

The original documents are located in Box 21, folder “Public Works Employment Act (4)” 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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

Some items in this folder were not digitized because it contains copyrighted materials. Please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library for access to these materials.

[July 1976]

ADMINISTRATION POSITION ON S. 3201
THE
PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1976

BACKGROUND

On July 6, 1976, the President vetoed S. 3201, the Public Works Employment Act of 1976. This Act would authorize Federal payments of almost \$4 billion to State and local governments for public works projects, maintenance of basic services, and wastewater treatment grants. The Act is similar to H.R. 5247, the Public Works Employment Act of 1975, which the President vetoed on February 13, 1976. This legislation was undesirable last February and it is even more undesirable after six months of improvement in the economy.

This paper summarizes (page 1 and 2) the reasons for the President's veto, describes (page 3 and 4) the President's own proposals for addressing the problem of unemployment and discusses in detail (pages 5 through 10) several key reasons for the President's veto.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE VETO

- The most fundamental reason for disapproval of this legislation is that it is inflationary. Together with other extraordinarily large spending proposals passed by this irresponsible Congress, it threatens to return the country to double digit inflation that would erode the living standards of all Americans.
 - . A very large portion of the increase in Government spending authorized by the Act would occur in 1978, when we expect economic activity to be at a much higher level than it is today. We must act now to avoid future overstimulation of the economy that could cause rampant inflation and lead to another serious recession. Paradoxically, the vetoed legislation--put forward as a job creation measure--may in the long run be a job destruction measure.
- Even in the shorter run, the Act is not an effective means of creating jobs.
 - . The Act's sponsors have overestimated the job creation benefits of this legislation. The sponsors' estimate that as many as 325,000 jobs will be created is unsupportable. A more realistic estimate is that no more than 60,000 extra jobs would be created in any year, with a total of less than 160,000 years of employment created over five or more years.
 - . The increased Federal funds that will have to be borrowed to implement this program will diminish the availability of funds in the private sector--funds that could be used to create more permanent jobs that would not require continued taxpayer support.

more

- . The Act would make little, if any, contribution to the currently declining trend in unemployment. The effect of this legislation would not be felt until late 1977 or early 1978. The public works approach embodied in this legislation is notoriously slow in creating employment because of the long lead times required to get construction projects underway. For example, in fiscal year 1976, we are still spending funds for an accelerated public works program passed in 1962!
 - . It will cost the taxpayer \$25,000 to fund each year of employment created under this legislation--an unacceptably high cost, considering the average annual income of the American worker and the burden the taxpayer would bear in supporting these jobs.
- The Act would authorize funding which would push the Federal deficit and Federal spending to even higher levels.
- . Providing full funding for the legislation could add \$1.7 billion to the deficit for fiscal year 1977, currently estimated to be \$47.5 billion. In 1978, \$1 billion would be added to the estimated \$28.1 billion deficit. In 1979 and later years, Federal spending would be increased by \$1.2 billion.
 - . Congress has considered neither acceptable program reductions that could offset the cost increases of this Act nor the Act's effect on the 1978 and later budgets. More than 60% of the outlays associated with this legislation would fall in 1978 and later years.
- The proposed public works program would misallocate capital resources and inefficiently use scarce dollars.
- . States and localities would not have the same incentive to carefully select and carry out public works projects that would be entirely financed by Federal funds as they would have if State or local contributions were required.
- Much of the bill is not relevant to current unemployment problems.
- . The countercyclical assistance proposed in Title II would do little to help the unemployed. Most of the funds would be used to pay the salaries of State and local employees already on the payroll.
 - . The \$700 million for wastewater treatment facilities grants would have no employment impact until well over two years from now.
- The countercyclical assistance provided by the Act cannot be used as effectively by States and local governments as can General Revenue Sharing (GRS) funds.
- . The amount of each jurisdiction's GRS allotment is known well in advance. Consequently, long-range planning for the use of these funds can be undertaken. In contrast, countercyclical payments would not afford the same planning opportunity.

more

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM AND POLICIES

- The President has proposed realistic alternatives to overcome unemployment problems and avoid a new round of inflation.
 - . The 1977 Budget includes more than \$21 billion in outlays for well planned, thoroughly reviewed public works such as roads, energy facilities, wastewater treatment plants, and veterans hospitals. This spending level--an increase of more than \$3 billion or nearly 17 percent over fiscal year 1976--will finance public works that are most needed and can be efficiently carried out in the next 15 to 18 months.
 - . Tax incentives are proposed for private construction initiated in the next year in areas of high unemployment. This proposal will result in much quicker and much more effective creation of jobs than will the vetoed act.
 - . Renewal of the General Revenue Sharing program will permit State and local governments to maintain employment in basic services.
 - . Additional permanent income tax reductions of more than \$10 billion will permit a quick and major increase in the take-home pay of all taxpayers, thus increasing their buying power and stimulating private investment--all of which will create real, rewarding employment in the private sector.
 - . The 1977 Budget provides \$3.2 billion for Community Development block grants to States and local governments--an increase of about 17 percent over 1976. These grants are allocated on the basis of relative need, and permit the States and local governments to carefully plan for the use of these funds.
 - . Tax incentives are proposed for investment in residential mortgages by financial institutions, to stimulate capital for homes rather than for public monuments.
 - . Tax incentives are proposed to induce broader ownership of common stock to stimulate investment which will provide long term productive jobs, rather than increasing public jobs.
- The President's policies have and will continue to result in steady and sustainable improvements in both employment and the overall economy.
 - . The President's economic policies will result in lasting, productive jobs--not temporary jobs paid for by the American taxpayers.
 - . The President's economic policies are designed to create 2 to 2.5 million jobs in 1976 and an additional 2 million jobs in 1977.
 - . Since June 1975, employment has increased by 3 million and the number of unemployed has declined by more than 900,000.

more

- . The national unemployment rate has dropped more than a full one percent in the last year.
- . The President's policies are intended to stimulate private sector construction projects which, unlike public works projects proposed in this bill, will add to the tax base of local governments.
- . Under the President's economic policies the rate of inflation over the last year--May 1975 to 1976--has declined by almost 35 percent over the same period in the preceding year. Rather than aiding the successful course the President has charted, the vetoed legislation would provide added stimulus, likely to be inflationary, two years from now when the economy will be much closer to full recovery.

more

DETAILED DISCUSSION OF KEY REASONS
FOR THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF S. 3201

Public Works Construction Is Not Effective in Increasing Employment Quickly

The bulk of the funds authorized by this bill (\$2.7 billion) would be used for public works.

For more than four years the Economic Development Administration has been trying to find the fastest ways to increase employment through public works projects. This effort, the Public Works Impact Program (PWIP), has shown the difficulty of quickly creating jobs for the unemployed by funding public works.

The facts are as follows. During the year in which the funds are appropriated for accelerated public works, only 10% of the funds are actually spent. During the full second year after appropriations, half of the funds are used. And after four years, 10% of the funds are still not spent for the approved projects.

It is very time consuming for the Federal government to allocate a large amount of money on a project-by-project basis. Even with the small PWIP program, it has required about 9 months to allocate the funds to individual projects. It has taken about 17 months from the time of appropriation to get all of the approved projects under construction. And two years after appropriation of funds, only about 60% of the projects were completed.

Although Title I of the bill requires that the Commerce Department must approve or reject applications for funding within 60 days of receipt of the applications, this will not assure speedy allocation of these funds. The bill provides that appropriations may be provided at any time through the end of fiscal year 1977, which may delay allocations. Funding applications will be submitted over a period of many months. Many of the initial applications might have to be rejected and resubmitted due to inadequate information. Accordingly, even with the 60 day approval or rejection requirement, it could take 18 months or longer to allocate all of the funds.

Once the funds are allocated, it can be expected that commencement and construction of the projects will be no faster, and more likely slower, than the experience with PWIP projects.

Thus, we can expect that it would be late 1977 or early 1978 before all of the projects to be authorized by this bill will be under construction. It will be 1980 or later before all of the projects are completed.

Appendix A is a table that provides the most optimistic estimate of the speed with which the funds would be spent. It is likely to be more realistic to move most of these spending estimates to about one year later than shown on the table.

more

Estimate that 325,000 Jobs Would be Created is Unfounded

Sponsors of the bill have asserted that it would provide work for 325,000 people, primarily as a result of public works projects. This estimate is entirely unrealistic. A much more likely estimate is 160,000 years of employment over the next five years with a peak increase in employment of about 50,000 to 60,000 in 1977 or early 1978.

Although there are no firm figures on employment generated by construction, studies of employment in construction conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that a \$1 billion (1974 dollars) public works program would provide only about 40,000 years of employment, off-site and on-site. Including multiplier effects there would be 60,000 years of employment created by \$1 billion in public works spending. Based on the optimistic spending estimates shown in Appendix A, the peak spending for public works in 1978 would produce a maximum of about 50,000 years. Since construction wages and other costs will be higher in 1978 and beyond than they were in 1974, these estimates of jobs could be high.

It is very difficult to estimate the employment that would be created by the \$1.25 billion in countercyclical grants (Title II).

There is substantial indication that State and local governments would not use much of these funds to hire additional personnel. Studies of revenue sharing have shown that State and local governments increased their purchases of goods and services by roughly one-third of the amount they received. The remainder was used to repay debt and reduce taxes. In addition, recent experience with public service employment indicates that, after the first year of funding, State and local governments may increase employment by only 10 to 40 percent of the number of public service jobs directly funded by the Federal government. Despite numerous regulations to make it difficult to substitute public service employment for regular employment, the practice is widespread. Title II of the vetoed bill contains no requirements that these funds be used for additional jobs.

The maximum expected payment under Title II of the bill is \$312 million per quarter. If as much as 50% of this were used for added employment, it might create as many as 60,000 jobs. Given the experience with similar programs, it is more likely that only 10 to 20% of the funds would be used for added employment, providing an increase of only 10-25,000.

In summary, the peak employment impact is unlikely to exceed 60,000, and is more likely to be near 40,000 to 50,000 sometime in fiscal year 1977 or 1978. The total is likely to be about 160,000 years of employment spread over five years or more.

If the bill produced a total of 160,000 years of employment, the average cost per year of employment would be about \$25,000.

The Title II Countercyclical Assistance Grants Would Discourage Government Incentives to Address Local Priorities.

The recent financial difficulties which have been facing some cities and other local governments have forced them to undertake a long-needed examination of their spending programs to identify the excesses and set priorities. There is no doubt but that some local governments had reached a spending level that they simply will be unable to sustain in the long-term.

The proposed countercyclical assistance grants would remove pressures from States and local governments to more carefully evaluate their activities in terms of benefits produced. If the program becomes permanent, it will allow those governments to avoid economy measures, and then to further expand their programs as their tax revenues increase with the resurgence of the economy. They would be led to expect still more Federal assistance the next time they are in financial difficulty.

The unemployment data required for the fund distribution under the countercyclical assistance program of Title II is not currently available. Developing the new set of statistics required will cost the Department of Labor several thousand dollars.

The countercyclical aid cannot reasonably be provided by the deadlines established in the bill. Payments for the first quarter are to be made by July 1, 1976. Before the payments can be made however, the unemployment data required for the distribution formula must be developed, the Congress must appropriate funds, the Department of Treasury must issue regulations, and signed statements of assurance, as required in the bill, must be obtained from thousands of State and local governments. Considering these requirements, it would likely be January 1977 or later before any payments could be made. Payments made in January 1977 would cover three of the five quarters authorized under Title II. Such a lump sum payment is likely to be counterproductive to the stated purpose of the countercyclical assistance.

In addition to the above problems with the program, it would be very costly to administer. It is estimated by the Department of Treasury that administrative costs and staffing would about equal those of the current General Revenue Sharing program. The current General Revenue Sharing program requires 110 employees and \$11 million to administer \$6.5 billion. The proposed countercyclical aid program would require similar resources to distribute only \$1.25 billion.

\$700 Million for EPA Sewage Treatment Grants is Unneeded and Irrelevant to Unemployment Problems.

The purpose of this provision of the bill is completely unrelated to the purported desire to create jobs quickly for the unemployed.

Even if EPA were to use these added funds now, they would have almost no job creating impact in the next two years. It is simply not practical to significantly accelerate the construction of such facilities.

The real purpose of this provision is to change the formula for the allocation of funds under the wastewater treatment grant program of EPA. An additional \$700 million to a large number of states would be provided by the Congress without consideration of essential reform to the current law. If the reform were not adopted, expenditures of a further \$333 billion between now and 1983 would be required.

It Would Be Administratively Impossible to Effectively Allocate \$2 Billion for Public Works Projects Quickly

This bill requires that the Commerce Department attempt to allocate \$2 billion, on a project-by-project basis, in a few months. All past experience would force a conclusion that this would be reckless and irresponsible.

Even without any substantive review of requests for funding, it is highly unlikely that the Department could physically process, in less than nine months, the many--perhaps thousands--of requests that would be involved.

The Department's recent experience with the Job Opportunities program illustrates the point. After its initial experience in allocating \$125 million, it still required six months for Commerce and the cooperating agencies to allocate the additional \$375 million. Also, that allocation was done with only a minimum amount of substantive review of the proposals by the agencies.

Moreover, the Department received a good deal of criticism from Congress for relying too heavily on objective criteria to make the \$375 million allocation, rather than reviewing each particular project.

With \$2 billion to award, the Department is likely to be faced with the choice of taking many months to do a responsible job, or taking nine months or more to pitch Federal tax dollars at projects as they come through the door.

Large Amounts for Spending on High Priority Public Works are Already In the 1976 and 1977 Budget

The attached table shows the amounts of expected spending for public works in the President's Budgets for 1976 and 1977. In 1976, a total of over \$18 billion is provided. This includes over \$11 billion in grants to state and local governments. In 1977, the spending for public works would increase by 17% or by over \$3 billion.

The spending for public works in the Budget is focused on the highest priority national needs, including energy, pollution abatement, flood control, and transportation. The Budget estimates reflect expected spending on projects which are already in the planning stages or under construction. Therefore, the \$3 billion increase will be providing jobs in 1977, rather than in 1978 or 1979. These projects will be helping us achieve important national objectives while at the same time providing employment opportunities.

There are adequate spending levels already in the 1977 Budget for those public works projects that are really needed.

