CONGRESS WRAPS UP MAJOR LEGISLATION,
CLOSES UP SHOP FOR A MONTH

After working long hours for the past several weeks, sometimes as late as midnight or longer, the House last Friday wound up its summer legislative activity with final passage of several major bills.

The last-minute flurry of effort gave Congress a respectable record as members headed for home districts or vacation spots or combined work and relaxation during the recess ending Sept. 5. I will be taking a little time off but for the most part I will be touring the Fifth Congressional District in my Mobile Main Street Office and making various speaking appearances.

In a legislative spurt toward the end of last week, the House Thursday night approved a bill aimed at removing restrictions blocking construction of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline and on Friday gave final approval to the Federal-Aid Highways Act, a farm bill, and a minimum wage bill.

* The House passed the trans-Alaska oil pipeline bill 356-60 after rejecting an amendment that would have knocked out a provision exempting the pipeline project from further environmental court challenges under terms of the Environmental Protection Act of 1969. The vote on the amendment was 221-198. I voted against the amendment and for the bill.

* The House approved a compromise three-year $20 billion highway bill that for the first time allows highway trust funds to be spent on mass transit capital improvements. No highway trust money can be used for mass transit during the first year of the bill but in fiscal 1975 urban areas could use $200 million of the $300 million earmarked for urban roads to buy passenger buses and in fiscal 1976 could use all or part of the $800 million for buses or improvements to rail transit systems. However, no trust fund money could be used for operating subsidies.

* In a move the President fears will feed inflation, the House approved an increase in the minimum wage to 42.30 on hour for most workers by next July 1 and expanded coverage by eight million workers.

* The House joined the Senate in approving an omnibus four-year farm bill which sets up a new support price plan for cotton and grains. Growers would be eligible for subsidies only if market prices drop below the bill's "target prices."
The only questions at issue as the House considered the trans-Alaska pipeline bill were whether the proposed trans-Alaska oil line should be delayed while the possibility of a trans-Canadian oil line was explored, and whether the Interior Department with its six-volume environmental impact statement had satisfied the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act with regard to the trans-Alaska project.

Going the route of the proposed trans-Canadian pipeline would have posed a delay of perhaps six or seven years in getting oil to the Lower 48 States—beyond the three years it will take to build the trans-Alaska oil line.

This assumes that all the obstacles that would have been involved in a trans-Canadian line could be surmounted. But the biggest stumbling block of all is that the Canadians have shown no particular interest in allowing an oil pipeline to be built through the Mackenzie River Valley.

Environmentalists are understandably concerned about the trans-Alaskan line. But there is no question that every possible environmental safeguard will be taken. The trans-Alaskan oil line has been designed to be safe from the most severe earthquake ever recorded in Alaska. And the tankers transporting the oil under the strictest possible controls and using segregated ballast systems and the most sophisticated navigational equipment. This should virtually eliminate any losses at sea.

While the trans-Alaskan oil line would be 789 miles long, the trans-Canadian oil line would traverse some 8,200 miles. The entire length of the Alaskan line involves northern wildlife habitats. However, the Canadian line would include 1,700 miles of such country—more than twice as much. The Alaskan line will cross 595 miles of permafrost; the Canadian line would cross 1,300. The Alaskan line involves one major river crossing—The Yukon; the trans-Canadian line would involve 12 major river crossings. In the unlikely event of a break in the trans-Alaskan line, the entire pipeline could be shut down in less than six minutes.

**HOUSE REJECTS TROOP REDUCTION, CUTS MILITARY FUNDS**

The House of Representatives last Tuesday rejected a move by House Democratic Leader Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. of Massachusetts to cut U.S. troop commitments abroad by 100,000 men.

I fought against O'Neill's proposal, offered as an amendment to the fiscal 1974 military procurement authorization bill, because I felt it was a serious mistake to weaken our defense establishment at a time when we are seeking a mutual reduction in Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces through negotiation.

