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WHAT CONGRESS DID IN 1975

Summary
A year of confrontation produced vetoes, few solid accomplishments (2839)

Legislation
Major action on foreign policy (2852), energy (2850), economic affairs (2847)

Budget
The new congressional budget system survives first year of tests (2863)

Politics
Labor coalition seeks partisan role without assistance from Meany (2881)
Appropriations in 1st Session, 94th Congress
For fiscal year 1976, in thousands of dollars
AS OF THE END OF THE 1ST SESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Final Action</th>
<th>Weekly Report Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative Branch (HR 6505—PL 94-59)</td>
<td>$853,705</td>
<td>$985,100</td>
<td>$925,374</td>
<td>$827,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Division, HEW (HR 8621—PL 94-94)</td>
<td>3,000,021</td>
<td>4,787,271</td>
<td>5,119,160</td>
<td>4,916,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and related agencies (HR 8561—PL 94-125)</td>
<td>14,221,606</td>
<td>11,047,263</td>
<td>11,092,283</td>
<td>11,061,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>507,841</td>
<td>410,243</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and related agencies (HR 8365—PL 94-134)</td>
<td>4,230,866</td>
<td>3,854,355</td>
<td>4,104,424</td>
<td>3,888,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science, Veterans (HR 8770—PL 94-119)</td>
<td>46,779,570</td>
<td>42,386,024</td>
<td>50,735,314</td>
<td>49,344,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Health, Education and Welfare and related agencies (HR 8089)</td>
<td>36,265,355</td>
<td>35,979,641</td>
<td>36,272,522</td>
<td>36,073,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior and related agencies (HR 8773)</td>
<td>4,079,059</td>
<td>4,101,961</td>
<td>4,304,340</td>
<td>4,234,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary and related agencies (HR 8121—PL 94-131)</td>
<td>5,722,145</td>
<td>5,671,699</td>
<td>6,188,253</td>
<td>5,958,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Department (HR 4461)</td>
<td>97,694,836</td>
<td>90,219,046</td>
<td>90,721,789</td>
<td>89,465,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Aid</td>
<td>6,965,541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction (HR 10009)</td>
<td>4,109,000</td>
<td>3,518,723</td>
<td>3,600,295</td>
<td>3,385,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works, Energy (HR 8122)</td>
<td>635,079</td>
<td>822,789</td>
<td>829,699</td>
<td>829,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury, Postal Service and General Government (HR 8497—PL 94-91)</td>
<td>7,365,087</td>
<td>7,225,401</td>
<td>7,456,261</td>
<td>7,440,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Resolution (H J Res 733—PL 94-41)</td>
<td>1,625,000</td>
<td>2,004,800</td>
<td>2,379,800</td>
<td>2,379,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Vote concurring Sept. 10.
2. Final vote pending in House.
3. Includes Harry F. Byrd, Jr., voted as an Independent.

CQ Inside Congress

CONGRESSIONAL FINALE: CONFLICT, COMPROMISE

The first session of the 94th Congress ended on the same note of conflict that had typified its relations with the Ford administration throughout 1975. During the first 70 days of the session, the Republican President vetoed two major bills passed by the Democratic Congress. A congressional attempt to override one of the vetoes, of a proposed extension of the 1972 tax cut, fell 17 votes short in the House. An 11th-hour compromise was then passed, with assurances that it would be signed.

Meanwhile, several Republican senators staged a short-lived and unsuccessful filibuster against a proposal to restrict Ford's power to intervene in the Angolan civil war. Members finally went home for Christmas at the end of the day on Dec. 23. Behind them was a year of disagreement with the executive branch over most of the problems besetting the nation. Among the major ones were the economy, energy, foreign policy, defense costs and waning public confidence in government.

Ford had vetoed 15 bills and promised to veto a 16th. Congress was able to override only three of them. The session was marked by much posturing and pre-1976 election politicking by both parties and at both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. Democrats were saying that their tax cuts and economic policies had saved the nation from a 1930s-style depression. Republicans warned that a radical Democratic Congress would spend the country into bankruptcy, while Ford rarely escaped a week without the legislative branch taking a position opposed to what he conceived as the country's best interest.

Exuberance to Frustration

Despite all the bravado, the disappointment of the congressional leadership with the session was summed up by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D Mont.) the day before adjournment: "It has not been easy for the legislative branch to make its will prevail." That assessment was not the way the Democrats had planned it in January, when the 94th convened. With their ranks swelled the previous November by one of the biggest election victories since the New Deal, congressional Democrats were calling for a new era of so-called "congressional government."

Republicans, on the other hand, led by Ford, were warning the country that the 2-to-1 Democratic majority in Congress would be unable to enact a "veto-proof" Congress that would doom the President's economic recovery and energy policies. Democrats, unwilling to accept the Ford program of imposing higher tariffs on imported oil and higher prices for U.S.-produced crude, sought a strategy that would defer economically painful actions until after the recession abated, and then raise fuel prices on the least vital uses of energy.

But the Democrats would not agree, even among themselves, on the issues of oil prices or conservation measures. The clearest example of this was on an energy tax bill that was supposed to drastically cut gasoline con-
sruption by levy a 20-cent-a-gallon additional tax whatever the unemployment increased above 1973 levels. But on a 345-72 House vote in June, the provision was stripped from the bill. Only 67 of 278 voting Democrats supported the Ways and Means Committee that drafted the bill. Their recommendations were to have formed the basic con- cessional basis to Ford’s plan for promoting U.S. energy independence.

Some members said the vote merely reflected the lack of agreement on energy issues which pitted one region against the other, divided producer and consumer interests, and raised nuclear and hydroelectric advocates against each other. Others argued that the con- gressional leadership was at fault, that on national problems such as energy crisis, it was up to the leadership to persuade Congress to make policy in the absence of a national consensus. Congress and the White House were deadlocked on fundamental energy questions, with Ford unable to sell his programs and the Democratic majority unable to draft viable alternatives.

A partial breakthrough occurred in October, when the two sides reached a compromise on a temporary oil price control bill that reinstated the old domestic pricing system through Nov. 15. This came only after two earlier bills to ex- tend controls were vetoed. A second interim measure, introduced during the session, slightly less than the number introduced during the first session of the 93rd Congress.

As of the end of the session, President Ford had signed 158 bills into law. He had vetoed 15 bills, of which three were overridden and six were sustained.

especially hard hit by the economic downturn, an end to certain tax shelters, and other provisions aimed at closing tax loopholes for big business and individuals in the higher income brackets.

Ford, who in late 1974 had called for a tax increase to combat inflation, in March reluctantly agreed to the tax cut package drafted by the Democrats made retroactive to Jan. 1. He had preferred a one-time, $16-billion tax rebate on 1974 taxes as a short-term solution to halt the deepening recession. Instead, he got $11 billion in new tax reductions as well as provisions ending the old oil and gas de- depletion allowances and oil and gas price controls and curtailing multina- tional corporations’ tax preferences. Ford and his aides insisted that it was just as im- portant to fight inflation as to reduce taxes. For this reason, he vetoed as too inflationary the Democrats’ bill to create more than one job. The White House vetoed the bill even though the national unemployment rate was climbing to its high of 9.2 per cent in May. Ford subsequent- ly made an about-face and agreed to a compromise version that had a lower price tag but contained many of the same job-creating provisions.

The division between Congress and White House was apparent again in late summer when the House, over President’s signature, passed a one-year extension of the 1975 tax cut. Ford countered with a $28-billion tax cut package, coupled with an equitable redistribution of federal spending. In a $635-billion spending ceiling for the fiscal year beginning Oct. 1, 1976, according to his budget projections.

