

**The original documents are located in Box 26, folder “Vetoed - General” of the Loen and Leppert Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

ACTION

August 14, 1974

**MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT**

**FROM:** William E. Timmons  
**SUBJECT:** Pocket Vetoes

Congress is planning a summer break recess from August 22nd to September 11th for the House and August 23rd to September 4th for Senate.

You will undoubtedly receive a number of bills just prior to the recess providing you with a pocket veto option since the 10-day requirement could fall in that period.

However, I strongly recommend against pocket vetoes. If you agree, I suggest Timmons be authorized to request the bipartisan leadership to hold measures which you may veto until they return in September and clear only those bills which you clearly will sign.

**TELL LEADERS TO HOLD OBJECTIONABLE BILLS \_\_\_\_\_.**

**I MAY EXERCISE POCKET VETO \_\_\_\_\_.**

**SEE ME \_\_\_\_\_.**



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 15, 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR:

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS

THRU:

MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF *M.L.F.*

FROM:

VERN LOEN *VL*

SUBJECT:

Veto of H. R. 11873,  
Animal Health Research

Rep. John Melcher, D-Mont. who literally shoved this bill through subcommittee and full Agriculture Committee, was livid about the veto, but could not argue with the reasons behind it. Rep. Bill Scherle, R-Iowa another strong backer of the bill, accepted the veto in good grace, said he agreed with every reason listed and urged the President to continue the same policy toward inflationary measures, particularly arts and humanities.

Rep. Bill Wampler, R-Va. ranking on Agriculture, was not upset.

Melcher said there would be no attempt to override the veto, but was trying to reach the President by telephoning this morning in the belief that today was the final day for decision on the bill.

cc: N. Ross  
F. Zarb

*B.T. — Poage says no veto  
override will be  
attempted. — May f.*



*Seen for comment*

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

August 13, 1974

*Coampter  
Hyde Murray*

MEMORANDUM FOR ~~BILL TIMMONS~~

~~FROM:~~

*→* JIM CAVANAUGH *[initials]*

SUBJECT:

VETO OF ANIMAL HEALTH RESEARCH BILL

The last date for action is Wednesday not today as Dave Gergen states. However, we would like your reaction as soon as possible.

*Thanks!*

*VETO!*

*B1*



THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 13, 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: WARREN HENDRICKS  
FROM: DAVE GERGEN  
SUBJECT: Veto of Animal Health Research Bill

We were notified this afternoon that the President would veto this bill. As you know, the last day for action is today. In view of the time pressures, I would urge that you quickly circulate this revised version of the statement among all principals, including Cavanaugh, Duval and Timmons. (I can be reached in the East Room from 4-5 p.m.)

cc: Jerry Jones

(Coyne)DG

August 13, 1974

VETO STATEMENT -- ENROLLED BILL H.R. 11873 - ANIMAL  
HEALTH RESEARCH

I am returning today without my approval H. R. 11873, an act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and assist States in carrying out programs of animal health research.

I believe, as do proponents of this bill, that veterinary research has helped to make American livestock the healthiest and most productive in the world. We must continue to maintain high standards of research.

But I also believe that this bill adds little to the existing programs of the Department of Agriculture and other agencies.

We are presently spending over \$40 million on programs involving animal health research, and nearly every land grant college and college of veterinary medicine in the United States is participating in these programs.

This bill, however, would establish a new categorical grant program that would require the expenditure of an additional \$47 million annually and would be duplicative of many programs that already exist. The overlapping would be especially true of programs in fish and shellfish research and predator control.

In addition, this bill would allocate substantial portions of the proposed grants simply on the basis of the value of domestic livestock and poultry production in a given State, rather than on the basis of the research capability of an institution within that State.

Because this bill would further strain the Federal budget without significantly meeting national needs and would only add to inflationary pressures within the economy, I feel that I must withhold my approval. I intend, however, to work with the Congress to develop a truly comprehensive, non-inflationary program of animal health research that will make maximum use of Federal resources in the most effective manner.

# # #

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

August 16, 1974

RECOMMENDED TELEPHONE CALL

TO: Representative John Melcher (D-Mont)

PURPOSE: To return Congressman Melcher's phone call concerning the veto of the Animal Health Research Bill, H.R. 11873.

VIA: William E. Timmons

RECOMMENDED BY: Max L. Friedersdorf *m.f.*

BACKGROUND:

1. Congressman Melcher, a sponsor of H.R. 11873, called Thursday morning, August 15, 1974, for the President to express objection to the veto.
2. Melcher had spoken with the Congressional Relations staff several times Thursday to voice his objections to a veto.
3. Melcher was concerned the President was not aware of the support by land grant colleges and veterinarian-related lobbies for the bill.
4. Staff explained that the President was taking all views into consideration before making a decision.

TALKING POINTS:

1. John, I know you were a sponsor of this bill, and believed it should be signed.
2. There are many good programs that would be desirable if we did not have inflationary pressures to worry about.
3. My veto was based on the duplication and overlapping resulting from another expensive (\$47 million) categorical program.
4. I hope you will help me in this fight against inflation, and your indication that no override attempt will be made is genuinely appreciated.



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

August 23, 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: PHIL BUCHEN

Subject: Pocket Vetoes

With the Senate adjourned from August 22 through September 4 and the House adjourned from August 22 through September 11, the question of the availability of the pocket veto has been raised. As you know, the Constitution provides in Art. I, Sec. 7, Clause 2 that if the President does not return a bill to the Congress within ten days from its delivery to him, then that bill shall not become law if "the Congress by their Adjournment prevents its Return." The pocket veto, of course, cannot be overridden.

The very recent case of Kennedy v. Sampson in the D.C. Court of Appeals has interpreted the meaning of adjournment and, although the question of seeking certiorari has not yet been decided, this case ought to be considered should the President wish to veto legislation during this or any other period of extended congressional absence.

In a word, the Court of Appeals held that a short absence (five days) is not an adjournment for pocket veto purposes. Thus the failure of the President to act on the family practice of medicine bill within ten days had the effect of approving that legislation rather than pocket vetoing it because the court said there had been no adjournment. Whether the Kennedy holding would be stretched to a significantly longer recess, as we have presently, is uncertain. I have discussed this matter with several key people at Justice who suspect that if a pocket veto were challenged, the Kennedy case would likely be expanded to cover the present circumstances.

While we all want to assure that the President's silence won't have the effect of approving legislation when his intent is to kill it by pocket veto

COPY FOR MR. TIMMONS

(as occurred to President Nixon in Kennedy), at the same time it would be unfortunate to set a precedent of using ordinary veto procedures when a pocket veto may well be appropriate. Such a course might add some weight to the argument that a lengthy recess, such as the present one, is in the Executive's mind the same as the brief recess in Kennedy.

I would recommend, therefore, that the President (should he decide to disapprove any bill) use the ordinary veto procedure but in the accompanying veto message emphasize his position that by the use of an affirmative veto he does not suggest that the pocket veto is inappropriate; rather, he takes such a course in order to set forth his views openly to the Congress and, in the spirit of shared power, give them the opportunity to override his veto.

[(Signed)] Stanley Ebner

Stanley Ebner  
General Counsel

October 11, 1974

**MEMORANDUM FOR: DONALD RUMSFELD**  
**FROM: WILLIAM E. TIMMONS**  
**SUBJECT: Vetoes**

**The President has deferred until tomorrow his decision on several bills that are possible vetoes.**

**I believe it is essential that Ash, Cole, Scowcroft, Buchen and I meet with him to review the merits of the several issues. The President must understand fully the pros and cons of each.**

**Perhaps we could get together late today on this.**

10/12/74 Mtg. held at 9:30 a.m. - Dick Cheney also present. sjh



veto  
file

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

November 27, 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR:

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS

THRU:

MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF

FROM: ~~MAX~~

VERN LOEN

SUBJECT:

H.R. 6191, Zinc Duties Veto

Doug Bennett of Treasury says Herm Schneebeli is furious about this veto and will do everything he can to over-ride. It comes up next Tuesday after GI benefits veto.