I warned the House against a return to the America First policy adopted by the United States after World War I, a policy of isolationism which I believe led to World War II. The best deterrent to enemy aggression is military strength, I declared. I urged that we continue the policy of military preparedness that has kept the peace in Europe throughout the postwar years.

Instead of accepting the O'Neill amendment, the House adopted 242 to 163 a substitute which calls for a study of U.S. troop levels in Europe by the House Armed Services Committee.

The House earlier had rejected a move to cut U.S. troops overseas by 322,000.

As brought to the House floor by the Armed Services Committee, the military procurement bill would have authorized $21,394,007,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, tracked combat vehicles, torpedoes and other weapons. The committee figure was $20,385.3 million less than the Administration's.

The House chopped another $950 million out of the bill across the board, reducing the measure to last year's level plus 4.5 per cent to offset inflation. The amendment was adopted 242 to 163, cutting the bill to $20,445,555,000.

I opposed the additional authorization cut because I believe defense spending reductions should be made judiciously—on recommendation of committees which have carefully studied the budget requests. The authorization bill, for instance, will be gone over tooth and nail by the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.
During the August recess of Congress, I had personal interviews with about 500 people as I toured the Fifth District in my Main Street Mobile Office.

I made 19 stops, involving total travel of nearly 1,500 miles. My Main Street Mobile Office took me to within 12 miles of every home in the Fifth District, an area which takes in parts of six counties. In addition, I made 16 speeches during the recess and had conferences with 18 groups.

Inflation is uppermost in the minds of Fifth District folks—the same problem that is No. 1 throughout the Nation. About 50 people talked with me about Watergate. Of those, some 25 percent were antagonistic toward the President. The others simply asked questions or said they would like to see the Ervin Committee hearings end.

What can we do about inflation? The best answer to inflation is to expand production. The Administration has encouraged farmers to do this, and record crops for wheat, corn and soybeans are in prospect. Prices are under tight government control. The Federal Reserve is curbing the money supply. The most important action Congress can take is to deal responsibly with the Federal budget for fiscal 1974.

The President has sent Congress a second State of the Union Message in which he urged action on some 50 Administration bills and pleaded with Congress to hold back on Federal spending without gutting the defense budget.

The dominant note in the President's message was one of conciliation, a willingness to work with Congress for the good of the country.

I, for one, am willing to stick with the legislative job until New Year's Eve, if necessary, to pass legislation benefiting the people and to keep a tight rein on Federal spending. We must do everything possible to fight inflation and to deal with the energy crisis.

By a 220-133 vote, the House has approved legislation strengthening the President's power to impose export controls to keep domestic prices down. I strongly supported the bill. The measure authorizes the President to impose export controls either if there is a domestic scarcity or to reduce the "inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand."
The House last Wednesday sustained the President's veto of a bill which would have kept outmoded and unnecessary Public Health Service Hospitals operating in addition to providing Federal funds for emergency medical services in home communities.

Most Republicans favor Federal funding for emergency medical services but they objected to keeping the Public Health Service hospitals inpatient facilities operating when the patient load at these hospitals is declining and the Administration had arranged for local hospitals to provide these patients with better services. Outpatient services and dental clinics would continue operating at the PHS hospitals. Also, the PHS hospital at Staten Island would continue full operations because no better alternative is available.

The veto override vote, 273 to 144, fell five votes short of the necessary two-thirds. Republicans the same day introduced a new Emergency Medical Services Bill identical with the vetoed legislation except for the directive forcing the Administration to continue operating the PHS hospitals. Although the President has not said he would sign such a bill, I told the House I would "stake my reputation" on getting him to approve it.

At this point, I would like to emphasize that Grand Rapids has an excellent emergency medical services program without Federal help. So it can be done through local initiative.

ADMINISTRATION-BACKED HEALTH CARE BILL PASSES

The House last Wednesday overwhelmingly approved an Administration-backed bill which may lead to less costly health care. I strongly favor the measure.

Passed by a vote of 369 to 40, the bill authorizes $240 million in Federal grants over a five-year period to encourage the development of so-called health maintenance organizations (HMO's).