Additional stimulus to private sector employment also would be provided by a 23% increase in spending in the 1977 Budget for major equipment purchases. Spending for this purpose is to increase by \$3.9 billion over 1976, to \$20.7 billion.

more

Changes in Public Works Outlays, Fiscal Year 1976-77
(in millions of dollars)

<u>Description</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>Change</u>
<u>Direct construction</u>			
Civilian programs:			
FAP: Strategic petroleum storage.....	11	164	153
Agr: Forest Service roads and trails and other.....	135	173	38
Corps of Engineers: construction and flood control.....	1,367	1,424	57
Int: Bureau of Reclamation.....	410	507	97
Bonneville.....	135	150	15
NPS, BIA, and other.....	273	252	-21
HEW: Indian health facilities, NIH, other.....	162	138	-24
DOT: Coast Guard facilities.....	78	63	-15
FAA airway systems.....	231	236	5
ERDA: Plant, capital equipment, other...	439	672	233
NASA: Plant and equipment.....	115	126	11
VA: Hospitals and other.....	186	303	117
TVA: Power facilities.....	1,038	1,137	99
All other.....	174	165	-9
Subtotal, civilian programs.....	<u>4,754</u>	<u>5,510</u>	<u>756</u>
Defense programs:			
DOD: Military construction.....	1,713	1,710	-3
Family housing.....	320	287	-33
ERDA: Plant and equipment.....	204	215	11
Subtotal, defense construction.....	<u>2,237</u>	<u>2,212</u>	<u>-25</u>
Total, direct construction.....	<u>6,991</u>	<u>7,722</u>	<u>731</u>
<u>Grants to State and local governments</u>			
FAP: Appalachian regional development...	248	242	-6
Agr: Water and waste disposal, rural development, conservation.....	198	190	-8
Com: EDA and other.....	183	154	-29
HEW: Health.....	213	184	-29
Education and other.....	51	36	-15
Int: Land and water conservation and other.....	274	275	1
DOT: Airports.....	375	355	-20
Highways.....	6,202	6,711	509
Mass Transit.....	573	1,179	606
EPA.....	2,350	3,770	1,420
All other.....	<u>563</u>	<u>442</u>	<u>-121</u>
Total, grants to State and local governments.....	<u>11,230</u>	<u>13,538</u>	<u>2,308</u>
Total public works.....	<u>18,221</u>	<u>21,260</u>	<u>3,039</u>

APPENDIX A

Estimate of Outlays
Local Public Works Capital Development and
Investment Act (S. 3201)

(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Program</u>	<u>Total Amount Authorized</u>	<u>Outlays^{1/}</u>			
		<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>After 1979</u>
Title I, Public works grants	2,000	400	800	600	200
Title II, Counter- cyclical Revenue Sharing	1,250	1,250			
Title II, EPA waste- water treatment facility grants	700	15	150	350	
Total	<u>3,950</u>	<u>1,675</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>200</u>

^{1/}The outlay estimates assume that initial appropriations would be provided by October, 1976.

[July 1976]

ADMINISTRATION POSITION ON S. 3201
THE
PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1976

BACKGROUND

On July 6, 1976, the President vetoed S. 3201, the Public Works Employment Act of 1976. This Act would authorize Federal payments of almost \$4 billion to State and local governments for public works projects, maintenance of basic services, and wastewater treatment grants. The Act is similar to H.R. 5247, the Public Works Employment Act of 1975, which the President vetoed on February 13, 1976. This legislation was undesirable last February and it is even more undesirable after six months of improvement in the economy.

This paper summarizes (page 1 and 2) the reasons for the President's veto, describes (page 3 and 4) the President's own proposals for addressing the problem of unemployment and discusses in detail (pages 5 through 10) several key reasons for the President's veto.

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR THE VETO

- The most fundamental reason for disapproval of this legislation is that it is inflationary. Together with other extraordinarily large spending proposals passed by this irresponsible Congress, it threatens to return the country to double digit inflation that would erode the living standards of all Americans.
- . A very large portion of the increase in Government spending authorized by the Act would occur in 1978, when we expect economic activity to be at a much higher level than it is today. We must act now to avoid future overstimulation of the economy that could cause rampant inflation and lead to another serious recession. Paradoxically, the vetoed legislation--put forward as a job creation measure--may in the long run be a job destruction measure.
- Even in the shorter run, the Act is not an effective means of creating jobs.
- . The Act's sponsors have overestimated the job creation benefits of this legislation. The sponsors' estimate that as many as 325,000 jobs will be created is unsupportable. A more realistic estimate is that no more than 60,000 extra jobs would be created in any year, with a total of less than 160,000 years of employment created over five or more years.
- . The increased Federal funds that will have to be borrowed to implement this program will diminish the availability of funds in the private sector--funds that could be used to create more permanent jobs that would not require continued taxpayer support.

more

- . The Act would make little, if any, contribution to the currently declining trend in unemployment. The effect of this legislation would not be felt until late 1977 or early 1978. The public works approach embodied in this legislation is notoriously slow in creating employment because of the long lead times required to get construction projects underway. For example, in fiscal year 1976, we are still spending funds for an accelerated public works program passed in 1962!
- . It will cost the taxpayer \$25,000 to fund each year of employment created under this legislation--an unacceptably high cost, considering the average annual income of the American worker and the burden the taxpayer would bear in supporting these jobs.
- The Act would authorize funding which would push the Federal deficit and Federal spending to even higher levels.
 - . Providing full funding for the legislation could add \$1.7 billion to the deficit for fiscal year 1977, currently estimated to be \$47.5 billion. In 1978, \$1 billion would be added to the estimated \$28.1 billion deficit. In 1979 and later years, Federal spending would be increased by \$1.2 billion.
 - . Congress has considered neither acceptable program reductions that could offset the cost increases of this Act nor the Act's effect on the 1978 and later budgets. More than 60% of the outlays associated with this legislation would fall in 1978 and later years.
- The proposed public works program would misallocate capital resources and inefficiently use scarce dollars.
 - . States and localities would not have the same incentive to carefully select and carry out public works projects that would be entirely financed by Federal funds as they would have if State or local contributions were required.
- Much of the bill is not relevant to current unemployment problems.
 - . The countercyclical assistance proposed in Title II would do little to help the unemployed. Most of the funds would be used to pay the salaries of State and local employees already on the payroll.
 - . The \$700 million for wastewater treatment facilities grants would have no employment impact until well over two years from now.
- The countercyclical assistance provided by the Act cannot be used as effectively by States and local governments as can General Revenue Sharing (GRS) funds.
 - . The amount of each jurisdiction's GRS allotment is known well in advance. Consequently, long-range planning for the use of these funds can be undertaken. In contrast, countercyclical payments would not afford the same planning opportunity.

more

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM AND POLICIES

- The President has proposed realistic alternatives to overcome unemployment problems and avoid a new round of inflation.
 - . The 1977 Budget includes more than \$21 billion in outlays for well planned, thoroughly reviewed public works such as roads, energy facilities, wastewater treatment plants, and veterans hospitals. This spending level--an increase of more than \$3 billion or nearly 17 percent over fiscal year 1976--will finance public works that are most needed and can be efficiently carried out in the next 15 to 18 months.
 - . Tax incentives are proposed for private construction initiated in the next year in areas of high unemployment. This proposal will result in much quicker and much more effective creation of jobs than will the vetoed act.
 - . Renewal of the General Revenue Sharing program will permit State and local governments to maintain employment in basic services.
 - . Additional permanent income tax reductions of more than \$10 billion will permit a quick and major increase in the take-home pay of all taxpayers, thus increasing their buying power and stimulating private investment--all of which will create real, rewarding employment in the private sector.
 - . The 1977 Budget provides \$3.2 billion for Community Development block grants to States and local governments--an increase of about 17 percent over 1976. These grants are allocated on the basis of relative need, and permit the States and local governments to carefully plan for the use of these funds.
 - . Tax incentives are proposed for investment in residential mortgages by financial institutions, to stimulate capital for homes rather than for public monuments.
 - . Tax incentives are proposed to induce broader ownership of common stock to stimulate investment which will provide long term productive jobs, rather than increasing public jobs.
- The President's policies have and will continue to result in steady and sustainable improvements in both employment and the overall economy.
 - . The President's economic policies will result in lasting, productive jobs--not temporary jobs paid for by the American taxpayers.
 - . The President's economic policies are designed to create 2 to 2.5 million jobs in 1976 and an additional 2 million jobs in 1977.
 - . Since June 1975, employment has increased by 3 million and the number of unemployed has declined by more than 900,000.

more

- . The national unemployment rate has dropped more than a full one percent in the last year.
- . The President's policies are intended to stimulate private sector construction projects which, unlike public works projects proposed in this bill, will add to the tax base of local governments.
- . Under the President's economic policies the rate of inflation over the last year--May 1975 to 1976--has declined by almost 35 percent over the same period in the preceding year. Rather than aiding the successful course the President has charted, the vetoed legislation would provide added stimulus; likely to be inflationary, two years from now when the economy will be much closer to full recovery.

more

DETAILED DISCUSSION OF KEY REASONS
FOR THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF S. 3201

Public Works Construction Is Not Effective in Increasing Employment Quickly

The bulk of the funds authorized by this bill (\$2.7 billion) would be used for public works.

For more than four years the Economic Development Administration has been trying to find the fastest ways to increase employment through public works projects. This effort, the Public Works Impact Program (PWIP), has shown the difficulty of quickly creating jobs for the unemployed by funding public works.

The facts are as follows. During the year in which the funds are appropriated for accelerated public works, only 10% of the funds are actually spent. During the full second year after appropriations, half of the funds are used. And after four years, 10% of the funds are still not spent for the approved projects.

It is very time consuming for the Federal government to allocate a large amount of money on a project-by-project basis. Even with the small PWIP program, it has required about 9 months to allocate the funds to individual projects. It has taken about 17 months from the time of appropriation to get all of the approved projects under construction. And two years after appropriation of funds, only about 60% of the projects were completed.

Although Title I of the bill requires that the Commerce Department must approve or reject applications for funding within 60 days of receipt of the applications, this will not assure speedy allocation of these funds. The bill provides that appropriations may be provided at any time through the end of fiscal year 1977, which may delay allocations. Funding applications will be submitted over a period of many months. Many of the initial applications might have to be rejected and resubmitted due to inadequate information. Accordingly, even with the 60 day approval or rejection requirement, it could take 18 months or longer to allocate all of the funds.

Once the funds are allocated, it can be expected that commencement and construction of the projects will be no faster, and more likely slower, than the experience with PWIP projects.

Thus, we can expect that it would be late 1977 or early 1978 before all of the projects to be authorized by this bill will be under construction. It will be 1980 or later before all of the projects are completed.

Appendix A is a table that provides the most optimistic estimate of the speed with which the funds would be spent. It is likely to be more realistic to move most of these spending estimates to about one year later than shown on the table.

more

Estimate that 325,000 Jobs Would be Created is Unfounded

Sponsors of the bill have asserted that it would provide work for 325,000 people, primarily as a result of public works projects. This estimate is entirely unrealistic. A much more likely estimate is 160,000 years of employment over the next five years with a peak increase in employment of about 50,000 to 60,000 in 1977 or early 1978.

Although there are no firm figures on employment generated by construction, studies of employment in construction conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that a \$1 billion (1974 dollars) public works program would provide only about 40,000 years of employment, off-site and on-site. Including multiplier effects there would be 60,000 years of employment created by \$1 billion in public works spending. Based on the optimistic spending estimates shown in Appendix A, the peak spending for public works in 1978 would produce a maximum of about 50,000 years. Since construction wages and other costs will be higher in 1978 and beyond than they were in 1974, these estimates of jobs could be high.

It is very difficult to estimate the employment that would be created by the \$1.25 billion in countercyclical grants (Title II).

There is substantial indication that State and local governments would not use much of these funds to hire additional personnel. Studies of revenue sharing have shown that State and local governments increased their purchases of goods and services by roughly one-third of the amount they received. The remainder was used to repay debt and reduce taxes. In addition, recent experience with public service employment indicates that, after the first year of funding, State and local governments may increase employment by only 10 to 40 percent of the number of public service jobs directly funded by the Federal government. Despite numerous regulations to make it difficult to substitute public service employment for regular employment, the practice is widespread. Title II of the vetoed bill contains no requirements that these funds be used for additional jobs.

The maximum expected payment under Title II of the bill is \$312 million per quarter. If as much as 50% of this were used for added employment, it might create as many as 60,000 jobs. Given the experience with similar programs, it is more likely that only 10 to 20% of the funds would be used for added employment, providing an increase of only 10-25,000.

In summary, the peak employment impact is unlikely to exceed 60,000, and is more likely to be near 40,000 to 50,000 sometime in fiscal year 1977 or 1978. The total is likely to be about 160,000 years of employment spread over five years or more.

If the bill produced a total of 160,000 years of employment, the average cost per year of employment would be about \$25,000.

The Title II Countercyclical Assistance Grants Would Discourage Government Incentives to Address Local Priorities.

The recent financial difficulties which have been facing some cities and other local governments have forced them to undertake a long-needed examination of their spending programs to identify the excesses and set priorities. There is no doubt but that some local governments had reached a spending level that they simply will be unable to sustain in the long-term.

The proposed countercyclical assistance grants would remove pressures from States and local governments to more carefully evaluate their activities in terms of benefits produced. If the program becomes permanent, it will allow those governments to avoid economy measures, and then to further expand their programs as their tax revenues increase with the resurgence of the economy. They would be led to expect still more Federal assistance the next time they are in financial difficulty.

The unemployment data required for the fund distribution under the countercyclical assistance program of Title II is not currently available. Developing the new set of statistics required will cost the Department of Labor several thousand dollars.

The countercyclical aid cannot reasonably be provided by the deadlines established in the bill. Payments for the first quarter are to be made by July 1, 1976. Before the payments can be made however, the unemployment data required for the distribution formula must be developed, the Congress must appropriate funds, the Department of Treasury must issue regulations, and signed statements of assurance, as required in the bill, must be obtained from thousands of State and local governments. Considering these requirements, it would likely be January 1977 or later before any payments could be made. Payments made in January 1977 would cover three of the five quarters authorized under Title II. Such a lump sum payment is likely to be counter-productive to the stated purpose of the countercyclical assistance.

In addition to the above problems with the program, it would be very costly to administer. It is estimated by the Department of Treasury that administrative costs and staffing would about equal those of the current General Revenue Sharing program. The current General Revenue Sharing program requires 110 employees and \$11 million to administer \$6.5 billion. The proposed countercyclical aid program would require similar resources to distribute only \$1.25 billion.

\$700 Million for EPA Sewage Treatment Grants is Unneeded and Irrelevant to Unemployment Problems.

The purpose of this provision of the bill is completely unrelated to the purported desire to create jobs quickly for the unemployed.

Even if EPA were to use these added funds now, they would have almost no job creating impact in the next two years. It is simply not practical to significantly accelerate the construction of such facilities.

The real purpose of this provision is to change the formula for the allocation of funds under the wastewater treatment grant program of EPA. An additional \$700 million to a large number of states would be provided by the Congress without consideration of essential reform to the current law. If the reform were not adopted, expenditures of a further \$333 billion between now and 1983 would be required.

It Would Be Administratively Impossible to Effectively Allocate \$2 Billion for Public Works Projects Quickly

This bill requires that the Commerce Department attempt to allocate \$2 billion, on a project-by-project basis, in a few months. All past experience would force a conclusion that this would be reckless and irresponsible.

more

Even without any substantive review of requests for funding, it is highly unlikely that the Department could physically process, in less than nine months, the many--perhaps thousands--of requests that would be involved.

The Department's recent experience with the Job Opportunities program illustrates the point. After its initial experience in allocating \$125 million, it still required six months for Commerce and the cooperating agencies to allocate the additional \$375 million. Also, that allocation was done with only a minimum amount of substantive review of the proposals by the agencies.

Moreover, the Department received a good deal of criticism from Congress for relying too heavily on objective criteria to make the \$375 million allocation, rather than reviewing each particular project.

With \$2 billion to award, the Department is likely to be faced with the choice of taking many months to do a responsible job, or taking nine months or more to pitch Federal tax dollars at projects as they come through the door.

