

SENATE REJECTS PLAN TO ENLARGE WATCH ON C.I.A.

61-to-28 Vote Follows Rare
Closed-Door Session on
Proposal of Fulbright

RUSSELL IS THE VICTOR

Decision on a Point of Order
Shelves Attempt to Add
Members to Committee

By E. W. KENWORTHY
Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, July 14 — After an extraordinary closed session, the Senate turned aside today an attempt to enlarge the committee supervising the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency. The vote was 61 to 28.

The outcome was a signal victory for Senator Richard B. Russell of Georgia, who, as chairman of both the Armed Services Committee and the present C.I.A. "watchdog" subcommittee, strenuously opposed any change.

By the same token, the vote was a setback for Senator J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas, who, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, had argued that his committee should be represented on legislative oversight of the C.I.A. His argument was that the supersecret spy agency obviously influenced foreign policy decisions.

Doors Locked and Guarded

The vote came after an hour of intense, and sometimes, sharp exchanges between Mr. Russell and Mr. Fulbright, followed by 3½ hours of debate behind locked and guarded doors.

Following the initial statements of Mr. Fulbright and Mr. Russell, Senator Mike Mansfield of Montana, the majority leader, moved to go into closed session on the ground that "things might be said that aren't particularly true and could be harmful" to the C.I.A., national security and the Senate.

Thereupon Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois, the Republican leader, seconded the motion. Since such a motion merely requires a seconding, Vice President Humphrey promptly ordered the public and

press galleries cleared. Only a few key committee aides were allowed to remain during the debate.

The doors were not opened again until the Senate was ready to vote.

Decisive Point of Order

The vote actually came on a point of order by Senator Russell. The Georgia Democrat's point was that the resolution to expand the watchdog committee involved the national security and should therefore be appropriately referred to the Armed Services Committee before being placed on the calendar, as proposed by Senator Fulbright.

The resolution offered by Mr. Fulbright would have created a new committee of nine members — three each from the Armed Services, Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees. At present the C.I.A. subcommittee is composed of seven ranking members of the Armed Services Committee and of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Department expenditures.

On the House side, oversight of the C.I.A. is maintained by an 11-member subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee and a four-member subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. These subcommittees meet separately, whereas on the Senate side, because of overlapping memberships in the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, there is only one watchdog committee.

The resolution shelved today has never been submitted on the floor. It was proposed by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy in the Foreign Relations Committee and that committee voted 14 to 5 on May 17 to send the proposal to the floor.

This uncommon procedure led to Mr. Russell's point of order when Senator Fulbright moved to put the resolution on the calendar.

Despite the fact that the vote was on this procedural question, it was, in effect, a vote on the substantive issue. This is so because the resolution, in being referred to the Armed Services Committee, was being sent to its death.

Observers are certain that if that committee ever reports the proposal out — which is regarded as unlikely — it will report it unfavorably and will be sustained by the Senate.

'Substantial Influence' Seen

In the open debate, Mr. Fulbright argued as follows:

"The C.I.A. 'plays a major role in the foreign policy decision-making process' and thereby exerts 'a substantial influence on our relations with other nations.'"

"The C. I.A. has unusual advantages in exerting influence because it draws its conclusions

from its own data, which is often 'virtually unchallengeable.'"

"Although it is asserted that the C.I.A. is under 'close continuous supervision' of the National Security Council and initiates no activity except on order of the council, the fact is that the council met last May 9 for the first time since July, 1965, and the former machinery of the council 'has atrophied to the point of nonexistence.'"

"It is imperative, in this situation, that the Senate 'know enough about the C.I.A.'s activities to be able to offer its own suggestions,' and the Foreign Relations Committee, as the committee with jurisdiction in foreign affairs, has 'a basic constitutional responsibility' to be informed of C.I.A. operations."

Russell Fears 'Leaks'

After complaining of the procedure by which the resolution came to the floor, Senator Russell turned to the substance of the issue.