HMO's are public or nonprofit private groups consisting of medical teams and facilities. They provide comprehensive health care to enrollees who pay a fixed premium. There is no extra charge for repeated checkups or treatment. The idea behind HMO's is to concentrate on preventing illness and thus reduce a family's health costs.

The Nixon Administration proposed a large-scale HMO program two years ago, and this year recommended a smaller demonstration-type program. It was this scaled-back proposal that the House approved last week.

ACADEMY OPENINGS

Four appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, three to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and one to the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs are available to young men living in the Fifth Congressional District. These all-expense college scholarships are open to high school seniors and graduates who are interested in careers in the armed services. In addition, applicants must be U.S. citizens, under 22 years of age, unmarried and able to pass the physical and scholastic tests. Applications may be obtained from my district office at 780 Federal Building, 110 Michigan Ave. N.W., Grand Rapids, or from my Washington office, Room H-230, U.S. Capitol Building, Washington, D.C., 20515.

TV BLACKOUT LIFTED

Acting swiftly to beat the opening whistle of the 1973-74 professional football season, the Congress Thursday rushed through legislation which lifts television blackouts of sold-out pro football games being played at home. Under the bill, there can be no TV blackouts of home pro football games sold out 72 hours in advance of game time. This ban on such TV blackouts extends for a three-year period.

A JOB WELL DONE -- I congratulate Stephen Meehan of Cascade for the fine job he did in assisting my regular Washington staff for a month earlier this fall. Steve is a senior at Calvin College.
Despite the certainty of a Presidential veto, the House last Wednesday narrowly approved a two-year $500 million program of operating subsidies for mass transit.

It is now up to the President to save the nation's taxpayers from a subsidy program which would be a never-ending, ever-growing drain on the Federal Treasury, with the bulk of the money going to less than a half dozen of our cities. New York City, alone, would get 22 per cent of the funds.

I don't want my constituents or any other taxpayers in this country providing operating subsidies for inefficient obsolete mass transit facilities in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia and Boston.

The bill does absolutely nothing to encourage sound management and efficiency. It simply would provide operating subsidies based on population, passenger miles, and vehicular miles traveled. This would be like pouring money down a rat hole.

I have voted for Federal aid for mass transit capital improvements in the past, although I opposed taking any money for this purpose from the Highway Trust Fund. I still believe such monies should come from general revenue and not from highway user tax revenues. I am unequivocally opposed to Federal subsidies for mass transit operating expenses. As I have said before, that is a bottomless pit and will run into billions of dollars.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973 authorized an additional $3 billion exclusively for mass transit capital grants and also $2.5 billion for urban transportation programs with the option of using this money for mass transit capital improvements.

In considering the Federal-Aid Highway Act, the House rejected an amendment which would have put the Federal Government in the business of paying operating subsidies for mass transit systems.

The House is deeply split over the question of operating subsidies for mass transit systems.

In the action last Wednesday, the House first voted tentatively, 208 to 203, to knock the funds out of the $800 million subsidy bill. After considerable arm-twisting by the House Democratic Leadership, House members later again voted on the fund-deleting amendment and this time rejected it 210 to 205. Needless to say, I voted both times for eliminating the subsidies.

The bill was approved 210 to 195 on final passage. I voted against the bill, and I feel certain the House will sustain the anticipated Presidential veto if called upon to vote on it.

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY TO CONTINUE

Convinced that efforts to bring the truth to the people of the Soviet Union and the Eastern bloc nations should continue, the House voted 313 to 90 last Tuesday to authorize the funding of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in fiscal 1974. I strongly supported this action.

The bill would authorize $50.2 million for the two stations this fiscal year and establishes a board of international broadcasting to supervise their operations.

The Senate earlier this fall approved similar legislation. The minor differences between the House and Senate bills now must be worked out in conference.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty provide the people of Communist nations in Europe with news they would not otherwise get. Radio Free Europe broadcasts daily via transmitters in West Germany and Portugal to Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria. Radio Liberty broadcasts daily in Russian and 18 other languages spoken within the Soviet Union.
The House is moving along on pension reform. I hope action will come yet this year.