Large Amounts for Spending on High Priority Public Works are Already In the 1976 and 1977 Budget

The attached table shows the amounts of expected spending for public works in the President's Budgets for 1976 and 1977. In 1976, a total of over \$18 billion is provided. This includes over \$11 billion in grants to state and local governments. In 1977, the spending for public works would increase by 17% or by over \$3 billion.

The spending for public works in the Budget is focused on the highest priority national needs, including energy, pollution abatement, flood control, and transportation. The Budget estimates reflect expected spending on projects which are already in the planning stages or under construction. Therefore, the \$3 billion increase will be providing jobs in 1977, rather than in 1978 or 1979. These projects will be helping us achieve important national objectives while at the same time providing employment opportunities.

There are adequate spending levels already in the 1977 Budget for those public works projects that are really needed.

Additional stimulus to private sector employment also would be provided by a 23% increase in spending in the 1977 Budget for major equipment purchases. Spending for this purpose is to increase by \$3.9 billion over 1976, to \$20.7 billion.

more

Changes in Public Works Outlays, Fiscal Year 1976-77
(in millions of dollars)

<u>Description</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>Change</u>
<u>Direct construction</u>			
Civilian programs:			
FAP: Strategic petroleum storage.....	11	164	153
Agr: Forest Service roads and trails and other.....	135	173	38
Corps of Engineers: construction and flood control.....	1,367	1,424	57
Int: Bureau of Reclamation.....	410	507	97
Bonneville.....	135	150	15
NPS, BIA, and other.....	273	252	-21
HEW: Indian health facilities, NIH, other.....	162	138	-24
DOT: Coast Guard facilities.....	78	63	-15
FAA airway systems.....	231	236	5
ERDA: Plant, capital equipment, other...	439	672	233
NASA: Plant and equipment.....	115	126	11
VA: Hospitals and other.....	186	303	117
TVA: Power facilities.....	1,038	1,137	99
All other.....	174	165	-9
Subtotal, civilian programs.....	<u>4,754</u>	<u>5,510</u>	<u>756</u>
Defense programs:			
DOD: Military construction.....	1,713	1,710	-3
Family housing.....	320	287	-33
ERDA: Plant and equipment.....	204	215	11
Subtotal, defense construction.....	<u>2,237</u>	<u>2,212</u>	<u>-25</u>
Total, direct construction.....	<u>6,991</u>	<u>7,722</u>	<u>731</u>
<u>Grants to State and local governments</u>			
FAP: Appalachian regional development...	248	242	-6
Agr: Water and waste disposal, rural development, conservation.....	198	190	-8
Com: EDA and other.....	183	154	-29
HEW: Health.....	213	184	-29
Education and other.....	51	36	-15
Int: Land and water conservation and other.....	274	275	1
DOT: Airports.....	375	355	-20
Highways.....	6,202	6,711	509
Mass Transit.....	573	1,179	606
EPA.....	2,350	3,770	1,420
All other.....	563	442	-121
Total, grants to State and local governments.....	<u>11,230</u>	<u>13,538</u>	<u>2,308</u>
Total public works.....	<u>18,221</u>	<u>21,260</u>	<u>3,039</u>

APPENDIX A

Estimate of Outlays
Local Public Works Capital Development and
Investment Act (S. 3201)

(Dollars in Millions)

<u>Program</u>	<u>Total Amount Authorized</u>	<u>Outlays^{1/}</u>			
		<u>1977</u>	<u>1978</u>	<u>1979</u>	<u>After 1979</u>
Title I, Public works grants	2,000	400	800	600	200
Title II, Counter- cyclical Revenue Sharing	1,250	1,250			
Title II, EPA waste- water treatment facility grants	700	15	150	350	
Total	<u>3,950</u>	<u>1,675</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>950</u>	<u>200</u>

^{1/}The outlay estimates assume that initial appropriations would be provided by October, 1976.

urge my colleagues to join with me today in supporting this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 328, nays 83, not voting 20, as follows.

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—328

Abzug	Danielson	Henderson
Adams	Davis	Hicks
Addabbo	de la Garza	Hightower
Alexander	Deaney	Hillis
Allen	DeLums	Holland
Ambro	Derrick	Holtzman
Anderson,	Derwinski	Horton
Calif.	Diggs	Howard
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Howe
Andrews, N.C.	Dodd	Hubbard
Andrews,	Downey, N.Y.	Hughes
N. Dak.	Downing, Va.	Hungate
Annunzio	Drinan	Hyde
Ashley	Duncan, Oreg.	Jeffords
Aspin	Duncan, Tenn.	Jenrette
AuCoin	Early	Johnson, Calif.
Badillo	Eckhardt	Johnson, Pa.
Bafalis	Edgar	Jones, Ala.
Baldus	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Baucus	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Okla.
Beard, R.I.	Ellberg	Jones, Tenn.
Beard, Tenn.	Emery	Jordan
Bedell	English	Kasten
Bennett	Esch	Kastenmeier
Bergland	Evans, Colo.	Kazen
Bevill	Evans, Ind.	Kemp
Biaggi	Evins, Tenn.	Keys
Bieber	Fary	Koch
Bingham	Fascell	Krebs
Blanchard	Fish	Krueger
Blouin	Fisher	LaFalce
Boggs	Pithian	Leggett
Boland	Flood	Lehman
Bolling	Florio	Lent
Bonker	Flowers	Levitas
Bowen	Flynt	Litton
Breaux	Foley	Lloyd, Calif.
Breckinridge	Ford, Mich.	Lloyd, Tenn.
Brinkley	Ford, Tenn.	Long, La.
Brodhead	Forsythe	Long, Md.
Brooks	Fountain	Lott
Broomfield	Fraser	Lujan
Brown, Calif.	Frey	Lundine
Buchanan	Fuqua	McClory
Burke, Calif.	Gaydos	McCloskey
Burke, Fla.	Glaime	McCormack
Burke, Mass.	Gibbons	McDade
Burlison, Mo.	Gilman	McFall
Burton, John	Ginn	McHugh
Burton, Phillip	Gonzalez	McKay
Byron	Goodling	McKinney
Carney	Green	Madden
Carr	Gude	Madigan
Carter	Guyer	Maguire
Chappell	Haley	Mahon
Chisholm	Hall	Mathis
Clausen,	Hamilton	Matsunaga
Don H.	Hammer-	Mazzoli
Clay	schmidt	Meeds
Cochran	Hanley	Melcher
Cohen	Hannaford	Meyner
Collins, Ill.	Harkin	Mezvinsky
Conte	Harrington	Mikva
Conyers	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Corman	Hayes, Ind.	Mineta
Cornell	Hebert	Minish
Cotter	Hechler, W. Va.	Mink
Coughlin	Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, Md.
D'Amours	Hefner	Mitchell, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	Heinz	Moakley

Moffett	Reuss	Stratton
Mollohan	Richmond	Stuckey
Moorhead, Pa.	Rinaldo	Studds
Morgan	Risenhoover	Sullivan
Mosher	Roberts	Symington
Moss	Rodino	Talcott
Mottl	Roe	Taylor, N.C.
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers	Teague
Murphy, N.Y.	Roncalio	Thompson
Murtha	Rooney	Thornton
Myers, Pa.	Rose	Trader
Natcher	Rosenthal	Tsongas
Neal	Rostenkowski	Udall
Nedzi	Roush	Ullman
Nichols	Roybal	Van Deerlin
Nix	Runnels	Vander Veen
Nolan	Ruppe	Vanik
Nowak	Russo	Vigorito
Oberstar	Ryan	Waggonner
Obey	St Germain	Walsh
O'Brien	Santini	Wampler
O'Hara	Sarasin	Waxman
O'Neill	Sarbanes	Weaver
Ottinger	Scheuer	Whalen
Passman	Schroeder	White
Patten, N.J.	Seiberling	Whitten
Patterson,	Sharp	Wilson, Bob
Calif.	Shibley	Wilson, C. H.
Pattison, N.Y.	Simon	Wilson, Tex.
Pepper	Sisk	Wirth
Perkins	Slack	Wolf
Pettis	Smith, Iowa	Wright
Pike	Solarz	Wylder
Pressler	Spellman	Yates
Preyer	Staggers	Yatron
Price	Stanton,	Young, Fla.
Pritchard	J. William	Young, Ga.
Quillen	Stark	Young, Tex.
Rallsback	Steed	Zablocki
Randall	Steiger, Wis.	Zerferetti
Rees	Stephens	
Regula	Stokes	

NAYS—83

Abdnor	Gradison	Paul
Archer	Grassley	Pickle
Armstrong	Hagedorn	Poage
Ashbrook	Hansen	Quie
Bauman	Harsha	Rhodes
Bell	Holt	Robinson
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Rousselot
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Satterfield
Broyhill	Jacobs	Schneebeli
Burgener	Jarman	Schulze
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Colo.	Sebelius
Butler	Kelly	Shriver
Cederberg	Ketchum	Shuster
Clancy	Kindness	Skubitz
Clawson, Del.	Lagomarsino	Smith, Nebr.
Cleveland	Latta	Snyder
Collins, Tex.	McCollister	Spence
Conable	McEwen	Steelman
Crane	Mann	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Dan	Martin	Symms
Devine	Michel	Taylor, Mo.
Dickinson	Miller, Ohio	Thone
du Pont	Mills	Treen
Erlenborn	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Eshleman	Moore	Wiggins
Findley	Moorhead	Winn
Frenzel	Calif.	Wylie
Goldwater	Myers, Ind.	Young, Alaska

NOT VOTING—20

Brademas	Helstoski	Peyser
Conlan	Hinsaw	Rangel
Daniel, R. W.	Karth	Riegle
Dent	Landrum	Sikes
Fenwick	McDonald	Stanton,
Hawkins	Metcalfe	James V.
Hays, Ohio	Milford	Vander Jagt

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. McDonald against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rangel with Mr. Conlan.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Hays of Ohio.

Mr. Milford with Mr. Karth.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Robert W. Daniel, Jr.

Mr. Helstoski with Mrs. Fenwick.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. James V. Stanton.

Mr. Riegle with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Peyser.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14236) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission; the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to strike title II and also on the conference report on (S. 3201) just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 3201

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 122) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill, (S. 3201) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to increase the antirecessionary effectiveness of the program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 122

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 3201), to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to increase the antirecessionary effectiveness of the program, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following correction:

re-
lift-
not
will
rob-

stood
er to
5247.
e on
el
fame
cur-
mind
time
t was
ed in
House
d out
ich I
enate
' title

since
Well,
gone
now
has
once
May,
annual
annual
year.
on the
e Fed-

day is
than
down
ad. Not
\$25 bil-
States
e main
there
le pro-
should
today
ew city
way to
I think
govern-
ven this
ne way.
r barrel
b bene-
t of so
s cham-

er scan-
f public
urge my
se, and

I rise in
ference
ains the
ich has
it repre-
which is
economic
riencing.
t experi-
ment that
have en-
stance is

le assist-
nemploy-

ment rate of greater than 4.5 percent when the national figure is 6 percent. It is a controllable because the legislation will operate for only 5 calendar quarters at a rate of \$250 million per quarter.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to stop waiting for action on jobs and begin completing the task of putting America back to work. I support the countercyclical proposal and urge its retention in the conference bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the previous question is ordered on the motion to strike title II.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 153, nays 259, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—153

Abbas	Grey	Myers, Pa.
Alexander	Fuqua	Paul
Andrews	Gibbons	Pettis
N. Dak.	Goldwater	Pickie
Archer	Gooding	Poage
Armstrong	Grassley	Quile
Amthor	Grassley	Randall
Ashley	Guyer	Regula
Bafalis	Hagedorn	Rhodes
Bauman	Hammer	Robinson
Beard, Tenn.	schmidt	Rose
Beggs	Hansen	Roush
Bell	Harsha	Rousselot
Bennett	Hightower	Runnels
Breckinridge	Holt	Ruppe
Brinkley	Hutchinson	Ryan
Brooks	Hyde	Satterfield
Brown, Mich.	Isard	Schneebeli
Brown, Ohio	Jacobs	Schulze
Broyhill	Jarman	Sebelius
Buchanan	Johnson, Colo.	Shriver
Burgener	Johnson, Pa.	Shuster
Burison, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Sikes
Burison, Mo.	Jones, Okla.	Skubitz
Butler	Jordan	Smith, Iowa
Cederberg	Kasten	Smith, Nebr.
Chappell	Kelly	Snyder
Clancy	Kemp	Spence
Chausen	Ketchum	Stanton
Don H.	Kindness	J. William
Claason, Del.	Krueger	Steelman
Cleveland	LaPalce	Stuckey
Cochran	Lagomarsino	Sullivan
Collins, Tex.	Landrum	Symms
Conable	Latita	Talbot
Conne	Lavitas	Taylor, Mo.
Daniel, Dan.	Long, Md.	Taylor, N.C.
Derwinski	Lott	Teague
Devine	Lujan	Thone
Dickinson	McClary	Thurston
Downing, Va.	McCollister	Treen
du Pont	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Ala.	McLean	Waggonner
English	Mann	Wampler
Erlenborn	Mitchel	Whitehurst
Eshleman	Muller, Ohio	Wiggins
Evans, Ind.	Mutis	Wilson, Bob
Evans, Tenn.	Montgomery	Wilson, Tex.
Findley	Moore	Winn
Flowers	Moorehead	Wylie
Flynt	Calif.	Young, Alaska
Fountain	Meeker	Young, Tex.
Frenzel	Myers, Ind.	