The increasing amount of time spent on voting led to efforts in the House during 1975 to reduce the number of votes. (Background, Weekly Report p. 658)

Chairwoman Rogers C. B. Morton for contempt of Congress for failing to produce documents which were ordered to be delivered by the House of Representatives. New- ly released documents on the Watergate affair provided evidence of a cover-up of the sabotage of the Democratic national convention in Chicago in 1968. The division was the only effective way to bring the war to a close.

The defense bill was a harbinger of other develop- ments: the Ford administration’s acquiescence in a number of major policy changes in the Vietnam war. The 1975 defense bill was a harbinger of further military policy changes under the Ford administration, including the end of military involvement in Angola and the return of American troops from Vietnam.

The division was the only effective way to bring the war to a close.

The defense bill was a harbinger of other develop- ments: the Ford administration’s acquiescence in a number of major policy changes in the Vietnam war. The 1975 defense bill was a harbinger of further military policy changes under the Ford administration, including the end of military involvement in Angola and the return of American troops from Vietnam.
Agriculture

ACTION COMPLETED

Emergency Farm Bill. The House May 13 failed to override President Ford's first veto of the 94th Congress. The veto had been announced March 20 and the Senate March 26. Supporters of the bill claimed it was needed to avoid a potential cost-price squeeze caused by an expected record 1975 crop which would cause prices to fall while production costs continued to rise. Ford said the bill would add $1.8-billion to the fiscal 1976 federal deficit and undermine existing market-oriented farm policies. (Weekly Report p. 3892)

Agriculture - 4

TOBACCO PRICE SUPPORTS

Congress did not attempt to override Ford's Sept 30 veto of HR 8476 which would have increased tobacco price support levels. Supporters claimed the bill was needed to keep pace with higher costs of tobacco production and provide growers with greater success. Ford said the bill would hamper tobacco exports and increase federal spending. (Weekly Report p. 8117)

Rice Production. In the last days of the session, Congress cleared S Res 121, calling for quarterly adjustments of the support price for milk until March 22, 1976, and an increase in the support price to a minimum of 86 per cent of parity. The House adopted the conference report Dec 17 and the Senate Dec 18. President Ford vetoed two previous congressional attempts to provide quarterly milk price adjustments. (Weekly Report p. 2898)

Rice Production - 4

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

New voting formula was weighted too heavily in favor of amendment, upheld in conference, which changed provisions for the referendum by which cattle producers had passed the fall of 1974 in the Senate. The old Rule 22, in effect since 1917 with only minor changes, required a two-thirds majority of senators present and voting to end debate. Advocates of changing Rule 22 to make it easier to end filibusters began their drive at the beginning of a new Congress by majority vote without debate on the change itself being subject to Rule 22. The change was adopted by voice vote, and it went into effect Jan. 20. But it did not affect the selection of committee chairmen for the 94th Congress.

The rules change made it easier for senators to depose a chairman without fear of retribution. Under the procedure, a list of the senators nominated by the Democratic Steering Committee to be committee chairmen would be distributed to all Democrats. Democrats then could check the names of any nominees for chairman they wished to subject to a secret ballot. At least 20 per cent of the caucus members wanted a secret vote on a nominee it would be held automatically two days later. (Weekly Report p. 218)

House Rules, Committee Changes. House Democrats consummated a six-year drive to reform the operations and structure of the House at the party's caucuses held in December 1974 and in January.

The caucus changes went to the heart of the House's power structure. The task of making committee assignments from the Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee to the Steering and Policy Committee, a party unit controlled by the Democratic leadership.

The caucus continued its efforts started in previous years by making the rules more accountable by providing the Steering and Policy Committee with authority to nominate the chairman of the committee of each session of Congress. And it did to make all committees subject to automatic secret ballot election by the entire caucus. That change was adopted in 1975.

Under the new rules, the Speaker of the House nominated all subcommittee chairmen and the end of the absolute seniority system for selecting committee chairmen. The change was adopted in 1975. The Speaker of the House, under the new rules, would appoint all subcommittee chairmen.

In whoN or In pert ReproducUon

PAY RAISES

Congress was given a 5 per cent pay raise for the 94th Congress. In the Senate, the pay raise was approved by the House, required Senate approval before it could go into effect.

Agriculture - 5
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by the Advisory Committee on Federal Pay. The Senate Sept. 18 rejected S Res 239, a related resolution to disapprove the President's pay plan. If either house had adopted a disapproval, the higher pay raise would have taken effect. (Weekly Report p. 2185)

Congressional Budget. Congress in 1975 refused to go ahead with construction of a Fourth House office building. Funds for acquisition of land and preliminary planning were denied during consideration of the fiscal 1976 legislative branch appropriations bill (HR 6850–PL 94-91). For the first time in four years, there was no effort made by the House to approve any of the funds requested by the Capitol. The House leadership, which had fought hard for the funds, decided to forego the legislation in the session, did not reintroduce its proposal because work could not have been completed in time for the bicentennial celebrations. (Weekly Report p. 1447)

Metric Conversion. More than a century after it legislated toward passage in 1876, the House Administration Committee Nov. 7 approved a bill (HR 8347–PL 94-94) reauthorizing federal employees to participate in partisan election campaigns and to run for office. The bill to amend the Hatch Act, which had prohibited political activities by federal employees since 1899, also was reported Dec. 5 by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Senate action on the bill was expected early in 1976. The measure faced an almost certain presidential veto. (Weekly Report p. 3884)

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

Consumer Affairs

ACTION COMPLETED

Fair Trade. With almost no opposition, Congress approved a bill (HR 6971—PL 94-145) repealing federal exemptions that protected state "fair trade" laws from challenge under the antitrust laws. The laws allowed manufacturers to discourage sales of products to stores that did not carry certain products. President Ford and Congress agreed that this practice amounted to price fixing and was costing consumers about $2-billion a year. (Weekly Report p. 2145)

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

Consumer Protection Agency. The Senate broke a filibuster in May to pass the long-debated consumer protection agency bill (S 200). The House passed a similar version (HR 6976—PL 94-145) repealing federal exemptions that protected state "fair trade" laws from challenge under the antitrust laws. The laws allowed manufacturers to discourage sales of products to stores that did not carry certain products. President Ford and Congress agreed that this practice amounted to price fixing and was costing consumers about $2-billion a year. (Weekly Report p. 2145)

Crime and Justice

ACTION COMPLETED

Voting Rights. Congress reaffirmed its guarantee of the right to vote in elections for federal, state, and local offices in Spanish-speaking Americans and other language minorities. President Ford vetoed the measure for seven years (HR 2107—PL 94-73). Passage came after the House passed a separate bill and the Senate took up the legislation and the Senate overcome a filibuster attempt.

Under the extension legislation, covered jurisdictions, including all or parts of seven deep South states, must still submit any proposed changes in their election laws to the attorney general who could veto such changes if he found that they discriminated against blacks.