The House Education and Labor Committee last Tuesday reported out a bill which is similar to legislation approved Sept. 19 by the Senate. Meanwhile, the House Ways and Means Committee is conducting hearings on pension reform because that committee shares jurisdiction with Education and Labor over pension legislation.

The Senate-approved pension reform bill sets minimum standards for participation in pension plans, for vesting, and for funding of private employee pension systems.

In my view, pension reform is top priority legislation and should be enacted as soon as possible. Compromises will be necessary. But whatever is done, workers' pension rights should be protected and strengthened.

**VOCATIONAL 'REHAB' LEGISLATION SIGNED INTO LAW**

President Nixon has signed into law a modified version of vocational rehabilitation legislation he had twice vetoed as too costly.

The new program, which I support, authorizes $1.54 billion over a two-year period in grants to states, local governments and private agencies to operate programs aimed at rehabilitating the handicapped and equipping them for jobs. The bill sets the spending ceiling for an appropriation to be approved by the Congress later.

The program for the first time will include special projects and research into the problems of those suffering from spinal cord injuries, the older blind and deaf, and disabled migratory agricultural workers. It also sets up Federal mortgage insurance to help build rehabilitation centers and remodel public buildings to accommodate the handicapped.

The authorization level of $1.54 billion for two years compares with $3.5 billion for three years in the first bill vetoed and $2.6 billion for three years in the second bill rejected by the President. The fiscal year 1974 authorization is $756.3 million, as compared with actual spending of $697.5 million in fiscal 1973.

**F.H.A. EXTENSION BECOMES EFFECTIVE**

In highly important action which received almost no mention in the press, the Congress passed a one-year extension of existing F.H.A. loan authority and the President on Oct. 2 signed the legislation.

The Senate had caused a backup of mortgage applications by attaching to the F.H.A. extension a provision dealing with impoundment of appropriated funds. This provision sought to prevent Presidential impoundment of certain housing program funds.

The House insisted upon a simple one-year extension of existing F.H.A. loan authority without the impoundment provision. In the tussle with the Senate, the House prevailed.

In addition to renewal of F.H.A. insurance authority, the legislation authorizes $140 million for the low rent public housing program, $65 million for the urban renewal program, and $103 million for other slum clearance programs.

**DISTRICT VISIT**

My district assistant, Gordon Vander Till, will be at Tonia City Hall from 2:30 to 5 p.m. Oct. 15 to answer questions and to discuss problems with my Fifth District constituents on my behalf.

**WHITE HOUSE MAJOR DONO'S -- I have frequent contacts with the White House staff. Shown here with me are, from left, White House chief-of-staff Alexander Haig and Mrs. Haig, chief domestic adviser Melvin Laird, and presidential counselor Bryce Harlow.**
HOME RULE — WITH PROTECTION FOR THE FEDERAL INTEREST

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17 of the United States Constitution provides that Congress shall "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District of Columbia.

Because the legislation as amended on the floor of the House adequately protected the Federal interest, I voted last Wednesday for a bill which gives a considerable measure of self-government to the people of Washington, D.C. The final vote was 343 to 74.

The House-approved bill would allow District voters to elect a mayor and a 13-member City Council on a nonpartisan basis. District voters first must adopt a charter. The mayor-council election could take place as early as the fall of 1974.

The Home Rule bill passed the House after a day of debate and a day spent on amendments. The Senate has approved a measure giving Washington residents greater self-government powers. The differences between the House and Senate bills now must be reconciled before the legislation can be sent to the President for his signature.

Under the legislation passed by the House, the D.C. government would have control over most local taxation, but with a ban on taxing the income of non-residents working in the city. Congress would retain power over line items in the district budget, the local courts and criminal laws.

I believe Congress should retain full and ultimate legislative jurisdiction over the district in accordance with the responsibility placed upon the Congress by the Constitution.

POWER OVER LINE ITEMS IN D.C. BUDGET ESSENTIAL

The power of the purse is vital if Congress is to retain legislative jurisdiction over the district.