Apparently it was Schneebeli's amendment adopted by the conferees that caused the veto. It would give a "double dip" to Hurricane Agnes victims in Pennsylvania and West Virginia and cost \$130 million.

These victims could deduct from taxable income casualty losses suffered in the flooding. Schneebeli's amendment would permit them to escape taxation also on any income from tort compensation or the \$5,000 disaster loan forgiveness feature.

In addition to giving preferential tax treatment to a select group, this amendment would seem to exceed the scope of the conference, but the issue was not addressed squarely in debate on the conference report, which, incidentally, received final Senate passage on October 15, but was not sent to the White House until November 19. Fear of pocket veto, no doubt.

Treasury sort of let itself get rolled on this and now is fearful of fighting Schneebeli because of his Ways and Means clout. Treasury will provide fact sheets, background, etc., but looks like we'll have to do all the work to spare the President from having both vetoes over-ridden next Tuesday.



NOVEMBER 26, 1974

## Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I am returning without my approval H.R. 6191, "To amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to provide that certain forms of zinc be admitted free of duty, and for other purposes."

This bill would suspend until June 30, 1977, the present duties on zinc ores and concentrates and zinc-bearing materials.

Unfortunately, the Congress attached to this desirable provision unacceptable tax riders which would grant windfall benefits to individuals already compensated for property losses resulting from certain disasters in 1972. Moreover, the most costly of these riders was added by the conference committee; and the significance of this rider was not explored during adoption of the conference report by the two houses.

Under current tax law, individuals are generally permitted to deduct casualty losses not otherwise compensated for by insurance, tort compensation, loan forgiveness, or other means. If individuals choose to deduct these losses, however, and are subsequently reimbursed, the reimbursement must be included as income in subsequent tax returns. Otherwise, the individual could receive a tax break for a loss that had not cost him anything.

H.R. 6191 would provide unwarranted and costly exceptions to the present law by allowing certain taxpayers who have already deducted their casualty losses to also exclude from taxable income any amounts received from tort compensation or Federal loan cancellations based on those losses. The cost of these benefits to the Government in terms of revenue loss would be about \$130 million.

This would result in favored treatment for a select group of taxpayers relative to others with identical or even larger casualty losses. The individuals benefiting from this bill have already been treated more generously by the Federal Government than the present, more equitable law would allow. Finally, this special tax consideration resulting in a windfall to a limited group of taxpayers would be a very undesirable precedent.

If the Congress were to reenact this bill without the undesirable tax riders, I would be glad to approve it.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE,

November 26, 1974.

# # # #





File

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

January 13, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: MAX FRIEDERSDORF  
FROM: BOB WOLTHUIS

The U.S. Chamber in cooperation with several industry groups, has put together a list of legislative opportunity districts designed to assist in the event of veto override votes. From their own personnel they have assembled a list of the Senate and House people whom they think are swing votes in a general sense.

I would appreciate it if you would look at the list at your convenience (not too long of a delay) and give me your input regarding additions or deletions. This is a project that has Jack Marsh's blessing.

cc: Loen  
Kendall  
Bennett ✓  
Leppert  
O'Donnell



LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTS

House of Representatives

94th Congress

January 7, 1975

\*Selected new members of Congress appear on this list pending establishment of Congressional voting record.

LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTS

House of Representatives

94th Congress

Northeastern Division

Maine

1 \*David Emery (R)

New Hampshire

1 \*Norman D'Amours (D)

New Jersey

2 \*William Hughes (D)

5 \*Millicent Fenwick (R)

6 Edwin Forsythe (R)

13 \*Helen Meyner (D)

New York

9 James Delaney (D)

23 Peter Peyser (R)

25 Hamilton Fish, Jr. (R)

27 \*Matthew McHugh (D)

33 William Walsh (R)

34 Frank Horton (R)

Pennsylvania

5 \*Richard Schulze (R)

12 John Murtha (D)

13 Lawrence Coughlin (R)

18 H. John Heinz III (R)

19 \*William Goodling (R)

25 \*Gary Myers (R)

Vermont

AL \*James Jeffords (R)



LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTSHouse of Representatives94th CongressSoutheastern DivisionAlabama

4	Tom Bevill (D)
5	Bob Jones (D)
7	Walter Flowers (D)

Florida

1	Robert Sikes (D)
3	Charles Bennett (D)
5	*Judge Richard Kelly (R)
8	James Haley (D)
11	Paul Rogers (D)

Georgia

1	Bo Ginn (D)
4	*Elliott Levitas (D)

Maryland

6	Goodloe Byron (D)
---	-------------------

North Carolina

8	*Bill Hefner (D)
---	------------------

South Carolina

1	Mendel Davis (D)
3	*Butler Derrick (D)
5	*Kenneth Holland (D)
6	*John Jenrette, Jr. (D)

Tennessee

3	*Marilyn Lloyd (D)
7	Ed Jones (D)

Virginia

1	Thomas Downing (D)
5	Dan Daniel (D)

LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTS

January 7, 1975

House of Representatives94th CongressNorthern Central DivisionIllinois

6	*Henry Hyde (R)
15	*Tim Hall (D)
22	George Shipley (D)

Indiana

2	*Floyd Fithian (D)
4	J. Edward Roush (D)
6	*David Evans (D)
8	*Philip Hayes (D)

Kentucky

1	*Carroll Hubbard, Jr. (D)
2	William Natcher (D)
3	Romano Mazzoli (D)
6	John Breckinridge (D)

Michigan

2	Marvin Esch (R)
5	Richard VanderVeen (D)
6	*Bob Carr (D)
8	Bob Traxler (D)
11	Philip Ruppe (R)
14	Lucien Nedzi (D)
17	*William Brodhead (D)
18	*James Blanchard (D)

Ohio

1	*Willis Gradison, Jr. (R)
6	William Harsha (R)
8	*Thomas Kindness (R)
11	*J. Wm. Stanton (R)
13	Charles Mosher (R)
16	Ralph Regula (R)

Wisconsin

1	Les Aspin (D)
3	*Alvin Baldus (D)
4	Clement Zablocki (D)
7	David Obey (D)
9	*Robert Kasten, Jr. (R)

January 7, 197

LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTS

House of Representatives

94th Congress

Southwestern Division

Louisiana

6

\*W. Henson Moore (R)

8

Gillis Long (D)

Missouri

4

Bill Randall (D)

6

Jerry Litton (D)

8

Richard Ichord (D)

New Mexico

2

Harold Runnels (D)

Oklahoma

1

James Jones (D)

6

\*Glenn English (D)

Texas

5

Alan Steelman (R)

10

Jake Pickle (D)

12

James Wright, Jr. (D)

21

\*Bob Krueger (D)

LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTS

House of Representatives

94th Congress

Northwestern Division

Iowa

3	*Charles Grassley (R)
4	Neal Smith (D)
6	*Berkley Bedell (D)

Minnesota

1	Albert Quie (R)
2	*Tom Hagedorn (R)
3	Bill Frenzel (R)

Nebraska

1	Charles Thone (R)
3	*Virginia Smith (R)
2	John McCollister (R)

North Dakota

AL	Mark Andrews (R)
----	------------------

South Dakota

1	*Larry Pressler (R)
---	---------------------

LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTS

January 7, 19

House of Representatives

94th Congress

Western Division

Alaska

AL

Don Young (R)

California

1

Harold Johnson (D)

11

Leo Ryan (D)

12

Pete McCloskey, Jr. (R)

15

B. F. Sisk (D)

27

Alphonzo Bell (R)

Idaho

2

\*George Hansen (R)

Oregon

3

\*Robert Duncan (D)

Washington

1

Joel Pritchard (R)

BUSINESS/CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS +

and

House of Representatives

94th Congress

January 7, 1975

- + Business/Conservative classification results when ACA rating is above 50 and COPE rating is below 50.
- \* Newly elected members classified Business/Conservative as a result of campaign statements and/or state legislative records.