The bill extended that same preemption protection to substantial numbers of Spanish-speaking Americans, American Indians, Asian-Americans and Alaskan natives. In addition, for the first time, Congress established a bureau to conduct bilingual elections in areas with significant numbers of language minorities whose illiteracy rate was higher than the national average. (Weekly Report p. 1688)

Rules of Criminal Procedure. Barely meeting a self-imposed Aug. 1 deadline, Congress July 30 cleared HR 6799 (FL 94-64), revising the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. The rules set standards in federal criminal cases for pre-trial, trial and post-trial situations such as plea bargaining, summonses and arrest warrants. The Supreme Court had submitted proposed changes in the rules of procedure to Congress in April 1974. Those changes would have become effective automatically unless Congress reversed them. The House passed HR 6799 June 25, making 35 changes in the Court's revisions. The Senate May 16 took up the major change in a new rule regulating defense of alibi. The Senate version, passed July 17, retained most of the House modifications, including the chief cases. (Weekly Report p. 1687)

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

Criminal Code Revision. The Senate continued its five-year effort to revise and reform the federal criminal code as the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedure (S 1138) completed the 750-page revised version of the bill described by the subcommittee as the most important of two bills (S 138 and S 1400) that died at the end of the 93rd Congress. The draft received major opposition from 100 opponents of the committee who claimed the bill would unduly restrict individual freedoms. There was no House action on criminal code bills (HR 381, HR 8007, HR 1138), before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Criminal Justice. (Weekly Report p. 2503)

Credit Cards. The House passed a bill (HR 10661) in November that would prohibit retailers from adding a sur­charge to card purchases. The bill would also authorize credit cards to be used for new agencies such as housing, banking, and Urban Affairs Committee. (Weekly Report p. 2818)
**Major Nominations in 1975**

The following major and controversial nominations took place during the session. Of a total of 5,495 civilian nominations submitted, President Ford, 294 were returned, six withdrawn for various reasons and 176 remain pending for consideration in the second session of the 94th Congress.

**CABINET**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Bush</td>
<td>Director, Central</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Coors</td>
<td>Member of the House,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Rumsfeld</td>
<td>Defense secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. David Mathews</td>
<td>Health, education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack M. Eker</td>
<td>General Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Kendrick</td>
<td>Member, Equal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacy R. Hathaway</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danny Southard Murphy</td>
<td>Chairman, National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Dunlop</td>
<td>Labor secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William T. Coleman Jr.</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Paul Stevens</td>
<td>Associate justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPREME COURT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Betty Southard Murphy</td>
<td>Chairman, Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John E. Robson</td>
<td>Chairman, Civil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurence Silverman</td>
<td>Ambassador to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil F. Staebler</td>
<td>Member, Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl J. Silbert</td>
<td>U.S. attorney for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton D. Stay</td>
<td>Judge for the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXECUTIVE BRANCH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ben B. Blair</td>
<td>Chairman, Federal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C. Daniel</td>
<td>National Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas J. Meskill</td>
<td>Judge for the Second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton D. Stay</td>
<td>Promoted to Lieutenant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MISCELLANEOUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parole Reorganization</td>
<td>A bill (HR 5727) to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Economic Affairs**

**ACTION COMPLETED**

**Tax Cuts**

Moving quickly to counter a deep economic recession, Congress March 26 cleared a $22.5-billion emergency tax cut to bolster consumer and business purchasing power.

President Ford March 29 signed the measure (HR 2166—PL 94-12) into law, nonetheless protesting congressional actions that went far beyond his own $15-billion tax cut proposal in both size and scope.

In its final form, HR 2166 put a Democratic stamp on the tax reduction program that was the federal government's primary response to a severe economic decline. The measure accordingly shifted the tax cuts toward lower income levels, repealed the percentage depletion allowance for major oil companies and carried several controversial provisos written in by the Senate.

As Congress pushed to enact the bill before its Easter recess, Senate Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D La.) forced House conferees to accept scaled-down versions of several Senate amendments that had pushed the bill's potential cost above $25-billion.

The House Feb. 27 had passed a $31.9-billion version of HR 2166 that hikes in individual income taxes by $15.5-billion and business taxes another $5.6-billion. Ford had proposed a one-shot $12-billion rebate of 1974 personal taxes, but the House accepted the Ways and Means Committee's proposal coupling $8.4-billion in 1974 tax refunds with another $19.1-billion in reduced 1975 tax withholding.

While accepting the committee's proposals for cutting business taxes, the House overrode Chairman At Ullman's (D Ore.) objection to the revision's amendment offered by dissident Ways and Means members.

The legislation was forced by the House Democratic Caucus, which voted 153-98 to instruct the House Rules Committee to allow a floor vote on amendments repealing the depletion allowance in a long-sought tax reform reply for tax revision advocates, the full House accepted the amendment by voice vote.

In the Senate, the Finance Committee restructured the House's tax cuts and raised the total cut by $7-$8-billion. Under Long's guidance, the panel dropped depletion repeal provisions but backed other controversial measures including a 5 per cent tax credit for buyers of unused homes.

After two late-night floor maneuvering, the Senate passed HR 2166 with several additional provisions, including $100 billion payments to federal benefit recipients, a cut in personal income taxes for 1975, a $10-billion oil and gas producers, and a $250 billion floor for all other revenue-related issues for the rest of fiscal year. However, spending still could rise as a result of increased commitments and the bill's items such as entitlement programs and possible revisions by Congress of the spending totals.

Congress did not completely implement the new budgetary procedures, mandated by the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (PL 93-344). As part of a "trial run," it skipped setting binding spending ceilings on both the House and Senate, pending the release of a new budget, such as defense and health. However, the House and Senate Budget Committees did propose targets for each of these areas.

Predictably, the new procedures had rough sledding at several points, including the battle over the size of the deficit, while many liberals were unhappy about cuts in social programs. In the Senate, Appropriations Committee Chairman John Stennis (D Ark.) criticized the process as "confusing."
Debt Limit. Congress three times extended the temporary federal debt ceiling, although the House twice declined to extend it for a more limited period. On those occasions, House members used the debt limit bill to cast token votes against federal deficits. In a more significant gesture, however, in a final 1976 extension that Republicans were trying to use as a vehicle for the $906-billion fiscal 1977 spending ceiling demanded by President Ford, the Rules Committee was able to construct a measure that would preserve the debt limit ceiling.

In February, Congress enacted a $33-billion debt limit extension through June 30 but House Speaker Tip O'Neill, and his Democratic colleagues, abandoned their tentative plan to use the measure as a vehicle for blocking President Ford's $1.093 billion import fee (Energy action, p. 1163).

The House Ways and Means Committee had linked provisions suspending the President's import fee powers to the debt limit increase in hopes of avoiding a presidential veto. That strategy followed the Senate's long-standing tactic of adding controversial measures to debt limit bills that must be enacted to allow the Treasury to keep funding operations.

House leaders had second thoughts about that tactic, however, and the Rules Committee split the initial measure (HR 1776) into two. Both the Senate and House, then passed the debt limit bill without amendments.

In June, however, the House rejected by a 152-25 vote the Ways and Means Committee proposals (HR 7545) for a $635.1-billion contemporary debt ceiling through 1976. The committee had backed a $577-million bill through March 15, 1976, which was accepted by a 223-156 vote in the House and a 73-21 vote in the Senate.

As that Nov. 15 expiration date neared, the House again balked at extension, this time defeating by a 157-217 vote the committee's proposal for a $567-billion ceiling through March 15, 1976 (HR 10409). That set the stage for an administrative trade effort to clear any support for a follow-up $586-billion ceiling through May 13, 1976, for a House floor vote on that extension.

The House blocked that maneuver, voting by a 221-196 margin to go for a bill sponsored by House Ways and Means Chairman Pat Williams to offer a spending limit amendment to the debt ceiling bill. With House leaders mortoring Democratic votes, the House then went along by a 158-186 vote. The Senate quickly cleared the bill (HR 10588—PL 94-123) by voice vote.

Securities Overhaul. Congress May 22 completed a four-year review of the securities industry by law (clearing S 249—PL 94-29) to encourage development of a national system for buying and selling stocks.

The bill was intended to improve federal securities laws and to raise capital for small business by strengthening Securities and Exchange Commission's powers over the over-the-counter market. The act was intended to provide assurances to securities markets and investors that the SEC would try to prevent excessive speculation or other abuses.

The act also was intended to give the SEC new powers to prohibit securities fraud and to establish a new federal court to hear SEC enforcement actions against securities issuers.

