

## Senate Reaction to Peace Setback

### Washington

The negative turn in the Paris peace negotiations provoked a common reaction of disappointment among senators yesterday, but it was still unclear whether the disappointment would lead to renewed criticism of the administration's Vietnam policies.

For the moment at least, the administration appeared to have kept the issue under political control by Henry A. Kissinger's lengthy public statement Saturday, explaining how the secret talks had reached an impasse.

Republican senators close to the White House suggested that had been one of the purposes behind the decision to have the President's national security adviser break the secrecy surrounding the talks and give a public accounting of the state of the negotiations.

"Disappointing" was the word used by both administration supporters and critics to describe the Kissinger briefing. But even among the doves there was little

immediate inclination to openly criticize the administration for the failure thus far in the negotiations.

The question being raised by administration supporters as well as critics, however, was whether a Democratic-controlled Congress would be as tolerant and docile if no peace agreement has been reached by the time it reconvenes on January 3.

The immediate reaction of Senator George McGovern, the defeated Democratic presidential candidate, was that the administration had "misled many people into believing the war was virtually over" and now "we must look again to the possibility of congressional action to terminate any further American involvement in Indo-China.

McGovern, who now returns to his backrow desk in the Senate, however, will not call the signals in the Senate as much as Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, probably the Senate's most persistent and influential critic of the war.

Confessing to a personal

feeling of "great depression" over the adverse turn in the negotiations, Mansfield obliquely suggested there would be renewed attempt in the Senate to force an end to American involvement in the war through legislation.

If negotiations have not been resumed by the time the new Congress convenes, Mansfield said, "I anticipate that the Senate, which has been very responsible in keeping silent during the negotiations, will give prior consideration to the matter."

Senator Hugh Scott, the Senate Republican leader, however, foresaw that Congress would tend to be "tolerant" at the outset, "particularly in view of the fact that Dr. Kissinger has been very candid in explaining the difficulties." Scott said he was personally disappointed but, in defense of the administration, emphasized that "the essential fact to be borne in mind is that the whole exercise is to make certain that war will not break out again in about a year."

To Senator J. William Fulbright, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, however, "the basic issue is whether we insist on maintaining a dominant influence in the area or whether we are willing to disengage completely."

Fulbright said the Kissinger briefing had come as "a very great disappointment" because "I accepted his statement in October as indicating that peace was near." But now, the Senator said, "I am very fearful the war will go on."

As for Congress mounting an effort to legislate an end to the war, however, Fulbright said he believes the administration still commands a majority of votes.

Repeatedly in the past two years, the Senate, often by narrow margins, has passed end-the-war amendments only to see them locked by the administration in the House. When the secret negotiations apparently picked up a hopeful momentum last fall, the anti-war movement collapsed completely in the Senate.

N.Y. Times Service