BUSINESS/CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS

and

House of Representatives

Northeastern Division

Delaware

AL

Pierre du Pont (R)

New Hampshire

2

James Cleveland (R)

New York

4

Norman Lent (R)

5

John Wydler (R)

30

Robert McEwen (R)

31

Donald Mitchell (R)

35

Barber Conable, Jr. (R)

38

Jack Kemp (R)

39

James Hastings (R)

Pennsylvania

9

E. G. Shuster (R)

16

Edwin Eshleman (R)

17

Herman Scheebeli (R)

23

Albert Johnson (R)

BUSINESS/CONSERVATIVE MEMBERSandHouse of Representatives94th CongressSoutheastern DivisionAlabama

1

Jack Edwards (R)

2

Bill Dickinson (R)

3

Bill Nichols (D)

6

John Buchanan, Jr. (R)

Florida

2

Don Fuqua (D)

6

C. W. Young (R)

9

Louis Frey, Jr. (R)

10

Skip Bafalis (R)

12

J. Herbert Burke (R)

Georgia

2

Dawson Mathis (D)

3

Jack Brinkley (D)

6

John Flynt, Jr. (D)

7

\*Larry McDonald (D)

8

Bill Stuckey, Jr. (D)

9

Phil Landrum (D)

10

Robert Stephens, Jr. (D)

Maryland

1

Robert Bauman (R)

4

Marjorie Holt (R)

Mississippi

1

Jamie Whitten (D)

2

David Bowen (D)

3

Sonny Montgomery (D)

4

Thad Cochran (R)

5

Trent Lott (R)



Southeastern Division (cont.)

North Carolina

1	Walter Jones (D)
2	L. Fountain (D)
3	David Henderson (D)
9	James Martin (R)
10	Jim Broyhill (R)
11	Roy Taylor (D)

South Carolina

2	Floyd Spence (R)
4	James Mann (D)

Tennessee

1	James Quillen (R)
2	John Duncan (R)
6	Robin Beard (R)

Virginia

2	G. Wm. Whitehurst (R)
4	Robert Daniel, Jr. (R)
6	M. Caldwell Butler (R)
7	J. Kenneth Robinson (R)
9	Wm. Wampler (R)

BUSINESS/CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS

and

House of Representatives

94th Congress

Northern Central Division

Illinois

4	Edward Derwinski (R)
12	Philip Crane (R)
13	Robert McClory (R)
14	John Erlenborn (R)
16	John Anderson (R)
17	George O'Brien (R)
18	Robert Michel (R)
19	Tom Railsback (R)
20	Paul Findley (R)
21	Edward Madigan (R)

Indiana

5	Edwood Hillis (R)
7	John Myers (R)

Kentucky

4	Marion G. Snyder (R)
5	Tim Lee Carter (R)

Michigan

3	Garry Brown (R)
4	Edward Hutchinson (R)
9	Guy Vander Jagt (R)
10	Elford Cederberg (R)
19	William Broomfield (R)

Northern Central Division (cont.)

Ohio

2

Donald Clancy (R)

4

Tennyson Guyer (R)

5

Delbert Latta (R)

7

Clarence Brown (R)

10

Clarence Miller (R)

12

Samuel Devine (R)

15

Chalmers Wylie (R)

17

John Ashbrook (R)

Wisconsin

6

William Steiger (R)

BUSINESS/CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS

and

House of Representatives

Northwestern Division

South Dakota

2

James Abdnor (R)

BUSINESS/CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS

and

House of Representatives

Southwestern Division

Arkansas

3

John P. Hammerschmidt (R)

Colorado

4

Jim Johnson (R)

5

William Armstrong (R)

Kansas

1

Keith Sebelius (R)

3

Larry Winn, Jr. (R)

4

Garner Shriver (R)

5

Joe Skubitz (R)

Louisiana

1

F. Edward Herbert (D)

3

David Treen (R)

4

Joe Waggonner (D)

5

Otto Passman (D)

Missouri

7

Gene Taylor (R)

New Mexico

1

Manual Lujan, Jr. (R)

Oklahoma

5

John Jarman (D)

Texas

3

James Collins (R)

4

Ray Roberts (D)

6

Olin Teague (D)

7

Bill Archer (R)

11

Bob Poage (D)

13

\*Jack Hightower (D)

17

Omar Burleson (D)

Southwestern Division (cont.)

Texas (cont.)

19

George Mahon (D)

22

Bob Casey (D)

24

Dale Milford (D)

BUSINESS/CONSERVATIVE MEMBERS

and

House of Representatives

Western Division

Arizona

1	John Rhodes (R)
3	Sam Steiger (R)
4	John Conlan (R)

California

2	Don Clausen (R)
16	Burt Talcott (R)
18	William Ketchum (R)
19	Robert Lagomarsino (R)
20	Barry Goldwater, Jr. (R)
22	Carlos Moorhead (R)
26	John Rosselot (R)
33	Del Clawson (R)
37	Jerry Pettis (R)
39	Charles Wiggins (R)
40	Andrew Hinshaw (R)
41	Bob Wilson (R)
43	Clair Burgener (R)

Idaho

1	Steven Symms (R)
---	------------------

January 2, 1975

LEGISLATIVE OPPORTUNITY DISTRICTS

Senate

94th Congress

	<u>Business/Conservative</u>	<u>Swing</u>	<u>Labor/Liberal</u>
<u>ALABAMA</u>	James Allen (D)		John Sparkman (D)
<u>ALASKA</u>			Mike Gravel (D) Ted Stevens (R)
<u>ARIZONA</u>	Paul Fannin (R) Barry Goldwater (R)		
<u>ARKANSAS</u>			Dale Bumpers (D)
	John McClellan (D)		
<u>CALIFORNIA</u>			Alan Cranston (D) John Tunney (D)
<u>COLORADO</u>			Gary Hart (D) Floyd Haskell (D)
<u>CONNECTICUT</u>			Abraham Ribicoff (I)
	Lowell Weicker Jr. (R)		
<u>DELAWARE</u>			Joe Biden (D)
	William Roth Jr. (R)		
<u>FLORIDA</u>		Lawton Chiles (D) Richard Stone (D)	
<u>GEORGIA</u>	San Nunn (D) Herman Talmadge (D)		
<u>HAWAII</u>			Daniel Inouye (D) Hiram Fong (R)



	<u>Business/Conservative</u>	<u>Swing</u>	<u>Labor/Liberal</u>
<u>IDAHO</u>			Frank Church (D)
	James McClure (R)		
<u>ILLINOIS</u>			Adlai Stevenson III (D)
			Charles Percy (R)
<u>INDIANA</u>			Birch Bayh (D)
			Vance Hartke (D)
<u>IOWA</u>			Dick Clark (D)
			John Culver (D)
<u>KANSAS</u>	Robert Dole (R)		
	James Pearson (R)		
<u>KENTUCKY</u>			Wendell Ford (D)
			Walter Huddleston (D)
<u>LOUISIANA</u>		J. B. Johnston Jr. (D)	
			Russell Long (D)
<u>MAINE</u>			Wm. Hathaway (D)
			Edmund Muskie (D)
<u>MARYLAND</u>	J. Glenn Beall Jr. (R)		
<u>MASSACHUSETTS</u>			Charles Mathias (R)
			Edward Kennedy (D)
			Edward Brooke (R)
<u>MICHIGAN</u>			Philip Hart (D)
	Robert Griffin (R)		

<u>Business/Conservative</u>	<u>Swing</u>	<u>Labor/Liberal</u>
<u>MINNESOTA</u>		Hubert Humphrey (D) Walter Mondale (D)
<u>MISSISSIPPI</u>		
James Eastland (D)		
John Stennis (D)		
<u>MISSOURI</u>		Thomas Eagleton (D) Stuart Symington (I)
<u>MONTANA</u>		Mike Mansfield (D) Lee Metcalf (D)
<u>NEBRASKA</u>		
Carl Curtis (R)		
Roman Hruska (R)		
<u>NEVADA</u>		Howard Cannon (D)
Paul Laxalt (R)		
<u>NEW HAMPSHIRE</u>		Thomas McIntyre (D)
---	No Decision on November 5, 1974 Election ---	
<u>NEW JERSEY</u>		Harrison Williams (C) Clifford Case (R)
<u>NEW MEXICO</u>		Joseph Montoya (D)
Pete Domenici (R)		
<u>NEW YORK</u>		Jacob Javits (R)
James Buckley (C)		
<u>NORTH CAROLINA</u>		
Robert Morgan (D)		
Jesse Helms (R)		