The implementation of the act was to be funded by a $25-million assessment on security exchanges.

The act also was intended to provide a new level of protection for investors by requiring securities exchanges to post a $50,000 bond to cover the cost of any securities transactions.

The act also was intended to provide investors with greater access to the financial markets and to ensure that investors were protected from financial emergencies.
Energy and Environment

Energy Policy. Congress Dec. 17 sent President Ford an energy bill that would start its work in the '76 session after a year's work by a variety of congressional committees to reconcile the regional, jurisdictional, philosophical and political interests which clashed on this energy policy.

A composite of four Senate bills approved in April and June was passed by the Senate. The House measure approved after marathon consideration in September (HR 7014), the final bill (S 622) set up a new federal role in the nation's role toward energy independence.

Among its major provisions were those granting the President new powers to control the flow of energy supplies and materials; providing standby authorities to exercise in an emergency; creating a national strategic reserve of oil for insulation against a future oil embargo; setting it. The final compromise, which satisfied neither environmentalists nor EPA critics, set up a formal EPA program for registration and classification of pesticides. (Weekly Report p. 8551)

Nuclear Insurance. Congress Dec. 17 cleared for the White House a 10-year extension of the federal program of insurance for the nuclear power industry in the event of a nuclear power accident. The bill (HR 3631—PL 94-900, approved by the House Dec. 8 and the Senate Dec. 16, extended coverage of the combined federal/private insurance program to all plants licensed before Aug. 1, 1987. The law would otherwise have expired Aug. 1, 1977.

The major controversy during consideration of the bill focused on the industry liability limit contained in the law. Under the limit, the industry could not be liable for more than $600 million in damages, no matter how extensive the injuries caused by a nuclear accident. Efforts to eliminate the limit failed by three votes to overrule the veto, 278-141. (Weekly Report p. 1778)

The energy policy bill included provisions similar to those of HR 23, but affecting only public lands, to its (S 391) environmental provisions. The House Interior Committee in November refused to add similar language, affecting public and private lands, to its version of the bill. The House Energy and Commerce Committee and the Senate in December did not start the mining debate, but to consider the bill, and thus the bill would have been defeated in both chambers. (Weekly Report p. 1778)

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

Energy Taxes. The Senate Finance Committee sidetracked a similar bill to increase energy taxes (HR 3010) that the House had passed June 19. As House Ways and Means Committee members acknowledged, the legislation contained no tax incentives to encourage the rise in prices to the President's energy policy. The Senate Finance Committee rewrote some provisions before Congress recessed in August, but Chairman Russell B. Long (D La.) let the matter lie thereafter as Congress considered the energy issues. When the Ways and Means panel started debating energy tax measures in June, the Democrats expected to form the basic congressional alternative to President Ford's plan for promoting U.S. energy independence from foreign sources. The bills were expected to focus on the economy's alternative to President Ford's plan for promoting U.S. energy independence from foreign sources. The bills would be the first to consider the idea of a new tax on energy products.

Working from draft proposals drawn up by its Democratic staff, the committee's approach to protect the nation's energy economy from the jolt that rising energy prices might cause, was, in effect, a tax on gasoline prices. The committee's approach was to limit gasoline prices to a reasonable level by a narrow 19- 16 margin, with all 12 Republicans opposing the measure because it ignored Ford's demand for a windfall profit tax hike.

In sending HR 6680 to the floor, the panel un­dertook the complex task of raising gasoline tax, especially among new House members who cam­paigned against such taxes in 1974. The House disbanded the tax issue in July after the 20-cent gasoline tax increase for 1977 was cut by a stunning 34-cent vote. After taking out a companion 5 cents gasoline tax to finance the trust fund and then substituting mandatory efficiency standards for the automobile taxes, the House passed remaining provisions by a 291-130 vote. (Weekly Report p. 1688)

Land Use, Congress did not act on land use planning in 1975. Consideration was blocked when the House Interior Committee refused to report legislation to the full House. After an intense lobbying campaign and a month of work drafting such a bill (HR 3010), the committee refused, in mid-July, to order the bill reported. The motion to report the bill failed by a four-vote margin. HR 3010 would have provided federal aid to states which were willing to set up regional, jurisdictional, philosophical and political interests which clashed on the energy issue.

Energy Corporation. President Ford sent Congress in October his proposal (S 3522, HR 10267) for a $168 billion government corporation to stimulate commercial develop­ment of new energy sources such as solar energy and syn­thetic fuels. The bill, which was expected to go to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Banking and Currency and pass through the committees, was expected to die in committee. (Weekly Report p. 10287)

Clean Air. The Senate Public Works Committee and House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee were asked to work out a bill to amend the 1963 Clean Air Act, the bill failed by a four-vote margin. HR 3010 would have provided for the development of new energy sources such as solar energy and synthetic fuels. The bill, which was expected to go to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Banking and Currency and pass through the committees, was expected to die in committee. (Weekly Report p. 10287)
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Senate accepted the House action, killing the synthetic fuel loan guarantee program for 1975. (Weekly Report p. 2770)

Foreign Policy/National Security
ACTION COMPLETED
Indochina Aid. The last chapter of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia was signed into law as President Ford signed the Foreign Assistance Appropriations bill (HR 6750—PL 94-23) authorizing $405-million for the assistance of refugees in South Vietnam and Cambodia. The bill authorized $327-million for the evacuation costs and humanitarian aid to Vietnam and $455-million in military assistance to South Vietnam and Cambodia. It was the first time both houses had agreed to separating foreign and military aid, and it was the first time Congress had accepted $1.2-billion for the war. (Weekly Report p. 2854)

Congressional actions on national security legislation were completed when Congress cleared the Foreign Military Sales Act (HR 846—PL 94-24), providing $405-million for the requirement effort, in advance of the authorization. The bill paid for the transportation of the refugees from their home countries, their initial care and lodging in this country, and social services, medical care and welfare they might need later. (Weekly Report p. 1075)

In an unusual procedure, Congress had cleared the appropriations bill (HR 6854—PL 94-24), providing $65,640,000 for fiscal 1976 for the Board for International Broadcasting, which oversees the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. (Status of foreign military sales bill, sec. 122.

The Senate passed the bill Oct. 2 by a vote of 237-176. During floor debate, members explained they were switching from their earlier support for the total embargo because of Turkey's takeover of U.S. and NATO bases in August, the resulting chill in Washington-Atlantic relations and the threat of permanent damage to the NATO alliance. The Senate passed the House version the following day, completing action.

Before the October votes, the House and Senate had taken these actions in 1975: (1) The Senate May 19 passed 41-40 a bill (S 845) to lift the embargo under certain conditions; (2) the House July 24 rejected S 946; (3) the Senate July 31 cleared 47-46 the bill (S 2230) containing the partial lifting of the embargo and the broadcasting board's authorization; (4) efforts to bring the bill to the floor were blocked by the House action until the Oct. 2 vote. (Weekly Report p. 3186)

SINLA Accord. Congress gave final approval Oct. 9 to the stationing of 6,000 American military police in the Sinaloa as part of an Egyptian-Israeli peace accord negotiated in September by Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger. The House and Senate had considered the ramifications of a U.S. presence in the Middle East intermittently for more than a month before the Ford administration, at the end of the session, gave Congress the final bill (H J Res 862—PL 94-110) authorizing the President to implement the Sinaloa agreement. (Weekly Report p. 835)

Some members were concerned that approval of the American monitoring would commit the United States to a more active role in the Middle East and imply acceptance of possible promises that Kissinger may have made to Egypt and Israel without the concurrent approval of the Sinaloa agreement. In the resolution of the argument, however, that the two countries had insisted on the presence of the Americans as a condition of their acceptance of the peace agreement and that rejection of the resolution by Congress would jeopardize the peace agreement itself. (Weekly Report p. 835)

The resolution was adopted overwhelmingly by both houses, but only after it was amended to include a number of restrictions on the stationing of the Americans. (Weekly Report p. 2813)

Intelligence Committees. After almost three decades of secrecy, the Central Intelligence Agency came under unprecedented public and congressional scrutiny in 1975. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency and other executive branch intelligence agencies were examined by the Senate Select Intelligence Committee and the House Select Intelligence Committee. (Weekly Report p. 2571)

Reactions to news stories that the CIA had violated its charter by spying on U.S. citizens during the Vietnam war period, and recent committee determinations to determine whether the CIA, FBI and other law enforcement and intelligence agencies had engaged in illegal activities, led to the Senate Intelligence Committee's holding public hearings on a long list of intelligence abuses illegal surveillance of U.S. citizens, drug experimentation on individuals, political spying, opening of the U.S. mails, assassination plots, covert attempts to topple foreign governments and attempts to cover up many of these activities.

