

Shultz Assails Nicaragua in Asking Aid for Rebels

By DAVID K. SHIPLER

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Feb. 27 — Denouncing the Nicaraguan Government as "a cancer, right here on our land mass," Secretary of State George P. Shultz faced a skeptical Senate Foreign Relations Committee today as he urged approval of President Reagan's request for \$100 million to help the Nicaraguan rebels.

The authorization would include \$70 million in military and \$30 million in nonlethal aid to the guerrillas, known as contras. Congress cut off covert military aid to the rebels in 1984 and approved \$27 million in the current fiscal year for food, medical supplies and other nonlethal support.

Under close questioning by dubious senators, Mr. Shultz conceded that only \$18 million of that had been spent so far, mainly because of resistance by Honduras to its territory being used as a conduit for supplies.

He also painted a vivid picture of the Government in Managua subverting neighboring Latin American countries with extensive Soviet and Cuban support.

Presenting a map of the region, he asserted that arms from Nicaragua had been discovered in the hands of insurgents and terrorists in Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica and Colombia. Nicaragua had provided military training to guerrillas operating in Venezuela, Brazil, Ecuador, Uruguay and Chile, he said, and safe haven to radicals from Bolivia and Argentina.

'On the Right Side'

"It has tried to spread itself around in a fundamentally evil way," Mr. Shultz said of the Nicaraguan Government. "There is incontrovertible proof that the Nicaraguan Government is involved in drug trafficking," he added, but did not provide the evidence.

"We're for the good guys," the Secretary asserted. "We're on the right side in this issue. I know who the good guys and the bad guys are."

At the White House, President Reagan, who was applauded today by a bipartisan group of Congressional leaders for his handling of the Philippines crisis, told the group that the successful transition to democracy in this instance reinforced the need for Congress to approve increased aid for the Nicaraguan rebels.

According to Larry Speakes, the White House spokesman, Mr. Reagan told the legislators that "several parallels" existed between the Philippines and Nicaragua.

"We can ignore the fraudulent elections Ortega had," Mr. Speakes quoted Mr. Reagan as having said in reference to President Daniel Ortega Saavedra of Nicaragua. "We can ignore the repression and we can ignore the subversion, terrorism and drug trafficking. But if we ignore it in Nicaragua and don't deal with it now, when will we deal with it?"

The spokesman said that Mr. Reagan had added that the most important par-

allel between the two cases was that "we stood for democracy in the Philippines; we have to stand for democracy in Nicaragua and throughout Central America and in our own hemisphere."

Mr. Shultz's appearance came as a Nicaraguan official told reporters in Managua that the aid request was a "slap in the face" to Latin America that could force Nicaragua to seek more military aid from abroad.

"Reagan persists stubbornly in his war policy, aimed at increasing tension in Central America and inflaming an already serious crisis," United Press International quoted Acting Foreign Minister Victor Hugo Tinoco as having said.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Richard G. Lugar, Republican of Indiana, endorsed the Administration's basic objectives without committing himself on the specific aid request.

Other committee members who support aid to the contras had some hard questions. They asked whether the effort would really work, whether it had the realistic potential of either overthrowing the Sandinistas or pressing them into negotiations.

'Simplistic' Views Criticized

The neat juxtaposition between good and evil was challenged by Senator Christopher J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut.

"We've had the President and others calling the contras Jeffersonian democrats, and we've had others referring to the Sandinistas as some new order of Franciscan monks," he said. "Frankly, both observations are terribly simplistic, and I think it makes it more difficult to really trying to come up with intelligent solutions to this problem."

Mr. Dodd recalled President Reagan's saying in 1984 that if former President Ferdinand E. Marcos were not supported in the Philippines, the alternative would be Communism. "I'd hate to think we've reached a conclusion in Central America that the only choice here is between the contras and the Sandinistas, and that we have abandoned our creativity."

Secretary Shultz conceded later that "good guys and bad guys" was an oversimplification. But he asserted passionately that support for the resistance had grown as the Sandinistas had eliminated individual liberties inside Nicaragua.

'It's Not a Flip Subject'

He reacted sharply when Senator Daniel J. Evans, Republican of Washington, made fun of a chart, presented by State Department aides, showing the armed resistance growing, even in the two years after a cutoff of United States military aid. "I calculate that after about three more years of no aid, the armed resistance will be considerably larger than the Nicaraguan military."

"Are you serious about that?" asked Mr. Shultz.

"No," Senator Evans replied.

"Or is that a flip comment? It's not a

flip subject," Mr. Shultz declared. "It's a very serious subject. And the point is, there would be more people on this chart if we gave them some support, if they had some shoes to wear and some uniforms to wear and some medical supplies!" The Secretary was pounding the table, nearly shouting.

"These are people who are trying to attain freedom and independence in their country! And we have to consider whether or not we're going to step in behind them and help them. That's what this is about. Right here on our doorstep!"

STAT