<u>Business/Conservative</u>	<u>Swing</u>	<u>Labor/Liberal</u>
<u>NORTH DAKOTA</u>		Quentin Burdick (D)
Milton Young (R)		
<u>OHIO</u>		John Glenn (D)
Robert Taft Jr. (R)		
<u>OKLAHOMA</u>		
Dewey Bartlett (R)		
Henry Bellmon (R)		
<u>OREGON</u>		Mark Hatfield (R)
	Robert Packwood (R)	
<u>PENNSYLVANIA</u>		Richard Schweiker (R)
		Hugh Scott (R)
<u>RHODE ISLAND</u>		John Pastore (D)
		Clairborne Pell (D)
<u>SOUTH CAROLINA</u>		
Ernest Hollings (D)		
Strom Thurmond (R)		
<u>SOUTH DAKOTA</u>		James Abourezk (D)
		George McGovern (D)
<u>TENNESSEE</u>		
Howard Baker Jr. (R)		
Bill Brock (R)		
<u>TEXAS</u>		
	Lloyd Bentsen (D)	
John Tower (R)		
<u>UTAH</u>		Frank Moss (D)
Jake Garn (R)		

	<u>Business/Conservative</u>	<u>Swing</u>	<u>Labor/Liberal</u>
<u>VERMONT</u>	Patrick Leahy (D)		Robert Stafford (R)
<u>VIRGINIA</u>	Harry Byrd Jr. (I) William Scott (R)		
<u>WASHINGTON</u>			Henry Jackson (D) Warren Magnuson (D)
<u>WEST VIRGINIA</u>			Robert Byrd (D) Jennings Randolph (
<u>WISCONSIN</u>			Gaylord Nelson (D) William Proxmire (D)
<u>WYOMING</u>	Clifford Hansen (R)		Gale McGee (D)
 TOTAL	 <u>36</u>	 <u>6</u>	 <u>57</u>

# YEARS OF EXPIRATION OF SENATE TERMS

## 1976

(33 Senators: 31 Democrats, 10 Republicans, one Conservative, one Independent)

Beall, J. Glenn Jr. (R Md.)  
Bentsen, Lloyd (D Texas)  
Brock, Bill (R Tenn.)  
Buckley, James L. (Cons-R N.Y.)  
Burdick, Quentin N. (D N.D.)  
Byrd, Harry F. Jr. (Ind Va.)  
Byrd, Robert C. (D W. Va.)  
Cannon, Howard W. (D Nev.)  
Chiles, Lawton (D Fla.)  
Fannin, Paul J. (R Ariz.)  
Fong, Hiram L. (R Hawaii)

Hart, Philip A. (D Mich.)  
Hartke, Vance (D Ind.)  
Hruska, Roman L. (R Neb.)  
Humphrey, Hubert H. (D Minn.)  
Jackson, Henry M. (D Wash.)  
Kennedy, Edward M. (D Mass.)  
McGee, Gale W. (D Wyo.)  
Mansfield, Mike (D Mont.)  
Montoya, Joseph M. (D N.M.)  
Moss, Frank E. (D Utah)  
Muskie, Edmund S. (D Maine)

Pastore, John O. (D R.I.)  
Proxmire, William (D Wis.)  
Roth, William V. Jr. (R Del.)  
Scott, Hugh (R Pa.)  
Stafford, Robert T. (R Vt.)  
Stennis, John (D Miss.)  
Symington, Stuart (D Mo.)  
Taft, Robert Jr. (R Ohio)  
Tunney, John V. (D Calif.)  
Weicker, Lowell P. Jr. (R Conn.)  
Williams, Harrison A. Jr. (D N.J.)

## 1978

(33 Senators: 16 Democrats, 17 Republicans)

Abourezk, James (D S.D.)  
Baker, Howard H. Jr. (R Tenn.)  
Bartlett, Dewey F. (R Okla.)  
Biden, Joe (D Del.)  
Brooke, Edward W. (R Mass.)  
Case, Clifford P. (R N.J.)  
Clark, Dick (D Iowa)  
Curtis, Carl T. (R Neb.)  
Domenici, Pete V. (R N.M.)  
Eastland, James O. (D Miss.)  
Griffin, Robert P. (R Mich.)

Hansen, Clifford P. (R Wyo.)  
Haskell, Floyd K. (D Colo.)  
Hatfield, Mark O. (R Ore.)  
Hathaway, William D. (D Maine)  
Helms, Jesse A. (R N.C.)  
Huddleston, Walter (Dee) (D Ky.)  
Johnston, J. Bennett Jr. (D La.)  
McClellan, John L. (D Ark.)  
McClure, James A. (R Idaho)  
McIntyre, Thomas J. (D N.H.)  
Metcalf, Lee (D Mont.)

Mondale, Walter F. (D Minn.)  
Nunn, Sam (D Ga.)  
Pearson, James B. (R Kan.)  
Pell, Claiborne (D R.I.)  
Percy, Charles H. (R Ill.)  
Randolph, Jennings (D W. Va.)  
Scott, William Lloyd (R Va.)  
Sparkman, John (D Ala.)  
Stevens, Ted (D Alaska)  
Thurmond, Strom (R S.C.)  
Tower, John G. (R Texas)

## 1980

(34 Senators: 23 Democrats, 11 Republicans)

Allen, James B. (D Ala.)  
Bayh, Birch (D Ind.)  
Bellmon, Henry (R Okla.)  
Bumpers, Dale (D Ark.)  
Church, Frank (D Idaho)  
Cranston, Alan (D Calif.)  
Culver, John C. (D Iowa)  
Dole, Robert (R Kan.)  
Eagleton, Thomas F. (D Mo.)  
Ford, Wendell H. (D Ky.)  
Garn, E. J. (Jake) (R Utah)  
Glenn, John H. (D Ohio)

Goldwater, Barry (R Ariz.)  
Gravel, Mike (D Alaska)  
Hart, Gary W. (D Colo.)  
Hollings, Ernest F. (D S.C.)  
Inouye, Daniel K. (D Hawaii)  
Javits, Jacob K. (R N.Y.)  
Laxalt, Paul (R Nev.)  
Leahy, Patrick J. (D Vt.)  
Long, Russell B. (D La.)  
McGovern, George (D S.D.)  
Magnuson, Warren G. (D Wash.)

Mathias, Charles McC. Jr. (R Md.)  
Morgan, Robert B. (D N.C.)  
Nelson, Gaylord (D Wis.)  
Packwood, Robert W. (R Ore.)  
Ribicoff, Abraham (D Conn.)  
Schweiker, Richard S. (R Pa.)  
Stevenson, Adlai E. III (D Ill.)  
Stone, Richard (D Fla.)  
Talmadge, Herman E. (D Ga.)  
Wyman, Louis C. (R N.H.)  
Young, Milton R. (R N.D.)\*

\*Pending recount.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

April 11, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: MAX L. FRIEDERSDORF  
THRU: VERN LOEN *VL*  
FROM: DOUGLAS P. BENNETT *DPB*  
SUBJECT: Presidential Vetoes

On the general subject of veto signals, some of the Republican leaders have indicated to me that there will be considerable reluctance on their part to oppose some legislation based upon "horror stories" and veto threats emanating from the White House or the jurisdictional Executive Department. Barber Conable stated that in his view to gain the veto support we will need, veto signals will have to be clearer and come earlier. It strikes me that this will pose a serious problem to us in the future and of an imminent nature with regard to the bill, ready to clear the Ways and Means Committee, which provides health insurance for unemployed persons. In my view this bill will typify the sort of situation which will unfold. The only Administration guidance has been opposition to the concept not a constructive alternative approach. Even the Democrats on that Committee were looking for guidance from us and we were unable to give it other than by registering total opposition to the concept. I understand the policy rationale but, if vetoed, which seems to be the existing inclination, this employment/ unemployment/ jobs related legislation may be very difficult to sustain.