The committee completed four months of public hearings in December after issuing a series of preliminary reports on CIA covert activities in Chile, U.S. assassination plots against foreign leaders and FBI attempts to disrupt American protest groups and movements, in particular civilian and veteran groups protesting the Vietnam war in the 1960s.

With a final report required after the committee's authorization expires Feb. 29, 1976, the panel in mid-December began considering legislation it would present to the Senate to prevent future abuses by federal intelligence and law enforcement agencies.

A parallel investigation also was underway in the House, but that investigation was secret, except for organizational and procedural problems throughout the year. The investigation first was assigned to a 15-member intelligence subcommittee and later to a special joint subcommittee chaired by Rep. Lucien N. Nedzi (D Mich.). (Weekly Report p. 866)

This panel, however, made little progress because of a dispute between Nedzi and other committee Democrats. As a result, the panel transferred the job to a new committee with the same investigative mandate, appointed in November by Rep. G. Pike (D N.Y.), and three additional members.

Beginning in August, the committee focused on the cost of U.S. intelligence operations; in September, the panel turned to evaluating the quality and accuracy of congressional oversight of the two agencies and the other agencies.

Throughout the late summer and fall, however, the committee often was thwarted in its attempts to obtain intelligence data and reports from the executive branch. Numerous times, when committee staff threatened to hold executive branch officials in contempt of Congress.

Contempt citations. Compromises between the executive branch and two House committees prevented...
contempt-of-Congress citations against two cabinet secretaries from reaching the House floor in the closing days of the session. The controversy over congressional access to executive branch records involved Secretary of State Henry A. Kissinger and the House Select Intelligence Committee, which had on Oct. 30, 1974, voted to call officials of the State, Defense, and Commerce departments to testify before the committee.

The full Intelligence panel, headed by Rep. Otto G. Pike (D N.Y.), voted Nov. 14 to issue three contempt citations against a Defense Department official and two Commerce Department officials, and gave House Speaker Carl V. Albert of Okla. a referral to hand over records on National Security Council documents dealing with covert activities abroad.

The White House had insisted that the House panel would not press those two citations. Finally, on Dec. 10, he announced that substantial compliance also had been reached on access to records the State Department records, making that citation " moot."

President Ford claimed executive privilege in denying the records to the committee, but the compromise allowed several committee members and staff aides to receive oral briefings on the contents. (Weekly Report p. 2856)

The second clash was averted Dec. 8 when Morton agreed to turn over to a House Commerce subcommittee Consumer and Criminal Justice records on U.S. companies that had been asked to join the Arab boycott of Israel. Morton agreed to a compromise allowing the subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations after its chairman, John E. Moss (D Calif.), assured him they would be treated "in accordance with the rules of the House." The action came on the eve of a full committee vote on the subcommittee's recommendation to cite Morton for his defiance of a July 28 subpoena for the information. (Weekly Report p. 2706)

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

Foreign Military Aid. Neither the House International Relations nor Senate Foreign Relations Committee completed markup of bills authorizing fiscal 1976 funding for foreign military assistance and security, many of them involving significant supplementations to U.S. military commitments. The House Committee referred a bill to the full committee on Dec. 9, 1975, providing $1.5-billion in support for $2-billion in existing commitments. (Weekly Report p. 64)

Fishing Limits. A controversial bill (H.R. 961) to extend the U.S. fishing zone to 200 miles from the U.S. coastline awaited action in the Senate after it had been considered by three committees because of its broad impact if enacted. Commerce and Armed Services Committees reported it favorably; Foreign Relations had taken no action.

Although the Senate had already passed a similar bill in 1974 over administration objections, a closer vote was expected when the proposal reached the Senate. The Senate Commerce Committee (SCC) (p. 290) was expected to hold over the bill. (Weekly Report p. 128) The Senate held a two-day hearing on the proposed extension. The bill had been referred to the Senate Commerce, Armed Services, and Foreign Relations committees.

Rhodean Chrome. An effort to stop the controversial importation of chromium ore from Rhodesia failed Sept. 25 when the House rejected a bill (HR 1287) that would have permitted the President to bring the United States into compliance with U.N. sanctions against the white minority government. A similar bill had failed in the 89th Congress when the House did not act on a Senate-passed measure. The U.N. sanctions had been imposed in 1966, but Congress passed the so-called Nyrd amendment in 1971, that had the effect of permitting the Rhodesian iron imports in violation of the U.N. sanctions. The amendment was named for its sponsor, Sen. Henry F. Byrd Jr. (Va.).

The bulk of the opposition to HR 1287 came from a conservative coalition of Southern Democrats and Republicans. (Weekly Report p. 2106) Defense Appropriations-Apel's Aid. An 11th hour Senate battle aimed at shutting off U.S. military aid to two factions fighting a communist-backed group in the Angola civil war held up final congressional action on the $90.5-billion fiscal 1976 defense appropriations bill (HR 9861) until the final day of the session.

The House Dec. 12 approved the conference report on the bill, which the State Department disputed (HR 9881) had $28 million for the U.S.-backed Angolan rebels. A Senate conference bill reached the Senate floor Dec. 15, a coalition of senators led by John V. Chalmers (D Calif.) instead that an amendment be added banning the use of any funds in HR 9861 for the civil war in the African nation.

As a result, a final vote on the measure was delayed until the opening and secret sessions over a four-day period, filibustered by Republicans at the direction of the White House, but finally approved Dec. 19 on a 54-22 vote. The amendment, which was attached to one of six in technical disagreement between House and Senate conference, was then rushed to the House, but Speaker Carl V. Albert (D Okla.), said he would not act on a bill that would change the Angola issue with adjournment only hours away.

The fiscal 1976 defense appropriations bill is largest in U.S. history, provided funds for Pentagon weapons programs, research and development projects, maintenance and operations, military and civilian salaries, and for American civil servants. It also provided funds for the Egyptian-Israeli peace accord; U.S. government and commercial arms sales to Argentina, Brazil, Iran, and Syria, and for American civil servants. It also provided funds for the Egyptian-Israeli peace accord; U.S. government and commercial arms sales to Argentina, Brazil, Iran, and Syria, and for American civilian salaries.

Although the bill fell $4-billion below the fiscal 1975 funding level requested by the Ford administration, it was $7.0-billion larger than the amount appropriated for defense in fiscal 1975. The Senate Appropriations Committee, according to the Pentagon, was needed to keep pace with inflated costs of labor and materials, but some "real growth" was "when the language was included in the bill that passed in the Senate, which barred buying beyond the school closest to the student's home. The House easily agreed to the Senate's amendment after demanding by a wide margin an amendment to water it down. It was uncertain at year's end whether the amendment would take effect, however, since President Ford Dec. 19 vetoed HR 9609 on grounds that it exceeded his budget request, which was $2.5-billion.

