

NYTimes
**HOUSE, 246 TO 162,
BARS \$327-MILLION
FOR REFUGEES' AID**

MAY 2 1975

**Opposes Authorization for
Troops in Evacuation as
Exiles Rise to 84,000**

PRESIDENT IS REGRETFUL

**Says Vote Reflects Fear
and Is Not Worthy of a
'Nation of Immigrants'**

By **DAVID BINDER**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, May 1—The House of Representatives overwhelmingly rejected today a bill that would have authorized \$327-million in aid for Vietnamese refugees as the Administration reported that the number of those refugees had swelled by 10,000 to 84,000.

The vote came at noon after a last-minute appeal by President Ford for passage of the authorization had been read to the House and after an hour of often impassioned debate.

There were 246 against and 162 for the authorization that had emerged from a Senate-House conference last weekend.

President Ford later issued a statement saying he was saddened and disappointed by the vote, adding: "This action does not reflect the values we cherish as a nation of immigrants. It is not worthy of a people which has lived by the philosophy symbolized in the Statue of Liberty."

Says it 'Reflects Fear

"It reflects fear and misunderstanding rather than charity and compassion."

He asked for new aid legislation as soon as possible.

A new bill for refugee aid

without clauses on the use of troops is expected to be drafted after hearings.

The bill, drafted before the conclusion of the removal of thousands of American citizens and scores of thousands of South Vietnamese from the region around Saigon, would have authorized Mr. Ford to use combat troops to implement the evacuation.

This portion of the bill caused the largest amount of opposition, although other motives for antagonism were evident.

In his letter to Speaker Carl Albert, President Ford said, "The Congress may be assured that I do not intend to send the armed forces of the United States back into Vietnamese territory."

'Urgent Need'

But he added that "in view of the urgent need for funds to pay for humanitarian assistance and transportation of refugees" the bill was the quickest way to get assistance for them.

"Why should we risk it?" demanded Bella S. Abzug, New York Democrat, in reference to the combat troop authorization.

Phillip Burton, California Democrat, reminded the House that in 1964 President Johnson, "an honorable man," also asked for troop use authority and then had gone ahead and implemented it. "It is a mindless act," he said. "Let us reject it."

Other Congressmen echoed Senator Jacob K. Javits, New York Republican, in pointing out that the authorization would have set a precedent by codifying the role of Congress in sharing with the President the process of making decisions about the use of American troops overseas.

Elizabeth Holtzman, Democrat of Brooklyn, asked with heavy sarcasm whether "this bill is urgently needed to transport President Thieu and Pre-

Continued on Page 17, Column 7

Continued From Page 1, Col. 8

mier Ky and his wife" to the United States.

Urging rejection, Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., of Massachusetts, the majority leader, and Donald W. Riegle Jr., Democrat of Michigan, called for "a clean bill" as a substitute for the authorization.

Afterward, Thomas E. Morgan, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who had managed the bill, complained, "I never in 30 years in Congress saw a majority leader oppose a committee chairman."

Representative Morgan was described by colleagues as being extremely angry with Representative O'Neill over his opposition.

"This kills it deader than hell," he said. "We can't even appropriate money already authorized. We'll have to start from scratch, get the facts up from the Administration. I think the liberals in there, bleeding and screaming, surrendered. This was the first moment to establish Congress's right to limit troops on the war powers act. I don't think another opportunity will come for years."

Cheers went up and applause spread across the House as it became apparent on electro-

nic tabulators after 14 minutes of voting that the bill would be crushingly defeated.

When the final vote was announced a minute later there was louder clapping and cheering. "This is a great day," said Mrs. Abzug.

Without the authorization the United States Government must go on transporting and resettling refugees from Vietnam on credit, Robert Anderson, the State Department spokesman, said at his noon briefing for newsmen.

5,100 Americans

He estimated that the number of evacuees from South Vietnam had risen to "roughly about 84,000" as of 6 A.M. Eastern Daylight time. This includes about 5,100 Americans, he said, as well as an undetermined number of citizens of other countries.

Mr. Anderson said United States troops ventured out into coastal waters today, bringing the total rescued by sea in the last three days to 32,000.

Mr. Anderson said the Administration now calculated that there were more than 76,000 South Vietnamese in various stages of evacuation and resettlement. They are strung out between U Taphao air base in Thailand, where there were 2,100 Vietnamese refugees yesterday; Guam, where there are more than 30,000, and Travis Air Force Base and Camp Pendleton in California, where 2,100 have arrived.

Most of these Vietnamese will eventually settle in the United States, he predicted, although the United States is in touch with a number of other countries that have expressed an interest in resettling some of the refugees.

No Estimate of Cost

Asked if more evacuation actions were contemplated, Mr. Anderson said, "It's over. It was successful. Thank God."

But he was unable to give an estimate of how much money the Government had spent on transporting and resettling refugees.

Yesterday, Administration officials said the cost of handling the refugees for the first six months might come to \$400-million. The cost of feeding and housing a single refugee for a day in the Pacific was earlier estimated to be about \$15.

Asked about objections from several American communities to an influx of Vietnamese, Mr. Anderson paused, reddened and replied, "My answer may not be too appropriate."

He then referred reporters to a printed statement that said:

"The United States historically has opened its doors to distressed refugees. In recent years it has settled Hungarians, Ugandans and Cubans. In doing so it has followed its own traditions and general international practice."

The State Department also disclosed that it had halted all shipments of American supplies to South Vietnam after transferring ownership of those goods consigned to Vietnam to the Agency for International Development.

Much of the fertilizer, machinery, steel, chemicals and wheat destined for Vietnam and Cambodia before the fall of Phnom Penh and Saigon has been unloaded in Singapore, Bangkok and Hong Kong, the department said.