He argued that the Foreign Relations Committee could have as much information from the director of the C.I.A. as did his subcommittee, provided that it did not insist on learning of the "methods and sources" by which the C.I.A. gathered its information.

He then proceeded, however, to oppose enlargement of the number of Senators receiving information because of the danger of "leaks."

"Any time you add one member to the subcommittee, you increase the chance of leaks," he said.

The voices of Senator Russell and the Arkansas Democrat rose as the exchanges grew sharper until finally the two Senators got down to what many of their colleagues regarded as the real substance of the matter—the power complex of the Senate. Senator Russell was defending his power base against Senator Fulbright's challenge to it.

Mr. Fulbright said his committee was not seeking to displace the Russell subcommittee but only to be a part of a new committee, as, he contended, it had a right to do.

"I'm not trying to muscle in on the Senator's committee," Mr. Russell snapped, "I'm trying to keep him from muscling in on my committee."

After the closed session, Senators declined to divulge details of the debate beyond saying that much of it, at least at the outset, was of the procedural question.

Roll-Call Vote in Senate On Control of C.I.A.

WASHINGTON, July 14, (AP)—Following is the roll-call vote by which the Senate agreed today to send a new proposal for supervising the Central Intelligence Agency to the Senate Armed Services Committee, where it is expected to die.

FOR THE MOTION—61

Democrats—36

Barilleit (Alaska)	Lausche (Ohio)
Bayh (Ind.)	Long (Mo.)
Bible (Nev.)	Long (La.)
Brewster (Md.)	Magnuson (Wash.)
Byrd (Va.)	McIntyre (N. H.)
Byrd (W. Va.)	McClellan (Ark.)
Cannon (Nev.)	Montoya (N. M.)
Douglas (Ill.)	Neuberger (Ore.)
Eastland (Miss.)	Pastore (R. I.)
Elliander (La.)	Randolph (W. Va.)
Ervin (N. C.)	Ribicoff (Conn.)
Harris (Okla.)	Robertson (Va.)
Hayden (Ariz.)	Russell (S. C.)
Hill (Ala.)	Russell (Ga.)
Holland (Fla.)	Stennis (Miss.)
Inouye (Hawaii)	Symington (Mo.)
Jackson (Wash.)	Talmadge (Ga.)
Jordan (N. C.)	

Republicans—25

Tydings (Md.)	Kuchel (Calif.)
Allott (Colo.)	Miller (Iowa)
Bennett (Utah)	Morton (Ky.)
Carlson (Kan.)	Mundt (S. D.)
Cooper (Ky.)	Murphy (Calif.)
Coffey (N. H.)	Pearson (Kan.)
Curtis (Neb.)	Prouty (Vt.)
Dirksen (Ill.)	Saltonstall (Mass.)
Dominkick (Colo.)	Simpson (Wyo.)
Fannin (Ariz.)	Smith (Me.)
Hickenlooper (Iowa)	Thurmond (S. C.)
Hruska (Neb.)	Tower (Tex.)
Jordan (Idaho)	Young (N. D.)

AGAINST THE MOTION—28

Democrats—21

Burdick (N. D.)	Mondale (Minn.)
Church (Idaho)	Monroney (Okla.)
Fulbright (Ark.)	Morse (Ore.)
Gore (Tenn.)	Moss (Utah)
Hart (Mich.)	Muskie (Me.)
Hartke (Ind.)	Pell (R. I.)
Kennedy (Mass.)	Proxmire (Wis.)
Kennedy (N. Y.)	Williams (N. J.)
McCarthy (Minn.)	Yarborough (Tex.)
McGovern (S. D.)	Young (Ohio)
Metcalf (Mont.)	

Republicans—7

Aiken (Vt.)	Griffin (Mich.)
Boggs (Del.)	Javits (N. Y.)
Case (N. J.)	Williams (Del.)
Fong (Hawaii)	

Not voting but paired: Anderson (D.-N. M.) for and Nelson (D.-Wis.) against; Smathers (D.-Fla.) for an Mansfield (D.-Mont.) against.