NAYS—259

Abzug	Beard, R.I.	Breaux
Adams	Bergland	Broadhead
Addabbo	Bevill	Broomfield
Allen	Biaggi	Brown, Calif.
Ambro	Blester	Burke, Calif.
Anderson	Bingham	Burke, Fla.
Calif.	Blanchard	Burke, Mass.
Anderson, Ill.	Blouin	Burton, John
Andrews, N.C.	Boggs	Burton, Phillip
Annunzio	Boland	Byron
Aspin	Bolling	Carney
AuCoin	Bonker	Carr
Badillo	Bowen	Carter
Baucus	Brademas	Chisholm

Clay	Hughes	Pike
Cohen	Hungate	Pressler
Collins, Ill.	Jenforts	Preyer
Conte	Jenrette	Price
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Fritchard
Corman	Jones, Ala.	Quillen
Cornell	Jones, Tenn.	Rallsback
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Coughlin	Kazen	Richmond
D'Amours	Keys	Rinaldo
Daniels, N.J.	Koch	Risenhoover
Danielson	Krebs	Roberts
Davis	Lehman	Rodino
de la Garza	Lent	Roe
Delaney	Litton	Rogers
DeLums	Lloyd, Calif.	Roncalio
Derrick	Lloyd, Tenn.	Rooney
Diggs	Long, La.	Rosenthal
Dingell	Lundine	Rostenkowski
Dodd	McCloskey	Roybal
Downey, N.Y.	McCormack	Russo
Drinan	McDade	St Germain
Duncan, Oreg.	McFall	Santini
Duncan, Tenn.	McHugh	Sarasin
Early	McKay	Sarbanes
Eckhardt	McKinney	Scheuer
Edgar	Madden	Schroeder
Edwards, Calif.	Madigan	Seiberling
Elberg	Maguire	Sharp
Emery	Martin	Shipley
Esch	Mathis	Simon
Evans, Colo.	Matsunaga	Sisk
Fary	Mazzoli	Slack
Fascell	Meeds	Solarz
Fish	Meicher	Spellman
Fisher	Meyner	Staggers
Pithian	Mezvisky	Stanton
Flood	Mikva	James V.
Florio	Miller, Calif.	Stark
Foley	Mineta	Steed
Ford, Mich.	Minish	Steiger, Ariz.
Ford, Tenn.	Mink	Steiger, Wis.
Forsythe	Mitchell, Md.	Stephens
Fraser	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stokes
Gaydos	Moakley	Stratton
Gilamo	Moffett	Studds
Gilman	Mollohan	Symington
Ginn	Moorhead, Pa.	Thompson
Gonzalez	Morgan	Traxler
Green	Moss	Tsongas
Gude	Motti	Udall
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Ullman
Hall	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Derlin
Hamilton	Murtha	Vander Veen
Hanley	Natcher	Vanik
Hannaford	Neal	Vigorito
Harkin	Nedzi	Walsh
Harrington	Nichols	Waxman
Harris	Nix	Weaver
Hawkins	Nolan	Whalen
Hayes, Ind.	Nowak	White
Hebert	Oberstar	Whitten
Heckler, W. Va.	Ober	Wilson, C.H.
Heckler, Mass.	O'Brien	Wirth
Hefner	O'Hara	Wolf
Heinz	O'Neill	Wright
Henderson	Otinger	Yates
Hicks	Pasman	Yatron
Hillis	Patten, N.J.	Young, Fla.
Holland	Patterson	Young, Ga.
Holtzman	Calif.	Zablocki
Horton	Pattison, N.Y.	Zerferetti
Howard	Pepper	
Hubbard	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—19

Baldus	Hinshaw	Peyser
Conlan	Howe	Rangel
Daniel, R. W.	Karth	Rees
Dent	Leggett	Riegle
Fenwick	McDonald	Wydler
Hays, Ohio	Metcalfe	
Helstoski	Milford	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. McDonald with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Baldus with Mr. Robert W. Daniel, Jr.
Mr. Riegle with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Helstoski with Mrs. Fenwick.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Milford with Mr. Howe.

Mr. KRUEGER and Mr. BRECKINRIDGE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BURKE of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to strike was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Clerk read the statement. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 11, 1976.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Jones) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the local Public Works Employment Act (S. 3201).

I stand here as a cosponsor of this legislation as I originally stood as a cosponsor of the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act (H.R. 5247) on its original passage, passage of the conference report and on the successful House vote on the override. Unfortunately, as we all well know, the other Chamber failed to override the Presidential veto by only three votes. Those three crucial votes prevented a multibillion-dollar public works program from going in effect. Had the bill been enacted in mid-April, we would have seen application grants approved by this time because it provided that applications would be deemed approved if the Department of Commerce did not act on the applications within 60 days. This legislation provides the same expediting language.

The bill before us is essentially the same as the House-passed version—H.R. 12972, which was approved by this Chamber on May 13, 1976, with two essential changes. This legislation contains the antirecession or countercyclical provisions that the vetoed bill contained as well as grants for publicly owned waste water treatment works which was also part of the vetoed legislation. These two items appear in the legislation as titles I and II, respectively.

The justification for title II—Public Works—of the bill is clear. We are providing jobs through the implementation of public works projects throughout the States.

Time and time again, I have stood on this floor advocating the rejuvenation of programs such as the Works Projects Administration—WPA—during the thirties and early forties. My reason for support of these programs is the plain and simple fact that when projects are concluded we have a tangible and sub-



most recent consecutive months in excess of 5 per centum, but less than the national unemployment rate. Information regarding unemployment rates may be furnished either to the Federal Government, or by States or local governments, provided the Secretary determines that the unemployment rates furnished by States or local governments are accurate, and shall provide assistance to States or local governments in the calculation of such rates to insure validity and standardization.

(d) Seventy per centum of all amounts appropriated to carry out this Act shall be used for public works projects submitted by State or local governments given priority under clause (1) of the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section. The remaining 30 per centum shall be available for public works projects submitted by State or local governments in other classifications of priority.

(e) The unemployment rate of a local government shall, for the purposes of this Act, upon request of the applicant, be based on the unemployment rate of any community or neighborhood (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within the jurisdiction of such local government.

(f) In determining the unemployment rate of a local government for the purposes of this section, unemployment in those adjoining areas from which the labor force for the project may be drawn, shall, upon request of the applicant, be taken into consideration.

(g) States and local governments making application under this Act should (1) relate their specific requests to existing approved plans and programs of a local community development or regional development nature so as to avoid harmful or costly inconsistencies, contradictions; and (2) where feasible, make requests which, although capable of voluntary initiation, will promote or advance longer range plans and programs.

SEC. 109. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted by the Secretary under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5). The Secretary shall not extend any financial assistance under this Act for such project without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 2-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 1964, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

SEC. 110. No person shall on the ground sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any project receiving Federal grant assistance under this Act, including any supplemental grant made under this Act. This provision will be enforced through agency provisions and rules similar to those already established, with respect to racial and other discrimination under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, this remedy is not exclusive and will not preclude or cut off any other legal remedies available to a discriminatee.

SEC. 111. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,500,000,000 for the period ending September 30, 1977, to carry out this Act.

Mr. WRIGHT (during the reading). Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read,

printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 16, after "government" and before the period, insert a comma and the following:

"Except that any grant made to a local government based upon the unemployment rate of a community or neighborhood within its jurisdiction must be for a project of direct benefit to, or provide employment for, unemployed persons who are residents of that community or neighborhood."

The Committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McFALL, having assumed the chair, Mr. FOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12972) to authorize a local public works capital development and investment program, pursuant to House Resolution 1188, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 339, nays 57, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—339

Abdnor
Adams
Addabbo
Alexander
Allen
Ambro
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, N.C.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Aspin

AuCoin
Badillo
Bafalis
Baldus
Baucus
Beard, R.I.
Beard, Tenn.
Bedell
Bennett
Bergland
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanchard

Blouin
Boland
Bolling
Bonker
Brademas
Breaux
Breckinridge
Brinkley
Brodhead
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill
Burgener
Burke, Calif.

Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Mo.
Burton, John
Burton, Phillip
Byron
Carney
Carr
Carter
Chisholm
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clay
Cleveland
Cochran
Cohen
Collins, Ill.
Conte
Conyers
Corman
Cornell
Cotter
Coughlin
D'Amours
Daniels, N.J.
Danielson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellums
Dent
Derrick
Derwinski
Diggs
Dingell
Dodd
Downey, N.Y.
Downing, Va.
Drinan
du Pont
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Early
Eckhardt
Edgar
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Emery
Evans, Colo.
Evans, Ind.
Evins, Tenn.
Fary
Fasell
Fenwick
Findley
Fish
Fisher
Fithian
Flood
Florio
Flowers
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Mich.
Ford, Tenn.
Forsythe
Fountain
Fraser
Frey
Fuqua
Gaydos
Gialmo
Gibbons
Gihman
Ginn
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green
Gude
Guyer
Haley
Hall
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hannaford
Harkin
Harrington
Harris
Harsha
Hawkins
Hayes, Ind.
Hays, Ohio
Heckler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Hefner
Heinz
Helstoski
Hicks

Hightower
Hillis
Holland
Holtzman
Horton
Howard
Howe
Hubbard
Hughes
Hungate
Hyde
Jeffords
Jehrette
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Jones, N.C.
Jones, Okla.
Jones, Tenn.
Jordan
Kasten
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kemp
Keys
Kindness
Koch
Krebs
Krueger
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Landrum
Leggett
Lehman
Lent
Levitas
Littton
Lloyd, Calif.
Lloyd, Tenn.
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lott
Lujan
Lundine
McClory
McCloskey
McCormack
McDade
McEwen
McHugh
McKay
McKinney
Madden
Madigan
Maguire
Mahon
Martin
Mathis
Mazzoli
Meeds
Meicher
Metcalfe
Meyner
Mezvinisky
Mikva
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Mineta
Minish
Mink
Mitchell, Md.
Mitchell, N.Y.
Moakley
Moffett
Molohan
Moore
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Mosher
Moss
Mottl
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murtha
Myers, Ind.
Myers, Pa.
Natcher
Neal
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
Nolan
Nowak
Oberstar
Obey
O'Brien
O'Hara
O'Neill
Ottinger

Patten, N.J.
Patterson, Calif.
Pattison, N.Y.
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Peyser
Pickle
Pike
Pressler
Preyer
Price
Pritchard
Quillen
Rangel
Rees
Regula
Reuss
Richmond
Rinaldo
Risenhoover
Roberts
Rodino
Roe
Rogers
Roncalio
Rooney
Rose
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Runnels
Ruppe
Russo
Ryan
St Germain
Santini
Sarasin
Scheuer
Schroeder
Schulze
Selberling
Sharp
Shipley
Shuster
Sikes
Simon
Slak
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Solaz
Spellman
Spence
Staggers
Stanton, J. William
Stark
Steed
Steiger, Wis.
Stokes
Stratton
Stuckey
Studds
Symington
Talcott
Taylor, N.C.
Thompson
Thornton
Traxler
Treen
Tsongas
Ullman
Van Deeren
Vander Jagt
Vander Veen
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walsh
Wampler
Waxman
Weaver
Whalen
White
Whitten
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, C. H.
Wilson, Tex.
Wirth
Wolf
Wright
Wylder
Yates
Yatron
Young, Alaska
Young, Fla.
Young, Tex.
Zablocki
Zerfetti

NAYS—57

Archer	Gradison	Qule
Armstrong	Grassley	Rhodes
Ashbrook	Hagedorn	Robinson
Bauman	Holt	Roussetot
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Schneebell
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Sebellus
Burleson, Tex.	Jacobs	Shriver
Butler	Jarman	Skubitz
Clawson, Del.	Kelly	Smith, Nebr.
Collins, Tex.	Ketchum	Snyder
Conable	Latta	Steelman
Conlan	McCollister	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	McDonald	Symms
Daniel, Dan	Mann	Taylor, Mo.
Daniel, R. W.	Michel	Thone
Devine	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Dickinson	Moorhead,	Winn
English	Calif.	Wylie
Erlenborn	Paul	
Frenzel	Poage	

NOT VOTING—36

Abzug	Eshleman	Riegle
Ashley	Hansen	Sarbanes
Bell	Hébert	Satterfield
Blaggi	Henderson	Stanton
Boggs	Hinshaw	James V.
Bowen	Karth	Stephens
Broomfield	McFall	Sullivan
Buchanan	Macdonald	Teague
Cederberg	Matsunaga	Udall
Chappell	Millford	Wiggins
Davis	Passman	Young, Ga.
Elberg	Rallsback	
Esch	Randall	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Elberg with Mr. Matsunaga.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Teague.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Stephens.
Ms. Abzug with Mr. Young of Georgia.
Mr. Riegle with Mr. Karth.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Randall.
Mr. Sarbanes with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Davis with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Millford with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
Mr. Bowen with Mr. Buchanan.
Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Eshleman.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. McFall with Mr. Rallsback.

Mr. BAFALIS and Mr. GOLDWATER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1188, I call up from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3201) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to increase the anti-recessionary effectiveness of the program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WRIGHT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WRIGHT moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill S. 3201 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12972, as passed, as follows:

Sec. 101. This act may be cited as the "Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976".

Sec. 102. As used in this title, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Economic Development Administration.

(2) "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(3) "local government" means any city, county, town, parish, or other political subdivision of a State, and any Indian tribe.

Sec. 103. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State or local government for construction (including demolition and other site preparation activities), renovation, repair, or other improvement of local public works projects including but not limited to those public works projects of State and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under provisions of law other than this Act. In addition the Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State or local government for the completion of plans, specifications, and estimates for local public works projects where either architectural design or preliminary engineering or related planning has already been undertaken and where additional architectural and engineering work or related planning is required to permit construction of the project under this Act.

(b) The Federal share of any project for which a grant is made under this section shall be 100 per centum of the cost of the project.

Sec. 104. In addition to the grants otherwise authorized by this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to a public works project for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under provisions of law other than this Act. Any grant made for a public works project under this section shall be in such amount as may be necessary to make the Federal share of the cost of such project 100 per centum. No grant shall be made for a project under this section unless the Federal financial assistance for such project authorized under provisions of law other than this Act is immediately available for such project and construction of such project has not yet been initiated because of lack of funding for the non-Federal share.

Sec. 105. In addition to the grant otherwise authorized by this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant for the purpose of providing all or any portion of the required State or local share of the cost of any public works project for which financial assistance is authorized under any provision of State or local law requiring such contribution. Any grant made for a public works project under this section shall be made in such amount as may be necessary to provide the requested State or local share of the cost of such project. A grant shall be made under this section for either the State or local share of the cost of the project, but not both shares. No grant shall be made for a project under this section unless the share of the financial assistance for such project (other than the share with respect to which a grant is requested under this section) is immediately available for such project and construction of such project has not yet been initiated.

Sec. 106. (a) No grant shall be made under section 103, 104, or 105 of this Act for any project having as its principal purpose the channelization, damming, diversion, or dredging of any natural watercourse, or the construction or enlargement of any canal (other than a canal or raceway designated for maintenance as an historic site) and having as its permanent effect the channelization, damming, diversion, or dredging of such watercourse, or construction or enlargement of any canal (other than a canal or raceway designated for maintenance as an historic site).

(b) No part of any grant made under section 103, 104, or 105 of this Act shall be used

for the acquisition of any interest in real property.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the payment of maintenance costs in connection with any projects constructed (in whole or in part) with Federal financial assistance under this Act.

(d) Grants made by the Secretary under this Act shall be made only for projects for which the applicant gives satisfactory assurances, in such manner and form as may be required by the Secretary and in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, that, if funds are available, on-site labor can begin within ninety days of project approval.

Sec. 107. The Secretary shall, not later than thirty days after date of enactment of this Act, prescribe those rules, regulations, and procedures (including application forms) necessary to carry out this Act. Such rules, regulations, and procedures shall assure that adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of various sections of the country. The Secretary shall consider among other factors (1) the severity and duration of unemployment in proposed project areas, (2) the income levels and extent of underemployment in proposed project area, and (3) the extent to which proposed projects will contribute to the reduction of unemployment. The Secretary shall make a final determination with respect to each application for a grant submitted to him under this Act not later than the sixtieth day after the date he receives such application. Failure to make such final determination within such period shall be deemed to be an approval by the Secretary of the grant requested. For purposes of this section, in considering the extent of unemployment or underemployment, the Secretary shall consider the amount of unemployment or underemployment in the construction and construction-related industries.

Sec. 108. (a) Not less than one-half of 1 per centum or more than 10 per centum of all amounts appropriated to carry out this title shall be granted under this Act for local public works projects within any one State, except that in the case of Guam, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, not less than one-half of 1 per centum in the aggregate shall be granted for such projects in all three of these jurisdictions.

(b) In making grants under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority and preference to public works projects of local governments.