Perhaps, this is a matter the Domestic Council and OMB must deal with early in the legislative game so that positions may be formulated at the subcommittee and full committee levels. Our leaders on the committees need and want the help of the Executive Branch and, in my opinion, on some very important issues we have failed.

cc: Jack Marsh, Jim Cannon, Paul O'Neill, Charles Leppert,  
Bob Wolthuis

three approaches taken in the new law, the seven-member committee, which conducted an exhaustive 18-month study of the issue, came out flatly against spending limits.

Their basic argument is that spending limits raise far more troublesome questions of free speech and free expression than are involved with disclosure or ceilings on private contributions.

"We believe," says the committee report, "that effective expenditure limits require controls applicable to all spending, whether incurred by the candidate himself, or by individuals and groups beyond the candidate's control. In our view, limits on independent citizens and groups presents substantial legal questions because of their potential curtailment of First Amendment rights." The issue, very simply, is whether everyone's freedom of speech can be abridged by limits applied to candidates' spending.

The new federal law attempted to circumvent this problem by providing a "loophole," permitting any voter to spend \$1,000 on his or her own to advocate any candidate for federal office. But in the oral arguments before the appeals court, attorneys defending the law conceded that was the toughest provision to justify in constitutional terms.

The bar association committee strongly suggests that it can't be done. It concludes that "the more desirable way of limiting the influence of money in the electoral process with the minimum of interference with First Amendment rights" is through full disclosure of private contributions which are limited to "reasonable amounts." By that, the committee means sums "sufficiently high to permit meaningful expression of support and at the same time not so high as to afford the contributor undue influence or access."

The practical problems of expenditure limits are highlighted in a separate study circulated last week by Professor Roy A. Schotland of the Georgetown University Law School.

It questions "the fundamental soundness" of expenditure limits and raises interesting questions about the equity of the ceilings on Senate contests specified in the new law. Those limits are based on voting-age population, with a floor provided for small states.

The Schotland study argues that the limits hit small states—those with less than 2 million eligible voters—much harder than they do big states.

If the limits prescribed in the new law had been in effect in 1972 and 1974, Schotland says, 29 of 73 candidates in the smaller states would have broken the law, while only 8 of 58 candidates in the larger states would have exceeded their limits.

This does not necessarily prove that the limits are too high for the big states or too low for the small ones, as the professor argues. Special-interest groups of both the left and right have dumped money into small states in hopes of winning Senate seats for much less than it would cost them in any of the big states—a practice that could be curbed by contribution limits.

But his study does at least suggest that the impact of expenditure ceilings would be felt very unevenly from one state to the next. And that fact underlines the question of whether such ceilings are justified at all.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. MARTHA KEYS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1975

Mrs. KEYS. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, I missed a series of votes taken on amendments to H.R. 5900, the bill pro-

viding for equal treatment of craft and industrial workers. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: Rollcall No. 433—yes, rollcall No. 434—no, rollcall No. 435—yes, rollcall No. 436—no.

#### THE PRESIDENT IS NOT BELIEVED ON GASOLINE

#### HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1975

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Pittsburgh television station WTEA occasionally sends reporters and cameramen into the streets to determine how the grassroots public stands on certain major issues confronting the Nation.

The responses in such a survey recently on the new gasoline price increases were both disturbing and enlightening. Not one mini-interview broadcast supported the position of the Ford administration. Many of those questioned expressed doubts about the stories which the President and his aides are telling.

Most asserted that in their minds there was no gasoline shortage warranting price hikes—some quoting gas station operators on this point. The consensus appeared to be that the people were being ripped off to the profit of the giant oil companies. Blamed were both these companies and the White House.

Not a single interviewee had been convinced by the President that higher prices were necessary in the national interest, or that there was a justification for the sock-the-motorist program he had presented Congress.

This, in my judgment, is important because it shows the width of the communications gap which has opened between the President and his energy aides here and the people on the streets of Pittsburgh, and, I am sure, elsewhere across the Nation. The public in large part just does not believe the President. And this certainly concerns us here in Congress.

How can we back the Ford measures when so many of our constituents apparently think what is being forced in Washington is unwarranted, a gouge in fact, and a giant hoax? Can there be any wonder why Congress so far has failed, as have the people, to go along with the contradictions, the price boosts, the Ford import levies, and, indeed, the other absurdities of the White House proposals?

I am in no position to argue for or against the need for gasoline conservation. As with the folks at home, I have been furnished information on this matter so misleading as to make a sound decision impossible. But I can say this. If gasoline must be conserved—if we must reduce our dependency on import oil—then all other conservation measures should have been tried fully before prices were pushed up to a point where the necessary motorist is being punished severely and a new round of inflation threatens.

Edward M. Carey, owner of Carey Energy Corp., and brother of New York

Governor Hugh Carsey, perhaps summed up the situation best when he told Time magazine the other day:

I just don't understand why we argue with the Arabs to lower the price of oil and then go out and put a tax on it.

Millions of other Americans, I am sure, cannot understand this either. I am one of them. This Presidential contradiction has not been missed by those who were interviewed in Pittsburgh, as WTEA learned. The President and his taxes have brought on these new price increases and when his spokesmen have the audacity to say that, come next year's election, the voters will blame Congress and not him. Then, in my opinion, they are whistling past the gas pumps.

#### THE HARRIS SURVEY

#### HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1975

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable talk by some Members on the majority side to the effect that the American people are not appreciative of President Ford's use of his veto authority. In point of fact, the opposite is true. The people greatly appreciate the fact that the President and the Republican minority—by exercising the veto and sticking together on override attempts—have spared the Nation some truly bad legislation. What the people do not appreciate is the tendency of the Democratic Congress to send to the President bills which are completely inimical to the desire of most Americans to cure inflation and which President Ford has no choice but to veto.

This analysis is documented by two public opinion polls recently conducted by the distinguished pollster, Mr. Louis Harris. The first poll shows that most Americans understand and support the President's vetoes. The second poll reveals that the Congress—which has been controlled by the Democratic Party for 38 out of the last 42 years—has received its lowest approval rating in history.

I have always maintained that Government by veto is no way to run the country. However, the Democratic leadership has shown little—if any—willingness to compromise with the President and the minority on vital issues. Until such time as the attitude of the Democratic leadership changes, Government by veto will have to continue. In the meantime, it is important for the Record to show that the American people perceive this debate accurately and are watching to see what we do.

The article follows:

#### HARRIS SURVEY

(By Louis Harris)

A narrow 38-33 per cent plurality of the American people tend to agree more with President Ford than with the Congress in the recent confrontation between them over Mr. Ford's successful use of his veto power. Consistently, Congress has been incapable of overriding the President's vetoes of key legislation.



On the specific vetoes by the President, pluralities of the public supported his action:

By 43-27 per cent, most Americans agreed with his veto of the bill to increase support for agriculture.

By 42-35 per cent, a plurality sided with the President on his veto of the bill which dealt with creating a job program for the unemployed.

By 41-32 per cent, a plurality supported the veto of the bill which was designed to stimulate the housing industry.

By 34-30 per cent, a narrow plurality backed the President's veto of the bill to regulate strip mining.

Basically, Mr. Ford's backing on his veto policy reflects continuing public concern over federal spending. A substantial 72 per cent of the American people simply feel that they do not "receive good value" for their tax dollars, up from 56 per cent who felt the same way back in 1969.

This moderate agreement with the Presidential vetoes also reflects the public's misunderstanding of what Congress has been trying to do in enacting legislation which it knows the White House opposes. This failure of Congress to adequately communicate its aims and objectives to the people must rank high on the list of reasons both for the low state of public confidence in Congress and in pluralities backing the Ford vetoes.

A cross section of 1,497 adults was asked between July 5 and 10:

"In general, who do you tend to agree with more on the question of recent vetoes by President Ford of legislation passed by Congress—the President who has defended his vetoes to keep federal spending in line and to check inflation, or the Congress, which defends its passing bills as vital to bringing the country out of the recession and creating more jobs?"

