn't stop the President from bombing since he could use funds previously voted in

earlier appropriations bills.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, to close up this loophole, not only endorsed the House provision and broadened it to include Laos, but added an entirely separate provision sponsored by Eagleton, applying both to funds in the bill and to all funds previously voted in any other bill.

### TERMS

It states: "None of the funds herein appropriated under this act or heretofore appropriated under any other act may be expended to support directly or indirectly combat activities in, over or off the shores of Cambodia or in or over Laos by United States forces."

This language, Eagleton said, won't apply to future appropriations bills — only the present bill and past ones. But he said he will offer it to all future funds bills that come before the committee so that future appropriations cannot be used for bombing either.

Two Republicans' amendments, which Eagleton said would undercut the binding character of his amendment, were defeated. A Robert Taft (Rep.-Ohio) amendment to let the President bomb in Cambodia and Laos as long as he aimed only at North Vietnamese troops there was crushed, 63 to 17. Amendments by Jesse Helms (Rep.-N.C.) and Robert Dole (Rep.-Kan.) to let the President bomb in both countries, if he determined that North Vietnam had failed to account for 1296 U.S. personnel missing in action in Vietnam and still unaccounted for, lost 56 to 25.

On final vote Democrats were 43 to 13 in favor of the Eagleton language, while Republicans were 20 to 16 in favor.

There is some evidence that Richardson's statement

on the House language which many took to mean that the President would keep bombing regardless of the will of Congress, hurt the administration.

"The need for the pending amendment was underscored by the arrogant testimony of then Secretary of Defense Richardson," Byrd told the Senate. "Mr. Richardson said that the executive branch would utilize public funds as it wishes in the absence of a clear-cut mandate from Congress."

## How They Voted on Bomb Ban

Washington

Here is the roll call vote of 63 to 19 by which the Senate yesterday adopted an amendment cutting off all funds for U.S. bombing in Cambodia and Laos.

### FOR THE AMENDMENT—63 DEMOCRATS—43

Abourezk (S.D.)	Kennedy (Mass.)
Bayh (Ind.)	Magnuson (Wash.)
Bentsen (Tex.)	Mansfield (Mont.)
Biden (Del.)	McClellan (Ark.)
Burdick (N.D.)	McGovern (S.D.)
Byrd (Va.)	McIntyre (N.H.)
Byrd (W. Va.)	Metcalf (Mont.)
Chiles (Fla.)	Mondale (Minn.)
Clark (Iowa)	Montoya (N.M.)
Cranston (Calif.)	Moss (Utah)
Eagleton (Mo.)	Nelson (Wis.)
Fulbright (Ark.)	Nunn (Ga.)
Grave (Alaska)	Pastore (R.I.)
Hart (Mich.)	Pell (R.I.)
Hankke (Ind.)	Proxmire (Wis.)
Hathaway (Maine)	Randolph (W. Va.)
Hollings (S.C.)	Ribicoff (Conn.)
Huddleston (Ky.)	Stevenson (Ill.)
Hughes (Iowa)	Symington (Mo.)
Humphrey (Minn.)	Tunney (Calif.)
Inouye (Hawaii)	Williams (N.J.)
Johnston (La.)	

### REPUBLICANS—20

Aiken (Vt.)	Mathias (Md.)
Bartlett (Okla.)	McClure (Idaho)
Bellmon (Okla.)	Packwood (Ore.)
Brooke (Mass.)	Pearson (Kan.)
Case (N.J.)	Percy (Ill.)
Cook (Ky.)	Saxbe (Ohio)
Domenici (N.M.)	Schweiker (Pa.)
Gurney (Fla.)	Taft (Ohio)
Hatfield (Ore.)	Stevens (Alaska)
Javits (N.Y.)	Young (N.D.)

### AGAINST THE AMENDMENT—19 DEMOCRATS—3

Eastland (Miss.)	Long (La.)
Jackson (Wash.)	

### REPUBLICANS—16

Beall (Md.)	Helms (N.C.)
Brock (Tenn.)	Hruska (Neb.)
Buckley (N.Y.)	Roth (Del.)
Curtis (Neb.)	Scott (Pa.)
Dole (Kan.)	Scott (Va.)
Fannin (Ariz.)	Taft (Ohio)
Griffin (Mich.)	Thurmond (S.C.)
Hanse (Wyo.)	Tower (Tex.)

Associated Press