(c) In making grants under this Act, if for the three most recent consecutive months, the national unemployment rate is equal to or exceeds 6½ per centum, the Secretary shall (1) expedite and give priority to applications submitted by States or local governments having unemployment rates for the three most recent consecutive months in excess of the national unemployment rate and (2) shall give priority thereafter to applications submitted by States or local governments having unemployment rates for the three most recent consecutive months in excess of 6½ per centum, but less than the national unemployment rate. Information regarding unemployment rates may be furnished either by the Federal Government, or by States or local governments, provided the Secretary determines that the unemployment rates furnished by States or local governments are accurate, and shall provide assistance to States or local governments in the calculation of such rates to insure validity and standardization.

(d) Seventy per centum of all amounts appropriated to carry out this Act shall be granted for public works projects submitted by State or local governments given priority under clause (1) of the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section. The remaining 30 per centum shall be available for public works projects submitted by State or local

Vetoed 7/6/76

Senate overridden 7/21
House overridden 7/22

319-96



July 6, 1976

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

TO THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

I am today returning without my approval, S. 3201, the Public Works Employment Act of 1976.

This bill would require \$3.95 billion in Federal spending above and beyond what is necessary. It sends a clear signal to the American people that four months before a national election, the Congress is enacting empty promises and giveaway programs. I will not take the country down that path. Time and time again, we have found where it leads: to larger deficits, higher taxes, higher inflation and ultimately higher unemployment.

We must stand firm. I know the temptation, but I urge Members of Congress to reconsider their positions and join with me now in keeping our economy on the road to healthy, sustained growth.

It was almost five months ago that the Senate sustained my veto of a similar bill, H.R. 5247, and the reasons compelling that veto are equally persuasive now with respect to S. 3201. Bad policy is bad whether the inflation price tag is \$4 billion or \$6 billion.

Proponents of S. 3201 argue that it is urgently needed to provide new jobs. I yield to no one in concern over the effects of unemployment and in the desire that there be enough jobs for every American who is seeking work. To emphasize the point, let me remind the Congress that the economic policies of this Administration are designed to create 2 - 2.5 million jobs in 1976 and an additional 2 million jobs in 1977. By contrast, Administration economists estimate that this bill, S. 3201, will create at most 160,000 jobs over the coming years -- less than 5% of what my own policies will accomplish. Moreover, the jobs created by S. 3201 would reduce national unemployment by less than one-tenth of one percent in any year. The actual projection is that the effect would be .06 percent, at a cost of \$4 billion. Thus, the heart of the debate over this bill is not over who cares the most -- we all care a great deal -- but over the best way to reach our goal.

When I vetoed H.R. 5247 last February, I pointed out that it was unwise to stimulate even further an economy which was showing signs of a strong and steady recovery. Since that time the record speaks for itself. The present 7.5 percent unemployment rate is a full one percent lower than the average unemployment rate of 8.5 percent last year. More importantly, almost three and a half million more Americans now have jobs than was the case in March of last year. We have accomplished this while at the same time reducing inflation which plunged the country into the severe recession of 1975.

more

(OVER)

S. 3201 would authorize almost \$4 billion in additional Federal spending -- \$2 billion for public works, \$1.25 billion for countercyclical aid to state and local governments, and \$700 million for EPA waste water treatment grants.

Beyond the intolerable addition to the budget, S. 3201 has several serious deficiencies. First, relatively few new jobs would be created. The bill's sponsors estimate that S. 3201 would create 325,000 new jobs but, as pointed out above, our estimates indicate that at most some 160,000 work-years of employment would be created -- and that would be over a period of several years. The peak impact would come in late 1977 or 1978 and would add no more than 50,000 to 60,000 new jobs in any year.

Second, S. 3201 would create few new jobs in the immediate future. With peak impact on jobs in late 1977 or early 1978, this legislation would add further stimulus to the economy at precisely the wrong time: when the economy is already far into the recovery.

Third, the cost of producing jobs under this bill would be intolerably high, probably in excess of \$25,000 per job.

Fourth, this bill would be inflationary since it would increase Federal spending and consequently the budget deficit by as much as \$1.5 billion in 1977 alone. It would increase demands on the economy and on the borrowing needs of the government when those demands are least desirable. Basic to job creation in the private sector is reducing the ever increasing demands of the Federal government for funds. Federal government borrowing to support deficit spending reduces the amount of money available for productive investment at a time when many experts are predicting that we face a shortage of private capital in the future. Less private investment means fewer jobs and less production per worker. Paradoxically, a bill designed as a job creation measure may, in the long run, place just the opposite pressures on the economy.

I recognize there is merit in the argument that some areas of the country are suffering from exceptionally high rates of unemployment and that the Federal government should provide assistance. My budgets for fiscal years 1976 and 1977 do, in fact, seek to provide such assistance.

Beyond my own budget recommendations, I believe that in addressing the immediate needs of some of our cities hardest hit by the recession, another measure before the Congress, H.R. 11860 sponsored by Congressman Garry Brown and S. 2986 sponsored by Senator Bob Griffin provides a far more reasonable and constructive approach than the bill I am vetoing.

H.R. 11860 would target funds on those areas with the highest unemployment so that they may undertake high priority activities at a fraction of the cost of S. 3201. The funds would be distributed exclusively under an impartial formula as opposed to the pork barrel approach represented by the public works portions of the bill I am returning

more

today. Moreover, H.R. 11860 builds upon the successful Community Development Block Grant program. That program is in place and working well, thus permitting H.R. 11860 to be administered without the creation of a new bureaucracy. I would be glad to accept this legislation should the Congress formally act upon it as an alternative to S. 3201.

The best and most effective way to create new jobs is to pursue balanced economic policies that encourage the growth of the private sector without risking a new round of inflation. This is the core of my economic policy, and I believe that the steady improvements in the economy over the last half year on both the unemployment and inflation fronts bear witness to its essential wisdom. I intend to continue this basic approach because it is working.

My proposed economic policies are expected to produce lasting, productive jobs, not temporary jobs paid for by the American taxpayer.

This is a policy of balance, realism, and common sense. It is a sound policy which provides long term benefits and does not promise more than it can deliver.

My program includes:

-- Large and permanent tax reductions that will leave more money where it can do the most good: in the hands of the American people;

-- Incentives for the construction of new plants and equipment in areas of high unemployment;

-- More than \$21 billion in outlays in the fiscal year beginning October 1 for important public works such as energy facilities, waste water treatment plants, roads, and veterans' hospitals representing a 17 percent increase over the previous fiscal year.

-- And a five and three quarter year package of general revenue sharing funds for state and local governments.

I ask Congress to act quickly on my tax and budget proposals, which I believe will provide the jobs for the unemployed that we all want.

GERALD R. FORD

THE WHITE HOUSE,

July 6, 1976.

#

The jobs bill veto

Crocodile tears are being shed in several quarters over President Ford's veto of the \$3.95 billion jobs bill.

Democrats accuse Mr. Ford of kowtowing to the Republican right in an effort to head off the nomination of Ronald Reagan. Big-city mayors claim it shows that Mr. Ford is callous about the problems of big cities. Rep. Bella Abzug de-

plained that Mr. Ford's veto was "a cruel blow to the hopes" of the nation's cities.

Representative Abzug's charge that Mr. Ford wants to keep Americans out of work is so preposterous as to be unworthy of comment, except to say that overblown rhetoric is typical of Mrs. Abzug.

Mr. Ford vetoed the bill on grounds that it would contribute to inflation and would do little

File

The Washington Star
July 10, 1976

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

Charlie --

this package was sent to the 153
Congressmen on the attached
list. (Sent to each district office.)

Janet
7/12

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 12, 1976

Dear Congressman:

The President wanted you to have the enclosed material pertaining to his recent veto of S. 3201.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Max". The signature is stylized with a large, sweeping initial 'M' and a cursive 'ax'.

Max L. Friedersdorf
Assistant to the President

JUL 13 1976

July 13, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: BILL BAROODY
FROM: MAX FRIEDERSDORF
SUBJECT: Jobs Bill

Per our conversation, I am attaching a copy of the veto message for S. 3201, the Public Works Job Bill, and a list of prospective Senators and House Members whom we hope to persuade to support the President's veto.

Senate

Allen
Eastland
Pearson
Taft
Stennis
Brock
Chiles

Fong
Hatfield
Long
McGee
Montoya
Morgan
Packwood

Percy
Sparkman
Stone

House

See attached list (the 153 "yea" votes are our targets).

cc: Jack Marsh
Bill Kendall
Charlie Leppert



well managed. It represents an example of how not to manage, if you will. In the bill, it probably will.

February we stood debated whether to veto on H.R. 5247, this bill. I spoke on the bill as an exception to those remarks. Nothing has occurred to change my mind. The passage of time convinces that it was the wrong time. I was veto was sustained in the House when this House ways and reported out of the bill which I for. Then the Senate the bad penny, title.

It has happened since on title II? Well, employment has gone where everyone now is over. Inflation has where it has once danger level. In May a 7.4 percent annual a 2.9 percent annual months of the year is once again on this time on the Federal. I submit that today to pass this bill than we take this step down it will never end. Not House passed a \$25 billion bill for the States. One of the main was whether there attached to the determined there should we doing here today strings to a new city? Is this any way to Independence Day? I think And I think the governors who have given the might feel the same way. More than pork barrel employees job benefits of a scandal that was the subject of a morning in this chamber.

us avoid another scandal. Petty theft of public property, and I urge my commonsense, and this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in II of the conference.

Title II contains the legislation which has this House. It represents assistance which is nation of the economic currently experiencing. They have not experienced in employment that the country have entirely, this assistance is much needed. It would provide assistance with an unemployed.

ment rate of greater than 4.5 percent when the national figure is 6 percent. It is a controllable because the legislation will operate for only 5 calendar quarters at a rate of \$250 million per quarter.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come to stop waiting for action on jobs and begin completing the task of putting America back to work. I support the countercyclical proposal and urge its retention in the conference bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore: Without objection the previous question is ordered on the motion to strike title II.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore: The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Brooks).

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 153, nays 259, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 439]

YEAS—153

Abdnor	Frey	Myers, Pa.
Alexander	Fuqua	Paul
Andrews	Gibbons	Pettis
N. Dak.	Goldwater	Pickle
Archer	Goodling	Poage
Armstrong	Gradison	Quile
Ashbrook	Grassley	Randall
Ashley	Guyer	Regula
Bafalis	Hagedorn	Rhodes
Bauman	Hammer	Robinson
Beard, Tenn.	schmidt	Rose
Bedell	Hansen	Roush
Bell	Harsha	Rousselot
Bennett	Hightower	Runnels
Breckinridge	Holt	Ruppe
Brinkley	Hutchinson	Ryan
Brooks	Hyde	Satterfield
Brown, Mich.	Ichord	Schneebeli
Brown, Ohio	Jacobs	Schulze
Broyhill	Jarman	Sebelius
Buchanan	Johnson, Colo.	Shriver
Burgener	Johnson, Pa.	Shuster
Burleson, Tex.	Jones, N.C.	Sikes
Burrlison, Mo.	Jones, Okla.	Skubitz
Butler	Jordan	Smith, Iowa
Cederberg	Kasten	Smith, Nebr.
Chappell	Kelly	Snyder
Ciancy	Kemp	Spence
Clausen	Ketchum	Stanton
Don H.	Kinross	J. William
Clawson, Del.	Krueger	Steelman
Cleveland	LaFalce	Stuckey
Cochran	Lagomarsino	Sullivan
Collins, Tex.	Landrum	Symms
Conable	Latta	Talcott
Crane	Levitas	Taylor, Mo.
Daniel, Dan.	Long, Md.	Taylor, N.C.
Derwinski	Lott	Teague
Davine	Lujan	Thone
Dickinson	McClory	Thornton
Downing, Va.	McCollister	Treen
du Pont	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Edwards, Ala.	Mabon	Waggonner
English	Mann	Wampler
Erlenborn	Michel	Whitehurst
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Wiggins
Evans, Ind.	Mills	Wilson, Bob
Evins, Tenn.	Montgomery	Wilson, Tex.
Findley	Moore	Winn
Flowers	Moorhead,	Wylie
Flynt	Calif.	Young, Alaska
Fountain	Mosher	Young, Tex.
Frenzel	Myers, Ind.	

NAYS—259

Abzug	Beard, R.I.	Breaux
Adams	Bergland	Brodhead
Addabbo	Beverly	Broomfield
Allen	Biaggi	Brown, Calif.
Ambro	Biester	Burke, Calif.
Anderson	Bingham	Burke, Fla.
Calif.	Blanchard	Burke, Mass.
Anderson, Ill.	Blouin	Burton, John
Andrews, N.C.	Boggs	Burton, Phillip
Annuzio	Boland	Byron
Aspin	Bolling	Carney
AuCoin	Bonker	Carr
Badillo	Bowen	Carter
Baucus	Brademas	Chisholm

Clay	Hughes	Pike
Cohen	Hungate	Pressler
Collins, Ill.	Jeffords	Preyer
Conte	Jenrette	Price
Conyers	Johnson, Calif.	Pritchard
Corman	Jones, Ala.	Quillen
Cornell	Jones, Tenn.	Rallsback
Cotter	Kastenmeier	Reuss
Coughlin	Kazen	Richmond
D'Amours	Keys	Rinaldo
Daniels, N.J.	Koch	Risenhoover
Danielson	Krebs	Roberts
Davis	Lehman	Rodino
de la Garza	Lent	Roe
Delaney	Liton	Rogers
DeLums	Lloyd, Calif.	Roncalio
Derrick	Lloyd, Tenn.	Rooney
Diggs	Long, La.	Rosenthal
Dingell	Lundine	Rostenkowski
Dodd	McCloskey	Roybal
Downey, N.Y.	McCormack	Russo
Drinan	McDade	St Germain
Duncan, Oreg.	McFall	Santini
Duncan, Tenn.	McHugh	Sarasin
Early	McKay	Barbanes
Eckhardt	McKinney	Scheuer
Edgar	Madden	Schroeder
Edwards, Calif.	Madigan	Seiberling
Ellberg	Maguire	Sharp
Emery	Martin	Shipley
Esch	Mathis	Simon
Evans, Colo.	Matsumaga	Sisk
Fary	Mazzoli	Slack
Fascell	Meeds	Solarz
Fish	Melcher	Spelman
Fisher	Meyner	Staggers
Flthian	Mezvinisky	Stanton
Flood	Mikva	James V.
Florio	Miller, Calif.	Stark
Foley	Mineha	Steed
Ford, Mich.	Minish	Steiger, Ariz.
Ford, Tenn.	Mink	Steiger, Wis.
Forsythe	Mitchell, Md.	Stephens
Fraser	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stokes
Gaydos	Moakley	Stratton
Gialmo	Moffett	Studds
Gillman	Mollohan	Symington
Ginn	Moorhead, Pa.	Thompson
Gonzalez	Morgan	Traxler
Green	Moss	Teongas
Gude	Mottl	Udall
Haley	Murphy, Ill.	Ullman
Hall	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerin
Hamilton	Murtha	Vander Veen
Hanley	Natcher	Vanik
Hannaford	Neal	Vigorito
Harkin	Nedzi	Walsh
Harrington	Nichols	Waxman
Harris	Nix	Weaver
Hawkins	Noian	Whalen
Hayes, Ind.	Nowak	White
Hebert	Oberstar	Whitten
Hechler, W. Va.	Obey	Wilson, C.H.
Heckler, Mass.	O'Brien	Wirth
Hefner	O'Hara	Wolf
Helms	O'Neill	Wright
Henderson	Ottiger	Yates
Hicks	Pasman	Yatron
Hill	Patten, N.J.	Young, Fla.
Holland	Patterson	Young, Ga.
Holtzman	Calif.	Zablocki
Horton	Pattison, N.Y.	Zelefetti
Howard	Pepper	
Hubbard	Perkins	

NOT VOTING—19

Baldus	Hinsaw	Peyser
Conlan	Howe	Rangel
Daniel, R. W.	Kath	Rees
Dent	Leggett	Riegle
Fenwick	McDonald	Wydler
Hays, Ohio	Metcalfe	
Helstoski	Milford	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Conlan.
Mr. McDonald with Mr. Kath.
Mr. Rangel with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Baldus with Mr. Robert W. Daniel, Jr.
Mr. Riegle with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Helstoski with Mrs. Fenwick.
Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Peyser.
Mr. Milford with Mr. Howe.