	[In percent]		
	Ford	Congress	Not sure
Nationwide.....	38	33	29
By region:			
East.....	36	34	30
Midwest.....	35	37	28
South.....	39	28	33
West.....	41	33	26
By size of place:			
Cities.....	32	37	31
Suburbs.....	39	32	29
Towns.....	49	28	23
Rural.....	36	33	31
By politics:			
Republican.....	59	18	23
Democratic.....	27	43	30
Independent.....	40	32	28

Regionally, the Ford vetoes have had more appeal in the South and West than in the East and Midwest. People who live in the central cities tend to side with Congress, but suburban and small town residents support the President. Mr. Ford's Republican backing is much higher than that accorded to the heavily Democratic Congress by rank and file Democrats. But the balance is really tipped by the independent voting segment which backs the President by a 40-32 per cent margin.

The slender edge recorded by President Ford on the veto issue holds up in general when the public was asked about four key vetoes: "Did you favor or oppose President Ford on his veto of the bill to (read list)?"

SPECIFIC FORD VETOES			
	[In percent]		
	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Increase supports for agriculture.....	43	27	30
Create a job program for the unemployed.....	42	35	23
Stimulate the housing industry.....	41	32	27
Regulate strip mining.....	34	30	36

By far, the widest margin of support for the Presidential veto action emerged in the case of the agricultural bill. Significantly, rural residents opposed that bill by the largest margin: 46-27 percent. The closest margin on the Ford vetoes was over his action in opposing the strip mining bill. This veto was costly to the President among the college educated and professional groups, who opposed Mr. Ford's strip mining position.

Of course, the fact remains that neither the President nor Congress appears to have won any significant victory on the veto issue. While he was exercising the veto successfully and thereby thwarting the congressional majority, Mr. Ford's over-all positive job rating dropped from 50 to 41 percent, a decline of 9 points. By the same token, during the period in which Congress found itself incapable of overriding the Presidential veto, its positive rating with the public dropped from 30 to 22 percent, a drop of 8 points.

These results suggest that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans can make much of the veto issue. If Mr. Ford, in particular, fancies the events of this spring as providing him with an inbuilt platform to run against the Democratic-controlled Congress, he is apt to find a rather unenthusiastic electorate out there in 1976.

#### CONGRESS: LOWEST RATING EVER

(By Louis Harris)

A 70-22 percent majority of Americans give Congress a negative overall job rating, the worst rating for Congress in a Harris Survey.

Public opinion of Congress' performance in key areas—foreign policy, inspiring confidence in government, the economy, for instance—is also decidedly low.

These latest results represent a complete turnaround from those recorded after the landslide Democratic victory last November and after former President Nixon's resignation last year, when public respect for Congress' job performance was high.

In the recent confrontations between President Ford and the present Congress, the public sides with Ford. Only 18 percent of the Americans approve of the way Congress has handled relations with the President, and 58-21 percent don't approve of the way Congress has failed to override Ford's vetoes. Ford, on the other hand, receives a 33 percent positive rating for his handling of relations with Congress.

Still, both the President and Congress have lost public standing since their sharp disagreements over recent legislation.

Earlier this month, the Harris Survey asked a nationwide cross section of 1,497 adults:

"How would you rate the job Congress has been doing so far this year—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

#### TREND OF RATING OF CONGRESS

	[In percent]		
	Positive	Negative	Not sure
July 1975.....	22	70	8
April.....	30	63	7
March.....	26	67	7
September 1974.....	38	54	8
July.....	29	64	7
January.....	21	69	10
1973.....	38	45	17
1970.....	26	63	11
1969.....	34	54	12
1968.....	46	46	8
1967.....	38	55	7
1966.....	49	42	9
1965.....	64	26	10
1964.....	59	33	8
1963.....	33	60	7

Over the past 12 years, Americans have widely fluctuated in their ratings of Congress. In 1965, when President Johnson got Congress to pass a great deal of legislation, a 64-26 percent majority gave Congress a positive rating. But since 1968, Congress has consistently received negative ratings.

The cross section was then asked: "Let me ask you about some specifics about the job Congress is doing. How would you rate Congress on the following—excellent, pretty good, only fair, or poor?"

#### SPECIFIC RATINGS OF CONGRESS

	[In percent]		
	Positive	Negative	Not sure
Keeping United States strong militarily:			
July.....	34	53	13
March.....	35	53	12
Working for peace in the world:			
July.....	33	58	9
March.....	32	60	8
Not overriding President Ford's vetoes:			
July.....	21	58	21
March.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Handling relations with Secretary Kissinger:			
July.....	21	64	15
March.....	29	57	14
Handling relations with President Ford:			
July.....	18	72	10
March.....	20	71	9
Inspiring confidence in Government:			
July.....	18	72	10
March.....	18	73	9
Providing adequate health insurance:			
July.....	16	67	17
March.....	16	68	16
Handling energy crisis:			
July.....	16	76	8
March.....	17	77	6
Keeping economy healthy:			
July.....	15	78	7
March.....	13	79	8
Handling taxes and spending:			
July.....	12	80	8
March.....	12	80	8
Bringing country out of recession:			
July.....	12	81	7
March.....	9	83	8
Controlling inflation:			
July.....	10	83	7
March.....	7	86	7

1 Not asked.

#### RUSSIAN OIL FOR U.S. WHEAT

#### HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 28, 1975

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last week the Valley Register in Middletown, Md., published a most interesting and timely editorial which represents food for thought for all of us here in Congress. Its message is self-explanatory and I submit it now for the Record:

#### RUSSIAN OIL FOR U.S. WHEAT (?)

There is an opportunity for both the United States and Russia to benefit by a mutual exchange of commodities to ease shortages in both countries and at the same time bolster the economies of both of them. This lies in the abundance of wheat and other grains in this country and a bountiful supply of oil in the Soviet Union. While Russia has not looked favorably in the past to such "barter" deals, there is no reason why, in the present atmosphere of detente, she should not be willing to enter into an exchange agreement with this country along the lines suggested above. Russia does need our grain surpluses and is willing to pay for this wheat and corn, but we also need oil, and there seems to be no reason why she would not be willing to sell us oil at a reasonable figure in exchange for our permitting her to buy grain here at a likewise fair price. Russia's close ties with the Arab oil-producing States may be one obstacle to such an



To: Chicago Tribune--New York News Syndicate, Inc.  
220 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017

PHS

HARRIS SURVEY

For Release: Monday AM, July 28, 1975

Not Before

BY LOUIS HARRIS

A narrow 38-33 per cent plurality of the American people tend to agree more with President Ford than with the Congress in the recent confrontation between them over Mr. Ford's successful use of his veto power. Consistently, Congress has been incapable of overriding the President's vetoes of key legislation.

On the specific vetoes by the President, pluralities of the public supported his action:

-- By 43-27 per cent, most Americans agreed with his veto of the bill to increase support for agriculture.

-- By 42-35 per cent, a plurality sided with the President on his veto of the bill which dealt with creating a job program for the unemployed.

-- By 41-32 per cent, a plurality supported the veto of the bill which was designed to stimulate the housing industry.

-- By 34-30 per cent, a narrow plurality backed the President's veto of the bill to regulate strip mining.

Basically, Mr. Ford's backing on his veto policy reflects continuing public concern over federal spending. A substantial 72 per cent of the American people simply feel that they do not "receive good value" for their tax dollars, up from 56 per cent who felt the same way back in 1969.

(MORE)

This moderate agreement with the Presidential vetoes also reflects the public's misunderstanding of what Congress has been trying to do in enacting legislation which it knows the White House opposes. This failure of Congress to adequately communicate its aims and objectives to the people must rank high on the list of reasons both for the low state of public confidence in Congress and in pluralities backing the Ford vetoes.

A cross section of 1,497 adults was asked between July 5 and 10:

"In general, who do you tend to agree with more on the question of recent vetoes by President Ford of legislation passed by Congress -- the President who has defended his vetoes to keep federal spending in line and to check inflation, or the Congress, which defends its passing bills as vital to bringing the country out of the recession and creating more jobs?"