Health, Education and Welfare

ACTION COMPLETED

Education for the Handicapped. In the major education legislation passed in 1975, Congress cleared a bill (S 6--PL 94-147) making an important new federal commitment to the education of handicapped children.

If S 6 sought to assure the nation's eight million handicapped children a free and appropriate public school education by expanding the authorization of appropriations and requiring school districts to educate or provide equivalent services and facilities for all handicapped children aged 3 to 21 by 1980. If the full authorization level were appropriated, the federal government by fiscal 1980 could provide up to 20 per cent of the additional cost of educating handicapped children, at an estimated cost of $2.5-billion a year.

President Ford signed the bill reluctantly, saying it raised "false expectations since Congress could not appropriate the full amounts authorized and still expect to bring federal spending under control. He said his administration would offer amendments to make the bill more realistic. (Weekly Report p. 8511)"

Older Americans Act. A companion measure (HR 2104, PL 94-188) authorized a total of $1.4-billion in fiscal 1976-77 for family planning, community mental health centers and other health services. It also authorized $165-million in fiscal 1976-77 for five health training programs. The programs originally expired in 1978; (Weekly Report p. 3531)

Developmental Disabilities. Congress completed action in late September on legislation (PL 94-103) expanding federal efforts to help the mentally retarded suffering from health problems known as developmental disabilities. The final version, dropped in late 1974, authorized a number of provisions that would have set detailed requirements for institutions caring for the mentally retarded, but required states to write a plan for implementation. (Weekly Report p. 2028)

Older Americans Act. Reauthorizing an administration proposal to end special employment programs for older workers, the Senate Commerce Committee (SCC) (p. 136) in November extending jobs, nutrition and other programs for the elderly through fiscal 1978. The bill also banned un­reasonable hiring in federal jobs for older workers. It also included a new "in-kind" funding program and placed new emphasis on transportation, home-delivered meals and other programs serving older Americans. (Weekly Report p. 3665)
Child Nutrition Programs. Congress Oct. 7 override President Ford's veto of a bill to amend and extend the school lunch and other child nutrition programs. The 94th-House bill would double the appropriation for the fiscal 1976-77 session by the House. The Senate voted 79-13 to override.

The bill (PL 94-100) extended existing non-school food programs to include emergency food aid to families for winter months and programs for the elderly and the blind. It increased the income eligibility level for reduced-price lunches from 50% to 140% of the poverty line and made children of unemployed parents eligible for free and reduced-price lunches.

Ford wanted Congress to implement his block-grant approach to child nutrition rather than extending the existing categorical programs. He said HR 4222 exceeded his budget request by $1.2-billion and extended federal subsidies to non-school children.

Congress did not complete the major overhaul of the food stamp program that it had planned in 1975. Although members agreed that reform was imperative, a $200,000 study of the program by the House Agriculture Committee was not complete and the Senate Agriculture Committee had not begun to mark up legislation despite holding extensive hearings from both committees before being expected by the end of the year. (Weekly Report p. 300)

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

National Health Insurance. Political and financial realities ended the momentum of national health insurance proposals again in 1975. Leery of the budget impact of major new programs, the administration withdrew its support for health insurance legislation and major interest groups did not pressure Congress for speedy action.

While neither panel made any substantive decisions, the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Health Subcommittee (S) 17 reported proposed constitutional amendments to the Senate (S 1737) designed to give the Senate control over the administration of the National Health Service. The Senate Judiciary committee (S) 17 rejected proposed constitutional amendments to the House (H 2161) that would have made the health service an arm of the federal government. Both committees agreed that the problem should be addressed by the states.

Abortion. In a setback for abortion opponents, a Senate Judiciary subcommittee (S 17) rejected proposed constitutional amendments designed to authorize states to ban abortion as a constitutional right. The amendment was to be viewed as a constitutional challenge to Roe v. Wade. The subcommittee was not expected to reexamine the issue, shifting the spotlight to a House Judiciary subcommittee. The House subcommittee may open hearings on the bill in 1976, but took no further action. Some observers believed that Edward M. Kennedy (D Mass.), subcommittee chairman, would prefer a constitutional amendment to the states rather than to the federal courts.

Malpractice. Congress briefly considered proposals that would have established federal programs to help doctors cope with the increasing costs of medical malpractice. The subcommittee was not expected to reexamine the issue, shifting the spotlight to a House Judiciary subcommittee. The House subcommittee may open hearings on the bill in 1976, but took no further action. Some observers believed that Edward M. Kennedy (D Mass.), subcommittee chairman, would prefer a constitutional amendment to the states rather than to the federal courts.

Housing/Community Development

ACTION COMPLETED

Aid to New York City. After one of the most heated legislative battles of the year, Congress Dec. 6 approved federal loan assistance for New York City. Although the city and New York state had taken drastic steps to reduce the city's spending needs, New York had been expected to default without federal aid. The final version of the bill (PL 94-148) is the same as the federal government's plan to loan New York up to $2.3-billion a year through mid-1978 to cover the city's seasonal cash flow problems. New York would have to repay the loans each year with interest.

Although city officials first sought federal help in May, Congress did not act because the city had failed to carry out national safety standards. The bill also had to give consumers more information about the settlement on the housing problems. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board decided not to put its proposal to effect without further discussion with Congress.

Real Estate Settlement. Acting just before adjournment, Congress Dec. 3 cleared legislation (S 567) reining requirements of 1975. The bill is designed to give consumers more information about the settlement on the housing problems. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board decided not to put its proposal to effect without further discussion with Congress.

The bill eliminated the provision of the 1974 law requiring mortgage lenders to give consumers a detailed list of settlement charges at least 12 days before settlement. Instead, lenders simply would have to give consumers a statement of charges before offering to buy up their houses at a fair market value. The act also eliminated the airline safety rules.

Redlining. Disclosure. Congress gave final approval to a bill requiring lenders to disclose how much mortgage money they provide to urban areas. Disclosure was designed to prevent lenders from "redlining," or not making loans in certain city neighborhoods in their lending practices.

The bill, which had the support of lenders, had been designed to give consumers more information about the settlement on the housing problems. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board decided not to put its proposal to effect without further discussion with Congress.

President Ford stood with the opponents until late November, when he decided to back limited federal aid to bail out a city that had spent with mismanaged abandon. Ford argued that the bill would cost too much and take too long to put into effect. Key House members in the housing field who opposed the original legislation put together the second bill as a Ford-backed alternative to the leadership's proposal. (Weekly Report p. 1158)

Variable Rate Mortgages. While it did not complete any formal action, Congress effectively blocked a regulatory proposal to allow lenders to make mortgage loans carrying interest rates that would float with the market over the life of the loan. Almost all new mortgages fix interest rates, and opponents of the proposal argued that floating rates would hurt the consumers.