Mr. KRUEGER and Mr. BRECKINRIDGE changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BURKE of Florida changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to stand.
The result of the vote as above recorded.
The Clerk read the (For conference see proceedings of the 1976.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama (reading). Mr. Speaker consent that further statement be dispensed.

The SPEAKER: Is the request of the Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER: The Alabama (Mr. Jones) for 30 minutes, and the Arkansas (Mr. HAMM) recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself may consume.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMERS. Speaker, I yield to the Massachusetts.

(Mr. CONTE asked mission to revise remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the local Public Act (S. 3201).

I stand here as a legislation as I original sponsor of the Local Development and (H.R. 5247) on its original of the conference successful House vote. Unfortunately, as we other Chamber failed Presidential veto by.

Those three crucial multibillion-dollar public from going in effect, enacted in mid-April seen application granted time because it provisions would be deemed Department of Commerce the applications within legislation provides the language.

The bill before us, same as the House passed 12972, which was approved on May 13, 1976, changes. This legislation antirecession or countercyclical that the vetoed well as grants for public water treatment works part of the vetoed legislation items appear in the I and II, respectively.

The justification for Works—of the bill is providing jobs through the of public works project States.

Time and time again this floor advocating the programs such as the WPA—thirties and early forties support of these programs and simple fact that we concluded we have a

REPUBLICAN WHIP—ROBERT H. MICHEL

FILE

Date: 19 July 76

PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYMENT

94th Congress

Question: Will you vote to sustain the President's veto of S. 3201?

Tally Sheet

Western and Plains (Talcott)					Midwestern States (Myers)				
	Yes	No	Und.	N/R		Yes	No	Und.	N/R
<i>California</i>					<i>Indiana</i>				
Bell	/				Hillis	/			
Burgener	/	/			Myers	/			
Clausen	/				<i>Iowa</i>				
Clawson	/				Grassley				/
Goldwater	/			/	<i>Michigan</i>			/	
Hinshaw	/			/	Broomfield			/	
Ketchum	/				Brown	/			/
Lagomarsino (ARW)	/				Cederberg	/	/		
McCloskey	/		/		Esch	/	/		
Moorhead	/		/		Hutchinson	/	/		
Rousselot	/				Ruppe	/	/		/
Talcott	/				Vander Jagt				/
Wiggins	/		/		<i>Minnesota</i>				
Wilson	/	/	/		Frenzel (ARW)	/	/		
Pettis	/	/			Hagedorn	/			/
<i>Alaska</i>					Quie	/			
Young probably	/				<i>Wisconsin</i>				
<i>Arizona</i>					Kasten	/	/		
Conlan	/				Steiger	/	/		
Rhodes	/				<i>Ohio</i>				
Steiger	/				Ashbrook	/	/		
<i>Colorado</i>					Brown (ARW)	/	/		
Armstrong (ARW)	/				Clancy	/	/		
Johnson probably	/				Devine	/			/
<i>Idaho</i>					Gradison	/		/	
Hansen	/	/			Guyer	/		/	
Symms	/	/			Harsha	/		/	/
<i>New Mexico</i>					Kindness	/		/	
Lujan	/	/			Latta	/			/
<i>Washington</i>					Miller	/			/
Pritchard	/	/			Mosher	/		/	
<i>Kansas</i>					Regula	/		/	
Sebelius	/	/			Stanton	/	/		
Shriver	/			/	Whalen	/	/		
Skubitz	/			/	Wylie	/	/		
Winn	/	/			<i>Illinois</i>				
<i>Nebraska</i>					Anderson	/	/		
McCollister	/	/		/	Crane	/	/		
Smith	/			/	Derwinski O/T	/			/
Thone (ARW)	/	/			Erlenborn	/	/		
<i>North Dakota</i>					Findley (ARW)	/		/	
Andrews	/	/			Hyde	/		/	
<i>Oklahoma</i>					Madigan	/			/
Jarman	/			/	McClory	/	/		
<i>South Dakota</i>					Michel	/	/		
Abdnor	/	/		/	O'Brien	/	/		
Pressler	/	/		/	Railsback	/	/		
Total	21	5	3	7	Total	19	8	5	9
Total pages 1 and 2	60	37	21	27					



REPUBLICAN WHIP—ROBERT H. MICHEL

94th Congress
Tally Sheet

Date:

Question:

Public Works

Border and Southern (Young)					New England and Mid-Atlantic (McDade)				
	Yes	No	Und.	N/R		Yes	No	Und.	N/R
Maryland					Connecticut				
Gude					McKinney				
Holt					Sarasin				
Bauman					Delaware				
Missouri					duPont				
Taylor (ARW)					Maine				
Kentucky					Cohen				
Carter					Emery				
Snyder					Massachusetts				
Tennessee					Conte (ARW)				
Beard					Heckler				
Duncan					New Hampshire				
Quillen					Cleveland				
Florida					New Jersey				
Bafalis					Fenwick				
Burke					Forsythe				
Frey					Rinaldo				
Kelly					Vermont				
Young					Jeffords				
North Carolina					New York				
Broyhill					Conable				
Martin					Fish				
South Carolina					Gilman				
Spence									
Virginia					Horton				
Butler					Kemp				
Daniel					Lent				
Robinson					McEwen				
Wampler					Mitchell (ARW)				
Whitehurst (ARW)					Peyser				
Alabama					Walsh				
Buchanan					Wydler				
Dickinson (ARW)					Pennsylvania				
Edwards					Biester				
Arkansas					Coughlin				
Hammerschmidt					Eshleman				
Louisiana					Goodling				
Moore					Heinz				
Treen					Johnson (ARW)				
Mississippi					McDade				
Cochran					Myers				
Lott					Schneebeli				
Texas					Schulze				
Archer					Shuster				
Collins									
Steelman									
Paul									
Total	13	7	7	6	Total	7	17	5	5



JULY 21, 1976

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I deeply regret today that the Senate has overridden my veto of the Public Works Bill.

Both the Senate and I share a keen desire to expand job opportunities for all Americans, but I continue to believe that the wisest, most productive means of reaching that goal is through a steadily growing private sector -- not through temporary jobs that are run by the government, increase the national debt, and create new inflationary pressures.

The House can rectify the Senate action on Thursday and should, in the best interest of the Nation, sustain my veto.

#

JULY 22, 1976

Office of the White House Press Secretary

THE WHITE HOUSE

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I am keenly disappointed by the action of the Congress in enacting, over my veto, the so-called Public Works Employment Act of 1976.

The Congress has badly misjudged the real public interest in enacting this bill. What the Congress is saying in effect is that:

- It is not sufficiently concerned about the risks of double digit inflation.
- It would rather create \$4 billion worth of temporary, Government funded jobs than let those same dollars go to work in the private sector to produce real, rewarding, lasting jobs.
- It wants the Federal Government to borrow yet another \$4 billion from the private sector.
- It is willing to fund jobs at a cost of \$25,000 a piece for each year of temporary employment created.
- And it would rather have the Federal Government borrow and spend yet another \$4 billion than enact my proposed \$10 billion added tax cut which would help all of our people.

My concern about our unemployed citizens is second to none. But that concern strengthens my resolve to do everything I can to keep our economy on the strong, stable growth path we are now on -- a path that does not risk a return to double-digit inflation and another deep recession. My concern does not and will not stampede me into embracing unwise legislation.

It is my hope that the Congress, on reflection, will agree with my views and not insist on providing funds to carry out this program. If it does insist on going ahead with this program, there will be no real winners but there will be real losers: the American people.

#

S.3201

FIVE

STATE AND PARTY REPORT

22 JULY 1976 12:14 PM PAGE 1

ROLL NO. 534

S 3201

2/3 YEA-AND-NAY

CLOSED 22 JULY 1976 12:10 PM

AUTHOR(S):

ON PRESIDENTIAL VETO

PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYMENT ACT

	YEA	NAY	PRES	NV
DEMOCRATIC	253	15		19
REPUBLICAN	57	81		7
OTHER				
TOTAL	310	96		26



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

ALABAMA

BEVILL	YEA
FLOWERS	YEA
JONES (AL)	YEA
NICHOLS	YEA

BUCHANAN	YEA
DICKINSON	NAY
EDWARDS (AL)	YEA

ALASKA

YOUNG (AK)	NV
------------	----

ARIZONA

UDALL	YEA
-------	-----

CONLAN	NAY
RHODES	NAY
STEIGER (AZ)	NAY

ARKANSAS

ALEXANDER	YEA
MILLS	YEA
THORNTON	YEA

HAMMERSCHMIDT	YEA
---------------	-----

CALIFORNIA

ANDERSON (CA)	YEA
BROWN (CA)	YEA
BURKE (CA)	YEA
BURTON, JOHN	YEA
BURTON, PHILLIP	YEA
CORMAN	YEA
DANIELSON	YEA
DELLUNS	YEA
EDWARDS (CA)	YEA
HANNAFORD	YEA
HAWKINS	YEA
JOHNSON (CA)	YEA
KREBS	YEA
LEGGETT	YEA
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	NAY
BURGENER	NAY
CLAUSEN, DON H.	YEA
CLAWSON, DEL	NAY
GOLDWATER	NAY
HINSHAW	NV
KETCHUM	NAY
LAGOMARSINO	NAY
MC CLOSKEY	YEA
MOORHEAD (CA)	NAY
PETTIS	YEA
ROUSSELOT	NAY
TALCOTT	YEA
WIGGINS	NAY
WILSON, BOB	YEA

COLORADO

EVANS (CO)	YEA
SCHROEDER	YEA
WIRTH	YEA

ARMSTRONG	NAY
JOHNSON (CO)	NAY



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

CONNECTICUT

COTTER	YEA
BODD	YEA
GIAMMO	YEA
HOFFETT	YEA

MC KINNEY	YEA
SARASIN	YEA

DELAWARE

DU PONT	NAY
---------	-----

FLORIDA

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

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

GEORGIA

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

HAWAII

NATSUNAGA	YEA
HINK	YEA

IDAHO

HANSEN	NAY
SYMMS	NAY



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

ILLINOIS

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

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

INDIANA

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

HILLIS	NAY
MYERS (IN)	NAY

IOWA

BEDELL	YEA
BLOVIN	YEA
HARKIN	NY
MEZVINSKY	YEA
SMITH (IA)	YEA

GRASSLEY	NAY
----------	-----

KANSAS

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

SEBELIUS	NAY
SHRIVER	NAY
SKUBITZ	NAY
WINN	NAY

KENTUCKY

BRECKINRIDGE	YEA
HUBBARD	YEA
MAZZOLI	YEA
HATCHER	YEA
PERKINS	YEA

CARTER	YEA
SNYDER	NAY

LOUISIANA

BOGGS	YEA
BREAUX	YEA
HEBERT	YEA
LONG (LA)	YEA
PASSMAN	YEA
MAGGONNER	NAY

MOORE	NAY
TREEN	NAY



ROLL NO. 534

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
DRINAN	YEA
EARLY	YEA
HARRINGTON	YEA
HOAKLEY	YEA
O'NEILL	YEA
STUDDS	YEA
TSONGAS	YEA

CONTE	YEA
HECKLER (MA)	YEA

MICHIGAN

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

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

MINNESOTA

BERGLAND	YEA
FRASER	YEA
KARTH	YEA
NOLAN	YEA
OSERSTAR	YEA

FRENZEL	NAY
HAGEDORN	NAY
QUIE	NAY

MISSISSIPPI

BOWEN	YEA
MONTGOMERY	NAY
WHITTEN	YEA

COCHRAN	YEA
LOTT	YEA



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

MISSOURI

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

TAYLOR (MO)	NAY
-------------	-----

MONTANA

BAUCUS	YEA
MELCHER	YEA

NEBRASKA

MC COLLISTER	NAY
SMITH (NB)	NAY
THONE	NAY

NEVADA

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

NEW HAMPSHIRE

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

CLEVELAND	NAY
-----------	-----

NEW JERSEY

DANIELS (NJ)	YEA
FLORIO	YEA
HELSTOSKI	YEA
HOWARD	YEA
HUGHES	YEA
MAGUIRE	YEA
MEYNER	YEA
MINISH	YEA
PATTEN (NJ)	YEA
RODINO	YEA
ROE	YEA
THOMPSON	YEA

FENWICK	YEA
FORSYTHE	YEA
RINALDO	YEA

NEW MEXICO

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

LUJAN	YEA
-------	-----



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

NEW YORK

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

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

NORTH CAROLINA

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

BROYHILL	NAY
MARTIN	NAY

NORTH DAKOTA

ANDREWS (ND)	NAY
--------------	-----



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

OHIO

ASHLEY	YEA
CARNEY	YEA
HAYS (OH)	NY
MOTTL	YEA
SEIBERLING	YEA
STANTON, JAMES V.	NY
STOKES	YEA
VANIK	YEA

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

OKLAHOMA

ALBERT	
ENGLISH	YEA
JONES (OK)	YEA
RISENHOVER	YEA
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
NIH	YEA
ROONEY	YEA
VIGORITO	YEA
YATRON	YEA

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

RHODE ISLAND

BEARD (RI)	YEA
ST GERMAIN	YEA



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

SOUTH CAROLINA

DAVIS	YEA
DERRICK	YEA
HOLLAND	YEA
JENRETTE	YEA
MANN	NAY

SPENCE	NAY
--------	-----

SOUTH DAKOTA

ABDHOR	NAY
PRESSLER	YEA

TENNESSEE

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

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

TEXAS

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

ARCHER	NAY
COLLINS (TX)	NAY
PAUL	NAY
STEELMAN	NY

UTAH

HOWE	NY
MC KAY	YEA

VERMONT

JEFFORDS	YEA
----------	-----

VIRGINIA

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

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



ROLL NO. 534

DEMOCRATIC

OTHER

REPUBLICAN

WASHINGTON

ADAMS	YEA
BONKER	YEA
FOLEY	YEA
HICKS	YEA
MC CORMACK	YEA
NEEDS	YEA

PRITCHARD

YEA

WEST VIRGINIA

HECHLER (WV)	YEA
MOLLOHAN	YEA
SLACK	YEA
STAGGERS	YEA

WISCONSIN

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

KASTEN	YEA
STEIGER (WI)	YEA

WYOMING

RONCALIO	YEA
----------	-----

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

REPUBLICAN CLERK'S
REFERENCE COPY

JOE BARTLETT
H-220, U. S. CAPITOL



S. 3201 (NR 12972) Public Works Employment Act of 1976

House override

July 22, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H. 7567

conomic history—that good public investments create far more new capital than they initially cost.