I therefore was pleased when Rep. Charles Diggs, D-Mich., chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, agreed that Congress should retain appropriations power over the district.

Since the committee bill had been so amended before it was taken up by the House, there was no fight in the House over the question of D.C. budget line item veto power.

In fiscal 1974, the District of Columbia will receive $515,812,100 from the Federal Government, including a "Federal payment" of $187,450,000, various grants-in-aid totalling $322,764,100, capital outlays amounting to $138,178,000, and $57,400,000 in revenue sharing funds.

In the last dozen years, the Federal payment to the district has jumped from $25 million to $187,450,000.

In the last dozen years, we have built 3,228 new classrooms in the district at a cost of $303,337,463. Our per capita expenditure for education in the nation's capital for fiscal 1974 is $1,358—one of the highest in the country.

I have supported the right of D.C. residents to vote for President and Vice-President; to elect a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives; and to elect their own school board. I have now voted to give them additional rights and responsibilities. But I am firmly convinced that if Congress is to be true to its constitutional mandate regarding the nation's capital, the Congress must retain control over the district budget.

In my view, this particular provision of the bill is non-negotiable in the House-Senate Conference.
To further protect the Federal interest, the House included in its Home Rule bill a provision which draws a line around all of the Federal buildings in the nation’s capital and places them exclusively under Federal control.

This Federal enclave includes the Capitol, the White House, the House and Senate Office Buildings, the Kennedy Center, and all of the Federal buildings up and down Independence Avenue. It also takes in Fort McNair, the Washington Navy Yard, Bolling Air Force Base, the Naval Research Observatory, and other Federal installations.

I feel that the nation’s capital belongs to every citizen of the United States, whether he lives in the District of Columbia or Michigan. Let’s be realistic. The city of Washington is different from every other city in the country because it is, after all, the capital of the United States.

The enclave amendment was offered by Rep. Edith Green, D-Ore. It passed 209 to 202. I strongly favored it.

APPOINTEE MAYOR AMENDMENT FAILS

I went into the Home Rule debate supporting a substitute bill advanced by Mrs. Green and Rep. Anclie Nelsen of Minnesota, the ranking Republican on the D.C. Committee.

The Green-Nelsen substitute provided for an elected City Council but would have empowered the President to appoint the mayor of Washington, as at present.

The rationale behind this proviso is that the mayor appoints the police chief, and if the President had the power to appoint the mayor he also would have some authority over the Washington police force.

Since the Diggs bill already gave the President certain emergency police powers in D.C., the Green-Nelsen substitute was rejected, 273 to 144. I voted for the substitute. As I noted earlier, I voted for the Diggs bill on final passage.

PRESIDENT WOULD CONTINUE APPOINTING D.C. JUDGES

The Diggs bill would have given the elected mayor the power to appoint judges for the D.C. courts. This was a serious defect in the bill.

To correct this defect, Rep. William Harsha, R-Ohio, offered an amendment empowering the President to name D.C. Superior Court judges, as at present.

Harsha pointed out that judges cannot render justice impartially if they are subject to political pressure, however indirect. He noted that judges of the Superior and Appeals courts are called upon to review certain actions of District officials, including the mayor.

I read to the House a letter from U.S. Attorney General Elliot Richardson in which the Justice Department expressed its opposition to having the mayor appoint Superior Court judges, principally for the reasons set forth by Congressman Harsha.

The House adopted the Harsha Amendment 228 to 186.

VETO POWERS

Under the House-approved Home Rule bill, Congress would continue to have authority to enact any legislation dealing with the District and would have the power to override any act of the local government.

The City Council would be empowered to override a veto by the mayor with a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, but the President would have the authority to sustain the mayor’s veto if he is overridden by the Council.

There is a proposed new ceiling of $250 million for the Federal Payment to the District.

The District government could initiate local land use planning, but the National Capital Planning Commission could veto any District plans it believes conflict with the Federal interest. The makeup of the NCPC would be changed to include more district representation and at least one representative each from Maryland and Virginia.
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