The House passed a bill (HR 6289) to block the proposal in May, and the Senate approved a similar, but non-binding, resolution in June. Given congressional sentiment, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board decided not to put its proposal to effect without further discussion with Congress.
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Presidential Vetoes, 94th Congress

(Through Dec. 23)

1. HR 1767 (Oil Import Fees) Vetosed: March 4
   Overide attempt.
2. HR 1269 (Emergency Farm Bill) Vetosed: May 1
   House sustained May 13. (Overide attempt, Weekly Report p. 1046)
3. HR 25 (Strip Mining) Vetosed: May 20
4. HR 4481 (Emergency Employment Appropriations) Vetosed: May 28
   House sustained June 4. (Overide attempt, Weekly Report p. 1199)
5. HR 5537 (Tourism Promotion) Vetosed: May 29
   No overide attempt.
6. HR 4485 (Emergency Housing) Vetosed: June 24
   House sustained June 25. (Overide attempt, Weekly Report p. 1535)
7. HR 4035 (Oil Pricing) Vetosed: July 1
   House sustained July 29. (Overide attempt, Weekly Report p. 1340)
8. HR 5901 (Education Appropriations) Vetosed: July 25
   No overide attempt.
9. S 2376 (Health Services) Vetosed: July 29
   Senate overrode July 29. (Weekly Report p. 1290)
10. S 2849 (Oil Price Decontrol) Vetosed: Sept. 9
    Senate sustained Sept. 10. (Overide attempt, Weekly Report p. 1699)
11. HR 8497 (Tobacco Price Supports) Vetosed: Sept. 20
    Senate overrode Sept. 20. (Weekly Report p. 1939)
12. HR 4229 (School Lunch) Vetosed: Oct. 3
13. HR 12 (Foreign Missions) Vetosed: Nov. 29
    No overide attempt.
14. HR 5559 (Tax Cuts) Vetosed: Dec. 17
    House sustained Dec 18. (Overide Attempt, Weekly Report p. 2793)
15. HR 8069 (Labor-HHS Appropriations) Vetosed: Dec. 19

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

"Countercyclical" Aid. House conferences agreed in December to accept a Senate-passed proposal that would triple the annual amount of "countercyclical" aid to help state and local governments combat recession. Sponsors of the proposals argued that state and local tax increases and service cutbacks would counteract federal efforts to stimulate the economy.

The grants would go to state and local governments with unemployment rates higher than 6 per cent only when the national unemployment rate exceeded 6 per cent. The total cost of the 15-month program would be $1.4-billion if the national rate stayed at its November level of 8.3 per cent.

The House held up final action on the proposal, part of a large package of tax cuts and price controls agreed to by the two houses in their January "omnibus" legislation.

Municipal Bankruptcy. Senate-House conferences did not reach agreement by the end of the year in legislation (HR 10924) that would make it easier for cities like New York to adjust to rising costs of their debt service and to avoid bankruptcy proceedings. President Ford had requested ac-

ACTION COMPLETED

Rail Revitalization. Congress Dec. 19 cleared for the President a bill (S 2718) authorizing up to $6.5-billion in financial assistance—grants and loans—for the nation's ailing railroads. Spokesmen for President Ford announced he would veto the bill, which would authorize $6.5-billion in emergency supplemental funds for fiscal 1975. (Weekly Report p. 2769)

Highway Jobs. Congress May 22 cleared legislation (HR 3978—FL 94-30) to temporarily increase to 100 per cent the federal support to states for certain highway and mass transit programs. The bill was designed to reduce unemployment and accelerate highway construction to ease the effects of the recession.

Congress could receive up to 100 per cent financing for projects approved between Feb. 13, 1975, and Sept. 30, 1975. (Weekly Report p. 1154)

Public Broadcasting. Giving public broadcasting a prize sought since 1967, Congress Dec. 17 cleared for the President a bill (HR 4661—FL 94-00) authorizing long-range funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB).

Designed to free public broadcasting from political pressures, the bill authorized spending of $454-million for the CPB over a four-year period (fiscal 1976-79). Stipulated were funds under a matching formula under which the federal government would contribute $1 for each $2 in funds by the public broadcast stations.

House-Senate conference rejected a controversial provision added on the House floor that would have specified that $2.50 of the 10-cent anti-pollution contributions under the 1965 Clean Air Rights Act applied to the CPB. (Weekly Report p. 2787)

ACTION NOT COMPLETED

Highway Program—Trust Fund. Dispute over the highway bill went unresolved in May when the House, Senate and House committee acted on widely varying versions of legislation for the fiscal highway program for two years (fiscal 1977 and 1978).

Critics of the trust fund, which in 1973 was opened for the first time to provide federal grants to states, said the 94th Congress would abolish the trust fund or reduce it as part of a new national transportation policy. But with warnings of nearly depleted funds for state highway programs, the highway lobby won an extension of the federal program, and the trust fund, for two years.

The Senate bill (S 2711), passed Dec. 12, featured a con-
solidation of existing narrow programs, increased flexibility for urban highway programs and a new trust fund ap-
portionsment formula to ensure completion of the Interstate Highway System. The interstate system received priority attention in the House bill (HR 8255), which in-
creased the existing funding levels for the system and ex-
stend the authorized for interstate construction through 1988. Efforts to resolve the differing versions were put off until the second session. (Weekly Report p. 2704)

Included in S 2718 was $2.4-billion for high-speed passenger service in the Northeast corridor between Washington, D.C., and Boston.

Earlier in the session, Congress approved legislation (S 281—FL 94-53) authorizing $447-million in emergency grants and loans for the bankrupt Penn Central and other financially ailing Northeast and Midwest railroads under emergency receivership (weekly report p. 441)

Amtrak. The National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak) got its first multi-year authorization when Congress May 13 cleared a bill (HR 4970—FL 94-23) to authorize $1.118,000,000 through Sept. 30, 1977, for the cor-
poration. The authorization included $650-million in emergency supplemental funds for fiscal 1975. (Weekly Report p. 2769)

Highway Jobs. Congress May 22 cleared legislation (HR 3978—FL 94-30) to temporarily increase to 100 per cent the federal support to states for certain highway and mass transit programs. The bill was designed to reduce unemployment and accelerate highway construction to ease the effects of the recession.

Congress could receive up to 100 per cent financing for projects approved between Feb. 13, 1975, and Sept. 30, 1975. (Weekly Report p. 1154)

Public Broadcasting. Giving public broadcasting a prize sought since 1967, Congress Dec. 17 cleared for the President a bill (HR 4661—FL 94-00) authorizing long-range funding for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB).

Designed to free public broadcasting from political pressures, the bill authorized spending of $454-million for the CPB over a four-year period (fiscal 1976-79). Stipulated were funds under a matching formula under which the federal government would contribute $1 for each $2 in funds by the public broadcast stations.

House-Senate conference rejected a controversial provision added on the House floor that would have specified that $2.50 of the 10-cent anti-pollution contributions under the 1965 Clean Air Rights Act applied to the CPB. (Weekly Report p. 2787)

Airport Development—SST Flights. Having approved a six-month ban on U.S. landings by the British-French Concorde supersonic jet transport, the House Dec. 18 passed legislation (HR 9771) authorizing $4-billion for airport development and other aviation projects over a five-year period, fiscal 1976-80.

The narrow 199-188 vote adopting the anti-Concorde amendment reflected the first successful attempt by either the House or Senate to deny landing rights to the giant British-French airliner, which would not apply to Dulles International Airport near Washington, D.C. The bill also opened the Airport and Airway Trust Fund for airport terminal development and facilities servicing, revised the formula for distribution of trust fund monies and authorized transportation department use of long-term projects.