President Hoover justified his veto of the 1932 public works measure because it pushed the budget into deficit. A good, strong, expansionary Federal deficit was, of course, exactly what America needed in 1932. With it, we might have avoided the worst of the depression. But, here is President Ford in 1976, still sounding the trumpet for a balanced budget during recession.

Well, we are not yet out of our recent very severe recession, the worst since the Great Depression itself. Unemployment went up again last month to 7.5 percent and millions of Americans cannot find work. The Democratic Congress planned, in its budget, to stimulate the economy with this public works measure, and I think we had better stay with our plan rather than with President Ford's and President Hoover's.

And what, finally, of inflation? Mr. Hoover worried about it and so, of course, does President Ford. Inflation is a serious problem—far more so now than in the 1930's. But economists have learned a few things about inflation—even if the conservative Republican leadership has not.

We know, for example, that this bill is not inflationary, that it will create new jobs. It puts money into a general economy, and into specific industries, with enormous idle capacity in manpower and machinery. This bill is not going to push us up against the limits of our ability to produce, thereby stimulating inflation.

If the Republican leadership have failed sadly in learning the economic lessons of the last 50 years, they have failed even more sadly to learn the moral lessons of our last half century.

The American people—and the Democratic Party—have concluded that unemployment is immoral. It is antisocial. It strikes at the heart of American society, the family, ruining lives, destroying dreams, creating criminals, truly a cancer in the body of our Nation.

Simple justice, as well as sound economics, dictates that we do everything in our power to rid our Nation of this evil. Unfortunately, the Republican administration has not yet come to understand the immorality of unemployment.

As I read President Ford's veto message, and then laid President Hoover's message beside it and compared them point by point, I could only wonder at how totally the conservative Republican leadership has failed to learn the lessons of the last 50 years of American economic experience and moral development.

The same economic arguments, the same moral stance, which motivated President Hoover's misguided veto of a public works measure in 1932 now motivates President Ford's equally ill-conceived veto of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976. The minds of the Republicans have been possessed by a demon mythology for half a century. Will it ever be exorcised?

It is said, my colleagues, that those who do not learn from history are condemned to repeat it.

Let us then learn, as President Ford

apparently has not, from the tragic history of the 1930's. Let us not repeat the fearfulness and suffering of that unfortunate era. Let us not, with President Ford, condemn our Nation once again to the agony of rampant unemployment and near depression.

Let us instead, Democrats and Republicans alike, learn from the tragic errors of our past and vote, now, overwhelmingly, to override the veto of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 96, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 534]

YEAS—310

Adams	Dent	Holland
Addabbo	Derrick	Holtzman
Alexander	Diggs	Horton
Allen	Dingell	Howard
Ambro	Dodd	Hubbard
Anderson, Calif.	Downey, N.Y.	Hughes
Annunzio	Downing, Va.	Hungate
Ashley	Drinan	Hyde
Aspin	Duncan, Oreg.	Jeffords
AuCoin	Duncan, Tenn.	Jenrette
Badillo	Early	Johnson, Calif.
Bafalis	Eckhardt	Johnson, Pa.
Baldus	Edgar	Jones, Ala.
Baucus	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Beard, R.L.	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Okla.
Bedell	Ellberg	Karsh
Bennett	Emery	Kasten
Bergland	English	Kastenmeier
Bevill	Esch	Kazen
Biaggi	Evans, Colo.	Kemp
Blester	Evans, Ind.	Keys
Bingham	Evins, Tenn.	Koch
Blanchard	Fary	Krebs
Blouin	Fasell	LaFalce
Boggs	Fenwick	Landrum
Boland	Fish	Leggett
Bolling	Fisher	Lehman
Bonker	Fithian	Lent
Bowen	Flood	Levitas
Brademas	Florio	Lloyd, Calif.
Breaux	Flowers	Lloyd, Tenn.
Breckinridge	Foley	Long, La.
Brodhead	Ford, Mich.	Long, Md.
Brooks	Ford, Tenn.	Lott
Broomfield	Forsythe	Lujan
Brown, Calif.	Fountain	Lundine
Buchanan	Fraser	McCloskey
Burke, Calif.	Frey	McCormack
Burke, Mass.	Fuqua	McDade
Burlison, Mo.	Gaydos	McFall
Burton, John	Glaime	McHugh
Burton, Phillip	Gilman	McKay
Byron	Ginn	McKinney
Carney	Gonzalez	Madden
Carr	Goodling	Maguire
Carter	Green	Mathis
Chappell	Gude	Matsunaga
Chisholm	Guyer	Mazzoli
Clausen	Haley	Meeds
Don H.	Hall, Ill.	Meicher
Cochran	Hamilton	Metcalfe
Cohen	Hammer	Meyner
Collins, Ill.	schmidt	Mezvisinsky
Conte	Hanley	Mikva
Conyers	Hannaford	Miller, Calif.
Corman	Harrington	Mills
Cornell	Harris	Mineta
Cotter	Hawkins	Minish
Coughlin	Hébert	Mink
D'Amours	Hechler, W. Va.	Mitchell, Md.
Daniels, N.J.	Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, N.Y.
Danielson	Hefner	Moakley
De la Garza	Heinz	Moffett
Delaney	Helstoski	Mollohan
Dellums	Henderson	Moorhead, Pa.
	Hicks	Morgan
	Hightower	Moss

Mottl	Rosenbloom	Stokes
Murphy, Ill.	Roberts	Stratton
Murtha	Rodino	Stuckey
Myers, Pa.	Roe	Studds
Natcher	Rogers	Sullivan
Neal	Roncallo	Symington
Nedzi	Rooney	Talcott
Nichols	Rose	Taylor, N.C.
Nix	Rosenthal	Thompson
Nolan	Rostenkowski	Thornton
Nowak	Roush	Traxler
Oberstar	Roybal	Tsongas
Obey	Runnels	Udall
O'Brien	Ruppe	Ullman
O'Hara	Russo	Van Deertin
O'Neill	Ryan	Vander Veen
Ottinger	St Germain	Vanik
Pasman	Santini	Vigorito
Patten, N.J.	Sarasin	Walsh
Patterson, Calif.	Sarbanes	Wampler
Pattison, N.Y.	Scheuer	Waxman
Perkins	Schroeder	Weaver
Pettis	Seiberling	Whalen
Pike	Sharp	White
Pressler	Sikes	Whitten
Preyer	Simon	Wilson, Bob
Price	Slak	Wilson, C. H.
Pritchard	Slack	Wilson, Tex.
Railsback	Smith, Iowa	Wirth
Randall	Solarz	Wolf
Rangel	Spellman	Wright
Rees	Staggers	Wyder
Regula	Stanton	Yates
Reuss	J. William	Yatron
Richmond	Stark	Young, Fla.
Riegle	Steed	Young, Tex.
Rinaldo	Steiger, Wis.	Zablocki
	Stephens	Zerferetti

NAYS—96

Abdnor	Gibbons	Moorhead, Calif.
Andrews	Goldwater	Mosher
N. Dak.	Gradison	Myers, Ind.
Archer	Grassley	Paul
Armstrong	Hagedorn	Pickle
Ashbrook	Hall, Tex.	Poage
Bauman	Hansen	Quile
Beard, Tenn.	Harsha	Quillen
Bell	Hillis	Rhodes
Brown, Mich.	Holt	Robinson
Brown, Ohio	Hutchinson	Rousselot
Broyhill	Ichord	Satterfield
Burgener	Jacobs	Schulze
Burke, Fla.	Jarman	Sebelius
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Colo.	Shriver
Butler	Kelly	Shuster
Cederberg	Ketchum	Skubitz
Clancy	Kindness	Smith, Nebr.
Cawson, Del.	Lagomarsino	Snyder
Cleveland	Latta	Spence
Collins, Tex.	McClary	Steiger, Ariz.
Conable	McCollister	Symms
Conlan	McDonald	Taylor, Mo.
Crane	McEwen	Thone
Daniel, Dan.	Madigan	Treen
Daniel, R. W.	Mahon	Vander Jagt
Devine	Mann	Waggonner
Dickinson	Martin	Whitehurst
du Pont	Michel	Wiggins
Erlenborn	Millford	Winn
Eshleman	Miller, Ohio	Wyllie
Findley	Montgomery	
Frenzel	Moore	

NOT VOTING—26

Abzug	Hays, Ohio	Peyser
Anderson, Ill.	Hinsshaw	Schneebell
Andrews, N.C.	Howe	Shipley
Brinkley	Jones, Tenn.	Stanton
Clay	Jordan	James V.
Derwinski	Krueger	Steelman
Flynt	Litton	Teague
Harkin	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Alaska
Hayes, Ind.	Pepper	Young, Ga.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Derwinski and Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. Schneebell against.
Mr. Anderson of Illinois and Mr. Young of Alaska for, with Mr. Steelman against.

Until further notice:

Ms. Abzug with Mr. Young of Georgia.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. James V. Stanton.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Hayes of Indiana.
Mr. Clay with Mr. Hays of Ohio.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Brinkley.

S.3201 (HR 12972) Public Works Employment Act of 1976 Conference Report

June 23, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

Passed House H 6509

urge my colleagues to join with me today in supporting this vital piece of legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 328, nays 83, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 440]

YEAS—328

Abzug	Danielson	Henderson
Adams	Davis	Hicks
Addabbo	de la Garza	Hightower
Alexander	Delaney	Hillis
Allen	DeLums	Holland
Ambro	Derrick	Holtzman
Anderson	Derwinski	Horton
Calif.	Diggs	Howard
Anderson, Ill.	Dingell	Howe
Andrews, N.C.	Dodd	Hubbard
Andrews	Downey, N.Y.	Hughes
N. Dak.	Downing, Va.	Hungate
Annunzio	Drinan	Hyde
Ashley	Duncan, Oreg.	Jeffords
Aspin	Duncan, Tenn.	Jenrette
AuCoin	Early	Johnson, Calif.
Badillo	Eckhardt	Johnson, Pa.
Bafalis	Edgar	Jones, Ala.
Baldus	Edwards, Ala.	Jones, N.C.
Baucus	Edwards, Calif.	Jones, Okla.
Beard, R.I.	Ellberg	Jones, Tenn.
Beard, Tenn.	Emery	Jordan
Bedell	English	Kasten
Bennett	Esch	Kastenmeier
Bergland	Evans, Colo.	Kazen
Bevill	Evans, Ind.	Kemp
Blaggi	Evins, Tenn.	Keys
Blester	Fary	Koch
Bingham	Fascell	Krebs
Blanchard	Fish	Krueger
Blouin	Fisher	LaFalce
Boggs	Fithian	Leggett
Boland	Flood	Lehman
Bolling	Florio	Lent
Bonker	Flowers	Levitas
Bowen	Flynt	Litton
Breaux	Foley	Lloyd, Calif.
Breckinridge	Ford, Mich.	Lloyd, Tenn.
Brinkley	Ford, Tenn.	Long, La.
Brodhead	Forsythe	Long, Md.
Brooks	Fountain	Lott
Broomfield	Fraser	Lujan
Brown, Calif.	Frey	Lundine
Buchanan	Fuqua	McClory
Burke, Calif.	Gaydos	McCloskey
Burke, Fla.	Gialmo	McCormack
Burke, Mass.	Gibbons	McDade
Burlison, Mo.	Gilman	McFall
Burton, John	Ginn	McHugh
Burton, Phillip	Gonzalez	McKay
Byron	Goodling	McKinney
Carney	Green	Madden
Carr	Gude	Madigan
Carter	Guyer	Maguire
Chappell	Haley	Mahon
Chisholm	Hall	Mathis
Clausen	Hamilton	Matsunaga
Don H.	Hammer-	Mazzoli
Clay	schmidt	Meeds
Cochran	Hanley	Meicher
Cohen	Hannaford	Meyner
Collins, Ill.	Harkin	Mezvinsky
Conte	Harrington	Mikva
Conyers	Harris	Miller, Calif.
Corman	Hayes, Ind.	Mineta
Cornell	Hebert	Minish
Cotter	Hechler, W. Va.	Mink
Coughlin	Heckler, Mass.	Mitchell, Md.
D'Amours	Hefner	Mitchell, N.Y.
Daniels, N.J.	Heinz	Moakley

Moffett	Reuss	Stratton
Mollohan	Richmond	Stuckey
Moorhead, Pa.	Rinaldo	Studds
Morgan	Risenhoover	Sullivan
Mosher	Roberts	Symington
Moss	Rodino	Talcott
Mottl	Roe	Taylor, N.C.
Murphy, Ill.	Rogers	Teague
Murphy, N.Y.	Roncalio	Thompson
Murtha	Rooney	Thornton
Myers, Pa.	Rose	Traxler
Natcher	Rosenthal	Tsongas
Neal	Rostenkowski	Udall
Nedzi	Roush	Ullman
Nichols	Roybal	Van Derlin
Nix	Runnels	Vander Veen
Noian	Ruppe	Vanik
Nowak	Russo	Vigorito
Oberstar	Ryan	Waggonner
Obey	St Germain	Walsh
O'Brien	Santini	Wampler
O'Hara	Sarasin	Waxman
O'Neill	Sarbanes	Weaver
Ottlinger	Scheuer	Whalen
Pasaman	Schroeder	White
Patten, N.J.	Seiberling	Whitten
Patterson, Calif.	Sharp	Wilson, Bob
Pattison, N.Y.	Shipley	Wilson, C. H.
Pepper	Simon	Wilson, Tex.
Perkins	Sisk	Wirth
Pettis	Slack	Wyder
Pike	Smith, Iowa	Yates
Pressaler	Solarz	Yatron
Preyer	Spellman	Young, Fla.
Price	Stagers	Young, Ga.
Pritchard	Stanton	Young, Tex.
Quillen	J. William	Zablocki
Railsback	Stark	Zeferetti
Randall	Steed	
Rees	Steiger, Wis.	
Regula	Stephens	
	Stokes	

NAYS—83

Abdnor	Gradison	Paul
Archer	Grassley	Pickle
Armstrong	Hagedorn	Poage
Ashbrook	Hansen	Quile
Bauman	Harsha	Rhodes
Bell	Holt	Robinson
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Rousslet
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Satterfield
Broyhill	Jacobs	Schneebeil
Burgener	Jarman	Schulze
Burleson, Tex.	Johnson, Colo.	Sebelius
Butler	Kelly	Shriver
Cederberg	Ketchum	Shuster
Clancy	Kindness	Skubitz
Clawson, Del.	Lagomarsino	Smith, Nebr.
Cleveland	Latta	Snyder
Collins, Tex.	McCollister	Spence
Conable	McEwen	Steelman
Crane	Mann	Steiger, Ariz.
Daniel, Dan	Martin	Symms
Devine	Michel	Taylor, Mo.
Dickinson	Miller, Ohio	Thone
du Pont	Mills	Treen
Erlenborn	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Eshleman	Moore	Wiggins
Findley	Moorhead, Calif.	Winn
Frenzel	Myers, Ind.	Wylie
Goldwater		Young, Alaska

NOT VOTING—20

Brademas	Helstoski	Peyser
Conlan	Hinshaw	Rangel
Daniel, R. W.	Karth	Riegle
Dent	Landrum	Sikes
Fenwick	McDonald	Stanton
Hawkins	Metcalfe	James V.
Hays, Ohio	Milford	Vander Jagt

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. McDonald against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rangel with Mr. Conlan.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Hays of Ohio.