#### PRESIDENTIAL VETOES?

	Ford	Con- gress	Not Sure
	%	%	%
<u>Nationwide</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>29</u>
By Region			
East	36	34	30
Midwest	35	37	28
South	39	28	33
West	41	33	26
By Size of Place			
Cities	32	37	31
Suburbs	39	32	29
Towns	49	28	23
Rural	36	33	31
By Politics			
Republican	59	18	23
Democratic	27	43	30
Independent	40	32	28

Regionally, the Ford vetoes have had more appeal in the South and West than in the East and Midwest. People who live in the central cities tend to side with Congress, but suburban and small town residents support the President. Mr. Ford's Republican backing is much higher than that accorded to the heavily Democratic Congress by rank and file Democrats. But the balance is really tipped by the independent voting segment which backs the President by a 40-32 per cent margin.

(MORE)

The slender edge recorded by President Ford on the veto issue holds up in general when the public was asked about four key vetoes:

"Did you favor or oppose President Ford on his veto of the bill to (READ LIST)?"

#### SPECIFIC FORD VETOES

	<u>Favor</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Not Sure</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Increase supports for agriculture	43	27	30
Create a job program for the unemployed	42	35	23
Stimulate the housing industry	41	32	27
Regulate strip mining	34	30	36

By far, the widest margin of support for the Presidential veto action emerged in the case of the agricultural bill. Significantly, rural residents opposed that bill by the largest margin: 46-27 per cent. The closest margin on the Ford vetoes was over his action in opposing the strip mining bill. This veto was costly to the President among the college educated and professional groups, who opposed Mr. Ford's strip mining position.

Of course, the fact remains that neither the President nor Congress appears to have won any significant victory on the veto issue. While he was exercising the veto successfully and thereby thwarting the congressional majority, Mr. Ford's over-all positive job rating dropped from 50 to 41 per cent, a decline of 9 points. By the same token, during the period in which Congress found itself incapable of overriding the Presidential veto, its positive rating with the public dropped from 30 to 22 per cent, a drop of 8 points.

These results suggest that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans can make much of the veto issue. If Mr. Ford, in particular, fancies the events of this spring as providing him with an inbuilt platform to run against the Democratic-controlled Congress, he is apt to find a rather unenthusiastic electorate out there in 1976.

(C) 1975 by the Chicago Tribune

World Rights Reserved

FIVE

STATE AND PARTY REPORT

16 SEPT 1976 11.20 AM PAGE 1

ROLL NO. 738

H R 8800

2/3 YEA-AND-NAY

CLOSED 16 SEPT 1976 11.18 AM

AUTHOR(S): TEAGUE

ON PRESIDENTIAL VETO

ELECTRIC VEHICLE RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND DEMONSTRATION ACT OF 1976

	YEA	NAY	PRES	NY
DEMOCRATIC	245	27		14
REPUBLICAN	62	74		9
OTHER				
TOTAL	307	101		23



ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## ALABAMA

BEVILL NAY  
FLOWERS YEA  
JONES (AL) YEA  
NICHOLS NAY

BUCHANAN NAY  
DICKINSON NAY  
EDWARDS (AL) NAY

## ALASKA

YOUNG (AK) NAY

## ARIZONA

UDALL YEA

CONLAN YEA  
RHODES YEA  
STEIGER (AZ) NY

## ARKANSAS

ALEXANDER YEA  
MILLS YEA  
THORNTON YEA

HAMMERSCHMIDT NAY

## CALIFORNIA

ANDERSON (CA) YEA  
BROWN (CA) YEA  
BURKE (CA) YEA  
BURTON, JOHN YEA  
BURTON, PHILLIP YEA  
CORMAN YEA  
DANIELSON YEA  
DELLUMS YEA  
EDWARDS (CA) YEA  
HANNAFORD YEA  
HAWKINS YEA  
JOHNSON (CA) YEA  
KREBS YEA  
LEGGETT NY  
LLOYD (CA) YEA  
MC FALL YEA  
MILLER (CA) YEA  
MINETA YEA  
MOSS YEA  
PATTERSON (CA) YEA  
REES YEA  
ROYBAL YEA  
RYAN YEA  
SISK YEA  
STARK YEA  
VAN DEERLIN YEA  
WAXMAN YEA  
WILSON, C. H. YEA

BELL YEA  
BURGENER NAY  
CLAUSEN, DON H. YEA  
CLAUSEN, DEL NAY  
GOLDWATER YEA  
HINSHAW NY  
KETCHUM YEA  
LAGOMARSINO YEA  
MC CLOSKEY YEA  
MOORHEAD (CA) YEA  
PETTIS YEA  
ROUSSELOT YEA  
TALCOTT YEA  
WIGGINS NAY  
WILSON, BOB NAY

## COLORADO

EVANS (CO) YEA  
SCHROEDER YEA  
WIRTH YEA

ARMSTRONG NAY  
JOHNSON (CO) YEA





ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## CONNECTICUT

COTTER	YEA
DODD	YEA
GIAMMO	YEA
HOFFETT	YEA

MC KINNEY	NAY
SARASIN	YEA

## DELAWARE

DU PONT	YEA
---------	-----

## FLORIDA

SENNETT	YEA
CHAPPELL	NV
FASCELL	YEA
FUQUA	YEA
GIBBONS	YEA
HALEY	YEA
LEHMAN	YEA
PEPPER	YEA
ROGERS	NAY
SIKES	NAY

BAFALIS	YEA
BURKE (FL)	NAY
FREY	YEA
KELLY	NV
YOUNG (FL)	NAY

## GEORGIA

BRINKLEY	NAY
FLYNT	YEA
GINN	YEA
LANDRUM	NAY
LEVITAS	NAY
MATHIS	NAY
MC DONALD	NAY
STEPHENS	NV
STUCKEY	NV
YOUNG (GA)	YEA

## HAWAII

MATSUNAGA	NV
MINK	YEA

## IDAHO

HANSEN	NV
SYMS	NAY



ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## ILLINOIS

ANNUNZIO	YEA
COLLINS (IL)	YEA
FARY	YEA
HALL (IL)	YEA
METCALFE	NY
MIKVA	YEA
MURPHY (IL)	YEA
PRICE	YEA
ROSTENKOWSKI	YEA
RUSSO	YEA
SHIPLEY	YEA
SIMON	YEA
YATES	YEA

ANDERSON (IL)	NAY
CRANE	NAY
DERWINSKI	NAY
ERLENBORN	NAY
FINDLEY	NAY
HYDE	NAY
MADIGAN	NAY
MC CLORY	NAY
MICHEL	NAY
O'BRIEN	NAY
RAILSBACK	NAY

## INDIANA

BRADENAS	YEA
EVANS (IN)	NAY
FITHIAN	YEA
HAMILTON	YEA
HAYES (IN)	YEA
JACOBS	YEA
MADDEN	YEA
ROUSH	YEA
SHARP	YEA

HILLIS	NAY
MYERS (IN)	NAY

## IOWA

BEDELL	YEA
BLOUIN	YEA
HARKIN	YEA
MEZVINSKY	YEA
SMITH (IA)	YEA

GRASSLEY	YEA
----------	-----

## KANSAS

KEYS	YEA
------	-----

SEBELIUS	NAY
SHRIVER	NAY
SKUBITZ	NAY
WINN	YEA

## KENTUCKY

BRECKINRIDGE	YEA
HUBBARD	NAY
MAZZOLI	YEA
HATCHER	YEA
PERKINS	YEA

CARTER	NY
SNYDER	NAY

## LOUISIANA

BOGGS	YEA
BREAUX	NAY
HEBERT	NY
LONG (LA)	YEA
PASSMAN	NAY
WAGGONER	NAY

MOORE	NAY
TREEN	NAY



ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## MAINE

COHEN	YEA
EMERY	YEA

## MARYLAND

BYRON	YEA
LONG (MD)	YEA
MITCHELL (MD)	YEA
SARBANES	YEA
SPELLMAN	YEA

BAUMAN	NAY
GUDE	YEA
HOLT	NAY

## MASSACHUSETTS

BOLAND	YEA
BURKE (MA)	YEA
BRINAN	YEA
EARLY	YEA
HARRINGTON	YEA
MDAKLEY	YEA
O'NEILL	YEA
STUDDS	YEA
TSONGAS	YEA

CONTE	YEA
HECKLER (MA)	NAY

## MICHIGAN

BLANCHARD	YEA
BRODHEAD	YEA
CARR	YEA
CONYERS	YEA
DIGGS	YEA
DINGELL	YEA
FORD (MI)	YEA
KEDZI	YEA
O'HARA	YEA
RIEGLE	YEA
TRAXLER	NAY
VANDER VEEN	YEA

