

A C.I.A. CHECKREIN WINS SENATE TEST

Plan for an Overseer Group Gets Tentative Approval of Foreign Relations Panel

By TOM WICKER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 12—A

proposal for a new and broadened Senate committee to oversee the Central Intelligence Agency won a surprisingly easy victory today in a test vote in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Opponents of the proposal prevented its final approval only when Senator Frank J. Lausche, Democrat of Ohio, walked out of the meeting room and left no quorum present.

Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat of Missouri, then exercised a parliamentary right and objected to a vote when a quorum was not present. Final action was thus postponed until Tuesday, when the committee meets again.

The test vote was 12 to 6 against tabling, and thus killing, a resolution by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Democrat of Minnesota.

The resolution would establish a formal Senate committee of nine members, empowered to employ a staff, to oversee the nation's foreign intelligence operations.

Its tentative approval by the Foreign Relations Committee was the strongest move toward strengthened Congressional oversight of the C.I.A. since 1954.

In that year, Senator Mike Mansfield, Democrat of Montana, now the majority leader, brought a resolution for a joint Senate-House oversight committee to the Senate floor with 34 cosponsors. Ultimately, the resolution was beaten, 59 to 27, with 14 of the sponsors abandoning it on the roll-call.

The likely prospect is that the McCarthy resolution also will face a hard fight on the floor, with defenders of the present "watchdog" system expected to prevail.

The Senate now has two informal subcommittees, one of the Armed Forces Committee and another of the Appropriations Committee, that meet together to review C.I.A. activities. Senator Richard B. Russell, Democrat of Georgia, is the

senior member of the nine-man "watchdog" group, which employs no staff.

Several weeks ago, Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, proposed that three members of his committee be added to the watchdog group. Senator Russell rejected the proposal, in a letter not yet made public.

The McCarthy resolution went beyond the Fulbright proposal.

In effect, it would replace the informal watchdog group with a nine-man standing committee, with three members each from the Armed Forces, Appropriations and Foreign Relations committees.

The committee would have jurisdiction over all of what is known here as the "intelligence community." In addition to the C.I.A., that would include the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the State Department, and other Government agencies dealing in foreign intelligence or counter-intelligence.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation would be included, too, to the extent that it deals with intelligence matters.

Proponents of the resolution, long restive at what they considered the lax operations of the watchdog group, conceded that the major significance of their move would lie in getting the Senate to approve the establishment of a formal committee that would include Foreign Relations members.

They said that if the resolution were approved, they would not necessarily press for the employment of a staff, which presumably would also be privy to the agencies' secrets and classified information.

The proponents contend that the senior members of the Appropriations and Armed Forces committees on the present watchdog group are too protective and do not sufficiently inquire into the effect of the agency's activities on the nation's foreign relations.

Some sources suggested that if the Foreign Relations Committee approved the resolution Tuesday, as it is expected to, Senator Russell and the present watchdog group might accept the change in order to avoid floor debate about the C.I.A., its activities and the efficacy of Congressional control procedures.

It was more widely believed, however, that Mr. Russell would be able to muster the votes to defeat the resolution on the floor. A proposal to broaden Congressional oversight of the intelligence agency has been approved since Congress established it and the informal watch-

The size of the vote against tabling the McCarthy resolution was surprising. It was made possible when Mr. McCarthy cast proxy votes against tabling for Senators Gale McGee of Wyoming and Thomas Dodd of Connecticut, both Democrats. They had generally been regarded as reluctant to change the present system.

All of those against tabling were Democrats. Joining Mr. Lausche and Mr. Symington in opposition to the McCarthy resolution were Republican Senators Rourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa, Frank Carlson of Kansas, John Williams of Delaware and Karl Mundt of South Dakota.

Long a C.I.A. Critic

Mr. McCarthy, long a critic of the C.I.A. and of the Russell Group, offered the resolution as a substitute for another that would have provided \$150,000 for an investigation of the foreign policy effects of C.I.A. activities.

Mr. Hickenlooper moved to table the McCarthy motion, and lost. Mr. Lausche then moved to send it to the Rules Committee, which ultimately will have to consider it and approve a budget for the proposed staff. That motion, in the nature of a delaying action, was defeated.

Then Mr. Lausche left the committee room. Mr. Symington objected to further votes and the whole matter was put over until Tuesday.

Senator Fulbright told reporters he thought establishment of the new committee would "tend to modify and even eliminate" uninformed criticism of the C.I.A. and would be "a step toward better relations" with the agency.

Voting with Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Fulbright against the tabling resolution were Senators Mansfield, Dodd, McGee, John Sparkman of Alabama, Albert Gore of Tennessee, Frank Church of Idaho, Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island and Wayne Morse of Oregon, all Democrats.

Senator Clifford P. Case of New Jersey, a Republican, abstained from voting on the tabling motion.