Mr. Milford with Mr. Karth.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Robert W. Daniel, Jr.

Mr. Helstoski with Mrs. Fenwick.

Mr. Brademas with Mr. James V. Stanton.

Mr. Riegle with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Peyser.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14236) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water and power development and energy research, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Appalachian regional development programs, the Federal Power Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Energy Research and Development Administration, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. BELLMON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to strike title II and also on the conference report on (S. 3201) just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF S. 3201

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 122) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill, (S. 3201) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to increase the antirecessionary effectiveness of the program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 122.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (S. 3201), to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to increase the antirecessionary effectiveness of the program, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following correction:

May 13, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE Passed House H 4401

most recent consecutive months in excess of 6½ per centum, but less than the national unemployment rate. Information regarding unemployment rates may be furnished either by the Federal Government, or by States or local governments, provided the Secretary determines that the unemployment rates furnished by States or local governments are accurate, and shall provide assistance to States or local governments in the calculation of such rates to insure validity and standardization.

(d) Seventy per centum of all amounts appropriated to carry out this Act shall be granted for public works projects submitted by State or local governments given priority under clause (1) of the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section. The remaining 30 per centum shall be available for public works projects submitted by State or local governments in other classifications of priority.

(e) The unemployment rate of a local government shall, for the purposes of this Act, and upon request of the applicant, be based upon the unemployment rate of any community or neighborhood (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) within the jurisdiction of such local government.

(f) In determining the unemployment rate of a local government for the purposes of this section, unemployment in those adjoining areas from which the labor force for such project may be drawn, shall, upon request of the applicant, be taken into consideration.

(g) States and local governments making application under this Act should (1) relate their specific requests to existing approved plans and programs of a local community development or regional development nature so as to avoid harmful or costly inconsistencies or contradictions; and (2) where feasible, make requests which, although capable of early initiation, will promote or advance longer range plans and programs.

Sec. 109. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted by the Secretary under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a-276a-5). The Secretary shall not extend any financial assistance under this Act for such project without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 1332-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1964, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Sec. 110. No person shall on the ground of sex be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any project receiving Federal grant assistance under this Act, including any supplemental grant made under this Act. This provision will be enforced through agency provisions and rules similar to those already established, with respect to racial and other discrimination under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. However, this remedy is not exclusive and will not prejudice or cut off any other legal remedies available to a discriminatee.

Sec. 111. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,500,000,000 for the period ending September 30, 1977, to carry out this Act.

Mr. WRIGHT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read,

printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 7, line 16, after "government" and before the period, insert a comma and the following:

"Except that any grant made to a local government based upon the unemployment rate of a community or neighborhood within its jurisdiction must be for a project of direct benefit to, or provide employment for, unemployed persons who are residents of that community or neighborhood."

The Committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McFALL, having assumed the chair, Mr. FOLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12972) to authorize a local public works capital development and investment program, pursuant to House Resolution 1188, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 339, nays 57, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 269]

YEAS—339

Abdnor	AuCoin	Blouin	Burke, Fla.	Hightower	Patten, N.J.
Adams	Badillo	Boland	Burke, Mass.	Hillis	Patterson, Calif.
Addabbo	Bafalis	Bolling	Burlison, Mo.	Holland	Pattison, N.Y.
Alexander	Baldus	Bonker	Burton, John	Holtzman	Pepper
Allen	Baucus	Brademas	Burton, Phillip	Horton	Perkins
Ambro	Beard, R.I.	Breaux	Byron	Howard	Pettis
Anderson	Beard, Tenn.	Breckinridge	Carney	Howe	Peyser
Anderson, Calif.	Bedell	Brinkley	Carr	Hubbard	Pickle
Anderson, Ill.	Bennett	Brodhead	Carter	Hughes	Pike
Andrews, N.C.	Bergland	Brooks	Chisholm	Hungate	Pressler
Andrews	Bevill	Brown, Calif.	Clancy	Hyde	Preyer
Annunzio	Blester	Broyhill	Clausen, Don H.	Jeffords	Price
Aspin	Bingham	Burgener	Clay	Jenrette	Pritchard
	Blanchard	Burke, Calif.	Cleveland	Johnson, Calif.	Quillen
			Cochran	Johnson, Colo.	Rangel
			Cohen	Johnson, Pa.	Rees
			Collins, Ill.	Jones, Ala.	Regula
			Conte	Jones, N.C.	Reuss
			Conyers	Jones, Okla.	Richmond
			Corman	Jones, Tenn.	Rinaldo
			Cornell	Jordan	Rosen
			Cotter	Kasten	Rosenbloom
			Coughlin	Kastenmeier	Roberts
			D'Amours	Kazen	Rodino
			Daniels, N.J.	Kemp	Roe
			Danielson	Keys	Rogers
			de la Garza	Kindness	Roncallo
			Delaney	Koch	Rooney
			Dellums	Krebs	Rose
			Dent	Krueger	Rosenthal
			Derrick	LaFalce	Rostenkowski
			Derwinski	Lagomarsino	Roush
			Diggs	Landrum	Roybal
			Dingell	Leggett	Runnels
			Dodd	Lehman	Ruppe
			Downey, N.Y.	Lent	Russo
			Downing, Va.	Levitass	Ryan
			Drinan	Litton	St Germain
			du Pont	Lloyd, Calif.	Santini
			Duncan, Oreg.	Lloyd, Tenn.	Sarasin
			Duncan, Tenn.	Long, La.	Scheuer
			Early	Long, Md.	Schroeder
			Eckhardt	Lott	Schulze
			Edgar	Lujan	Seiberling
			Edwards, Ala.	Lundine	Sharp
			Edwards, Calif.	McClary	Shipley
			Emery	McCloskey	Shuster
			Evans, Colo.	McCormack	Sikes
			Evans, Ind.	McDade	Simon
			Evins, Tenn.	McEwen	Slack
			Fary	McHugh	Slack
			Fasell	McKay	Smith, Iowa
			Fenwick	McKinney	Solarz
			Findley	Madden	Spellman
			Fish	Madigan	Spence
			Fisher	Maguire	Staggers
			Fithian	Mahon	Stanton
			Flood	Martin	J. William
			Florio	Mathis	Stark
			Flowers	Mazzoli	Steed
			Flynt	Meeds	Steiger, Wis.
			Foley	Meicher	Stokes
			Ford, Mich.	Metcalfe	Stratton
			Ford, Tenn.	Meyner	Stuckey
			Forsythe	Mezvisinsky	Studds
			Fountain	Mikva	Symington
			Fraser	Miller, Calif.	Talcott
			Frey	Miller, Ohio	Taylor, N.C.
			Fuqua	Mills	Thompson
			Gaydos	Mineta	Thornton
			Giaimo	Minish	Traxler
			Gibbons	Mink	Treen
			Gliman	Mitchell, Md.	Tsongas
			Ginn	Mitchell, N.Y.	Ullman
			Goldwater	Moakley	Van Deertin
			Gonzalez	Moffett	Vander Jagt
			Goodling	Molohan	Vander Veen
			Green	Moore	Vanik
			Gude	Moorhead, Pa.	Vigorito
			Guyer	Morgan	Waggonner
			Haley	Mosher	Walsh
			Hall	Moss	Wampler
			Hamilton	Mottl	Waxman
			Hammer	Murphy, Ill.	Weaver
			Hammer	Murphy, N.Y.	Whalen
			schmidt	Murtha	White
			Hanley	Myers, Ind.	Whitten
			Hannaford	Myers, Pa.	Wilson, Bob
			Harkin	Natcher	Wilson, C. H.
			Harrington	Neal	Wilson, Tex.
			Harris	Nedzi	Wirth
			Harsha	Nichols	Wolf
			Hawkins	Nix	Wright
			Hayes, Ind.	Nolan	Wyder
			Hays, Ohio	Nowak	Yates
			Hechler, W. Va.	Oberstar	Yatron
			Heckler, Mass.	Obey	Young, Alaska
			Hefner	O'Brien	Young, Fla.
			Heinz	O'Hara	Young, Tex.
			Helstoski	O'Neill	Zablocki
			Hicks	Ottinger	Zerfetti

NAYS—57

Archer	Gradison	Quie
Armstrong	Grassley	Rhodes
Ashbrook	Hagedorn	Robinson
Bauman	Holt	Rousselet
Brown, Mich.	Hutchinson	Schneebeli
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Sebelius
Burleson, Tex.	Jacobs	Shriver
Butler	Jarman	Skubitz
Clawson, Del.	Kelly	Smith, Nebr.
Collins, Tex.	Ketchum	Snyder
Conable	Latta	Steelman
Conlan	McCollister	Steiger, Ariz.
Crane	McDonald	Symms
Daniel, Dan	Mann	Taylor, Mo.
Daniel, E. W.	Michel	Thone
Devine	Montgomery	Whitehurst
Dickinson	Moorhead,	Winn
English	Calif.	Wylie
Erlenborn	Paul	
Frenzel	Poage	

NOT VOTING—36

Abzug	Eshleman	Riegle
Ashley	Hansen	Sarbanes
Bell	Hébert	Satterfield
Biaggi	Henderson	Stanton
Boggs	Hinsaw	James V.
Bowen	Karth	Stephens
Broomfield	McFall	Sullivan
Buchanan	Macdonald	Teague
Cederberg	Matsunaga	Udall
Chappell	Millford	Wiggins
Davis	Passman	Young, Ga.
Ellberg	Rallsback	
Esch	Randall	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Boggs with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Matsunaga.
 Mr. Biaggi with Mr. Teague.
 Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Stephens.
 Ms. Abzug with Mr. Young of Georgia.
 Mr. Riegle with Mr. Karth.
 Mr. Passman with Mr. Henderson.
 Mr. Udall with Mr. Randall.
 Mr. Sarbanes with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Davis with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Chappell with Mr. Ashley.
 Mr. Millford with Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Bowen with Mr. Buchanan.
 Mr. James V. Stanton with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Cederberg.
 Mr. McFall with Mr. Rallsback.

Mr. BAFALIS and Mr. GOLDWATER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea." So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 1188, I call up from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 3201) to amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, to increase the anti-recessionary effectiveness of the program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. WRIGHT

Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WRIGHT moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill S. 3201, and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 12972, as passed, as follows:

Sec. 101. This act may be cited as the "Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976".

Sec. 102. As used in this title, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Economic Development Administration.

(2) "State" includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(3) "local government" means any city, county, town, parish, or other political subdivision of a State, and any Indian tribe.

Sec. 103. (a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State or local government for construction (including demolition and other site preparation activities), renovation, repair, or other improvement of local public works projects including but not limited to those public works projects of State and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under provisions of law other than this Act. In addition the Secretary is authorized to make grants to any State or local government for the completion of plans, specifications, and estimates for local public works projects where either architectural design or preliminary engineering or related planning has already been undertaken and where additional architectural and engineering work or related planning is required to permit construction of the project under this Act.

(b) The Federal share of any project for which a grant is made under this section shall be 100 per centum of the cost of the project.

Sec. 104. In addition to the grants otherwise authorized by this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to a public works project for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under provisions of law other than this Act. Any grant made for a public works project under this section shall be in such amount as may be necessary to make the Federal share of the cost of such project 100 per centum. No grant shall be made for a project under this section unless the Federal financial assistance for such project authorized under provisions of law other than this Act is immediately available for such project and construction of such project has not yet been initiated because of lack of funding for the non-Federal share.

Sec. 105. In addition to the grant otherwise authorized by this Act, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant for the purpose of providing all or any portion of the required State or local share of the cost of any public works project for which financial assistance is authorized under any provision of State or local law requiring such contribution. Any grant made for a public works project under this section shall be made in such amount as may be necessary to provide the requested State or local share of the cost of such project. A grant shall be made under this section for either the State or local share of the cost of the project, but not both shares. No grant shall be made for a project under this section unless the share of the financial assistance for such project (other than the share with respect to which a grant is requested under this section) is immediately available for such project and construction of such project has not yet been initiated.

Sec. 106. (a) No grant shall be made under section 103, 104, or 105 of this Act for any project having as its principal purpose the channelization, damming, diversion, or dredging of any natural watercourse, or the construction or enlargement of any canal (other than a canal or raceway designated for maintenance as an historic site) and having as its permanent effect the channelization, damming, diversion, or dredging of such watercourse or construction or enlargement of any canal (other than a canal or raceway designated for maintenance as an historic site).

(b) No part of any grant made under section 103, 104, or 105 of this Act shall be used

for the acquisition of any interest in real property.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize the payment of maintenance costs in connection with any projects constructed (in whole or in part) with Federal financial assistance under this Act.

(d) Grants made by the Secretary under this Act shall be made only for projects for which the applicant gives satisfactory assurances, in such manner and form as may be required by the Secretary and in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, that, if funds are available, on-site labor can begin within ninety days of project approval.

Sec. 107. The Secretary shall, not later than thirty days after date of enactment of this Act, prescribe those rules, regulations, and procedures (including application forms) necessary to carry out this Act. Such rules, regulations, and procedures shall assure that adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of various sections of the country. The Secretary shall consider among other factors (1) the severity and duration of unemployment in proposed project areas, (2) the income levels and extent of underemployment in proposed project area, and (3) the extent to which proposed projects will contribute to the reduction of unemployment. The Secretary shall make a final determination with respect to each application for a grant submitted to him under this Act not later than the sixtieth day after the date he receives such application. Failure to make such final determination within such period shall be deemed to be an approval by the Secretary of the grant requested. For purposes of this section, in considering the extent of unemployment or underemployment, the Secretary shall consider the amount of unemployment or underemployment in the construction and construction-related industries.

Sec. 108. (a) Not less than one-half of 1 per centum or more than 10 per centum of all amounts appropriated to carry out this title shall be granted under this Act for local public works projects within any one State, except that in the case of Guam, Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, not less than one-half of 1 per centum in the aggregate shall be granted for such projects in all three of these jurisdictions.

(b) In making grants under this Act, the Secretary shall give priority and preference to public works projects of local governments.

(c) In making grants under this Act, if for the three most recent consecutive months, the national unemployment rate is equal to or exceeds 6½ per centum, the Secretary shall (1) expedite and give priority to applications submitted by States or local governments having unemployment rates for the three most recent consecutive months in excess of the national unemployment rate and (2) shall give priority thereafter to applications submitted by States or local governments having unemployment rates for the three most recent consecutive months in excess of 6½ per centum, but less than the national unemployment rate. Information regarding unemployment rates may be furnished either by the Federal Government, or by States or local governments, provided the Secretary determines that the unemployment rates furnished by States or local governments are accurate, and shall provide assistance to States or local governments in the calculation of such rates to insure validity and standardization.

(d) Seventy per centum of all amounts appropriated to carry out this Act shall be granted for public works projects submitted by State or local governments given priority under clause (1) of the first sentence of subsection (c) of this section. The remaining 30 per centum shall be available for public works projects submitted by State or local