BROOMFIELD	NAY
BROWN (MI)	NAY
CEDERBERG	NAY
ESCH	NV
HUTCHINSON	NAY
RUPPE	NAY
VANDER JAGT	NAY

## MINNESOTA

BERGLAND	YEA
FRASER	YEA
KARTH	YEA
NOLAN	YEA
OBERSTAR	YEA

FRENZEL	YEA
HAGEDORN	YEA
QUIE	NAY

## MISSISSIPPI

BOWEN	YEA
MONTGOMERY	NAY
WHITTER	YEA

COCHRAN	NAY
LOTT	NAY





## STATE AND PARTY REPORT

16 SEPT 1976 11.20 AM PAGE 6

ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## MISSOURI

BOLLING	YEA
BURLISON (MO)	YEA
CLAY	YEA
HUNGATE	YEA
ICHORD	YEA
RANDALL	YEA
SULLIVAN	YEA
SYMINGTON	YEA

TAYLOR (MO)

NAY

## MONTANA

BAUCUS	YEA
MELCHER	YEA

## NEBRASKA

MC COLLISTER	NV
SMITH (NB)	NAY
THONE	YEA

## NEVADA

SANTINI	YEA
---------	-----

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

D'AMOURS	YEA
----------	-----

CLEVELAND

YEA

## NEW JERSEY

DANIELS (NJ)	YEA
FLORIO	YEA
HELSTOSKI	NV
HOWARD	YEA
HUGHES	YEA
MAGUIRE	YEA
MEYNER	YEA
MINISH	YEA
PATTEN (NJ)	NAY
ROBINO	YEA
ROE	YEA
THOMPSON	YEA

FENWICK	NAY
FORSYTHE	YEA
RIHALDO	YEA

## NEW MEXICO

RUNNELS	YEA
---------	-----

LUJAN

YEA



ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## NEW YORK

ABZUG	YEA
ADDABBO	YEA
AMBRO	YEA
BADILLO	YEA
BIAGGI	YEA
BINGHAM	YEA
CHISHOLM	NY
DELAHEY	YEA
DOWNEY (NY)	YEA
HANLEY	YEA
HOLTZMAN	YEA
KOCH	YEA
LAFALCE	NAY
LUNDINE	NAY
MC HUGH	YEA
MURPHY (NY)	YEA
NOWAK	YEA
OTTINGER	YEA
PATTISON (NY)	YEA
PIKE	YEA
RANGEL	YEA
RICHMOND	YEA
ROSENTHAL	YEA
SCHEUER	YEA
SOLARZ	YEA
STRATTON	YEA
WOLFF	NAY
ZEFERETTI	YEA

CONABLE	NAY
FISH	NAY
GILMAN	YEA
HORTON	YEA
KEMP	NY
LENT	YEA
MC EHEN	YEA
MITCHELL (NY)	YEA
PEYSER	YEA
WALSH	YEA
WYDLER	NAY

## NORTH CAROLINA

ANDREWS (NC)	YEA
FOUNTAIN	YEA
HEFNER	YEA
HENDERSON	NAY
JONES (NC)	YEA
NEAL	YEA
PREYER	YEA
ROSE	YEA
TAYLOR (NC)	YEA

BROYHILL	NAY
MARTIN	YEA

## NORTH DAKOTA

ANDREWS (ND)	YEA
--------------	-----



## STATE AND PARTY REPORT

16 SEPT 1976 11.20 AM PAGE 8

ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## OHIO

ASHLEY	YEA
CARNEY	YEA
HDTTL	YEA
SEIBERLING	YEA
STANTON, JAMES V.	NY
STOKES	YEA
YANIK	YEA

ASHBROOK	NAY
BROWN (OH)	YEA
CLANCY	NAY
DEVINE	NAY
GRADISON	NAY
GUYER	YEA
HARSHA	YEA
KINDNESS	NAY
LATTA	NAY
MILLER (OH)	NAY
MOSHER	YEA
REGULA	NAY
STANTON, J. WILLIAM	NAY
WHALEN	YEA
WYLIE	NAY

## OKLAHOMA

ALBERT	YEA
ENGLISH	YEA
JONES (OK)	YEA
RISENHOOVER	NY
STEED	YEA

JARMAN	NAY
--------	-----

## OREGON

AUCOIN	YEA
DUNCAN (OR)	YEA
ULLMAN	YEA
WEAVER	YEA

## PENNSYLVANIA

DENT	YEA
EDGAR	YEA
EILBERG	YEA
FLOOD	YEA
GAYDOS	YEA
GREEN	YEA
MOORHEAD (PA)	YEA
MORGAN	YEA
MURTHA	YEA
NIX	YEA
ROONEY	YEA
VIGORITO	NAY
YATRON	YEA

BIESTER	NAY
COUGHLIN	NAY
ESHLEMAN	YEA
GOODLING	YEA
HEINZ	YEA
JOHNSON (PA)	NY
MC DADE	YEA
MYERS (PA)	YEA
SCHNEEBELI	NAY
SCHULZE	YEA
SHUSTER	NAY

## RHODE ISLAND

BEARD (RI)	YEA
ST GERMAIN	YEA





ROLL NO. 738

## DEMOCRATIC

## \*\*OTHER\*\*

## REPUBLICAN

## SOUTH CAROLINA

DAVIS	YEA
DERRICK	YEA
HOLLAND	YEA
JENRETTE	YEA
HANN	YEA

SPENCE	YEA
--------	-----

## SOUTH DAKOTA

ABDHOR	YEA
PRESSLER	YEA

## TENNESSEE

ALLEN	YEA
EVINS (TN)	YEA
FORD (TN)	NY
JONES (TN)	NY
LLOYD (TN)	YEA

BEARD (TN)	YEA
DUNCAN (TN)	YEA
QUILLEN	YEA

## TEXAS

BROOKS	YEA
BURLESON (TX)	YEA
DE LA GARZA	YEA
ECKHARDT	YEA
GONZALEZ	YEA
HALL (TX)	NAY
HIGHTOWER	NAY
JORDAN	YEA
KAZEN	YEA
KRUEGER	YEA
MAHON	YEA
MILFORD	YEA
PICKLE	YEA
POAGE	YEA
ROBERTS	NAY
TEAGUE	YEA
WHITE	YEA
WILSON, (TX)	YEA
WRIGHT	YEA
YOUNG (TX)	YEA

ARCHER	NAY
COLLINS (TX)	NAY
PAUL	NAY
STEELMAN	YEA

## UTAH

HOWE	NY
MC KAY	YEA

## VERMONT

JEFFORDS	NAY
----------	-----

## VIRGINIA

DANIEL, DAN	NAY
DOWNING (VA)	YEA
FISHER	YEA
HARRIS	YEA
SATTERFIELD	NAY

BUTLER	NAY
DANIEL, R. W.	YEA
ROBINSON	NAY
WAMPLER	YEA
WHITEHURST	YEA



16 SEPT 1976 11:20 AM PAGE 10

REPUBLICAN

\*\*\*OTHER\*\*\*

ADAMS	YEA
BONKER	YEA
FDLEY	YEA
HICKS	YEA
MC CORMACK	YEA
NEEDS	YEA

PRITCHARD YEA

HECHLER (WV)	YEA
MOLLOHAN	YEA
SLACK	YEA
STAGGERS	YEA

ASPIN	YEA
BALDUS	YEA
CORNELL	YEA
KASTENMEIER	YEA
OBEY	YEA
REUSS	YEA
ZABLOCKI	YEA

KASTEN	YEA
STEIGER (WI)	NAY

RONCALIO YEA

\* \* \* \* \* E N D O F R E P O R T \* \* \* \* \*