Companion legislation was pending in the Senate Commerce Aviation Subcommittee at adjournment. (Weekly Report p. 2781)

Attempts in both houses to amend the transportation appropriations bill (HR 8255—FL 94-340) to prevent the Concorde from landing at U.S. airports were narrowly defeated. Unless HR 9771 was enacted within the six-month ban, a decision on a British-French application to be allowed to make six flights daily to the United States would be left to Transportation Secretary William T. Coleman Jr., who had said he would make his decision by Dec. 4. (Weekly Report p. 2869)

Postal Reorganization. In response to mounting complaints about the inefficiency of the U.S. Postal Service, the House Oct. 30 passed a bill (HR 9603) to return the financial control of the post office to Congress. In 1975, Congress approved legislation reorganizing the postal service and giving the agency independent financial status. The Senate did not act on HR 9603, but the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee planned to hold hearings on the bill early in 1976. (Weekly Report p. 4711)

Regulatory Reform. Congress failed to take action in 1975 on the Ford administration's proposals to lessen federal regulation of the airlines and trucking industries, but did include some of the President's regulatory proposals for the railroad industry in an omnibus rail bill (S 2718). One action completed.
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FORD ENDS STALEMATE, SIGNS ENERGY BILL

"This legislation...puts into place the first elements of a comprehensive national energy policy," said President Ford Dec. 22 in signing H.R. 3474 (PL 94-163), the Energy Policy and Conservation Act. Congress had cleared the omnibus energy bill for the White House Dec. 17. (Weekly Report p. 2868)

"The time has come to end the long debate over national energy policy," Ford said, explaining why he opted for signing the bill in the face of intense opposition from conservative Republicans, oil-state representatives and the oil industry. The bill was "by no means perfect," Ford conceded, but it "provides a foundation upon which we can build a more comprehensive program." He urged Congress to act in 1976 on pending energy bills, including one which would end federal price controls on new natural gas. (Weekly Report p. 2768, 2829)

Most controversial of the provisions of S 522 were those which required Ford to continue federal controls on the price of domestic oil. In addition, the bill required an extension of those controls to "new" oil, which is presently not subject to federal price controls. This extension was required by language setting $7.68 as the average maximum per-barrel price for domestic oil. $1.09 below the present average. Administration officials indicated that this average would be attained initially by retaining the $0.28-per-barrel price ceiling for "old" oil—about two-thirds of the oil consumed in the United States—and by holding the price of "new" oil at $11.28 per barrel. "New" oil sells at up to $15.00 per barrel.

As reported, the bill, President Ford acknowledged defeat—at least for the short-term—of his effort to reduce consumption of oil and increase domestic production by allowing the prices of this fuel to rise. This "conservation-by-price" philosophy had marked the major thrust of energy policy since he had been elected in part to address the energy problem and that taken by congressional Democrats. Ford also had faced opposition in S 522, the $5.25-per-barrel price ceiling which he imposed in two stages earlier in the year to make imported oil more expensive, especially in imported oil, which producers can pass on to consumers. But Federal Energy Administrator Frank R. Garvey said Dec. 17 that oil conservation would be a "significant" factor in the oil market, particularly if a second oil embargo or the harassment of OPEC nations is threatened.

Congress late in December cleared legislation (HR 3474) authorizing $8-billion in appropriations in fiscal 1976 for energy research and development. The bill authorized a proportional amount, totaling $1.27-billion, in the transition quarter, July through September 1976. (Weekly Report p. 2770)

As cleared by Congress, HR 3474 authorized for major energy research and development in fiscal 1976:

- $106-million for fossil fuel research and development, including: $117.6-million for work to produce liquid fuel from coal (including $20-million for advance work on a demonstration plant); $146-million for work to produce a gas-like fuel from coal (of which $25-million was for advance work on two demonstration plants); $43-million for research on the extraction and utilization of natural gas and oil; $84.5-million for magnetohydrodynamics, and $118-million for in-situ processing of oil shale. (The House had struck from the conference report on HR 3474 two controversial sections: one authorizing loan guarantees for commercial development of synthetic fuels—including liquid and gaseous fuels from coal; the other authorizing a cooperative federal-private demonstration of in-situ development of oil shale. Weekly Report p. 2770)
- $3.2-billion for solar energy research and development, including: $1.09-billion for solar heating and cooling, $250-million for solar thermal projects (including $100-million for work on two test facilities), $350-million for work on photovoltaic conversion, $250-million for wind energy conversion, and $115-million for ocean thermal energy conversion.
- $56-million for research and development on geothermal energy (including $10-million for advance work on two hydrothermal power plants).
- $250-million for fusion energy research and development operating expenses, including a $125-million ceiling for fusion test reactor and $277-million for neutron source facilities.

Committee Action:

LAND MANAGEMENT

The Senate Interior Committee Dec. 18 reported the National Resource Lands Management Act (S 507—S Sept 94-968). The Senate did not act on S 507 before adjourning its first session.

As reported, S 507 was virtually identical to S 41, a bill approved by the Senate in July 1974 which died at the end of the 89th Congress because the House took no action. (Detailed provisions, 1974 Almanac p. 806)

The Senate bill authorized $3.2 billion for the acquisition of federal lands, including lands within a 100-mile-wide band along the border, to preserve federal power to transfer lands in exchange for oil and gas leases. It authorized $1.2 billion for public lands, including $150-million for the U.S. Forest Service and $250-million for the Bureau of Land Management.

Background

S 507 is one of several Senate amendments to the 1974 Public Lands Act (S 22), which added the two amendments by voice Dec. 12. The Senate had first approved the bill June 2; the House had approved its version Nov. 18.
CONGRESS CLEARS REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT BILL

After House-Senate conferences worked out a last-minute compromise, Congress Dec. 19 sent the President a legislation (S 2327) repealing provisions of a 1974 law (PL 93-532) giving homeowners the right to find out what real estate settlement charges they must pay at least 12 days before they complete the sale transaction. (House action, Weekly Report p. 2862-Dec. 27, 1975)

While repealing the 12-day advance disclosure requirement, the final version of S 2327 required lenders to give homeowners an estimated range of settlement charges when they applied for a mortgage loan. Homebuyers also could find out whatever actual charges had been set at least one business day before settlement.

Other provisions of the bill killed requirements of the 1974 law designed to disclose excessive profits by real estate speculators and streamlined the paperwork involved in preparing a list of charges for use at settlement. Lenders had led a persuasive lobbying campaign against the requirements of the 1974 bill. They argued that the law created unnecessary paperwork, increased lending costs and caused moving delays.

Opponents of the bill claimed that it would make it impossible for consumers to shop for the least expensive settlement services, the purpose of the original 12-day advance disclosure requirement. "This bill is an out-and-out real estate industry triumph over the homebuying public," complained Rep. Leo R. Sullivan (D Mo.).

The House ignored this argument and voted overwhelmingly Nov. 17 to repeal the 12-day advance disclosure requirement and simply require lenders to give homeowners a range of possible charges when they applied for a mortgage loan. The Senate and House agreements Dec. 8 that homeowners should have the chance to find out exact charges at least one day before settlement. Senate action, Weekly Report p. 2794, Dec. 6, 1975.

House-Senate conferences resolved the stand-off Dec. 19 by deciding to give homebuyers the right to find out whatever exact charges had been fixed by the day before settlement. The conference compromise did not require lenders, or others conducting a settlement, to make any special effort to gather change information by the day before settlement. The compromise also did not require lenders to disclose any information in advance unless the homebuyer requested it.

The Senate and then the House adopted the report (H Rept 94-769) on the conference agreement by voice vote on Dec. 19, completing action before adjournment.

The President was expected to sign the bill.

Provisions

As cleared for the President, S 2327:

- Allowed regional variations in the items included on a standard form setting forth settlement charges.
- Required lenders to give homeowners a booklet describing common settlement charges and good-faith estimates of the range of charges likely to be paid when they applied in writing for a mortgage loan.
- Repealed provisions of the 1974 law (PL 93-532) requiring lenders to disclose exact settlement costs at least 12 days before actual settlement; instead, required the person conducting the settlement to make available for a homeowner's inspection whatever exact charge information he had on hand one business day before settlement.
- Repealed provisions of the 1974 law barring lenders from making a loan commitment if the seller did not inform the buyer of the approximate purchase price of a house bought within the last two years that was not used as a place of residence by the seller.
- Clarified that provisions of the 1974 law prohibiting kickbacks between those in the real estate industry did not apply to cooperative brokerage and referral arrangements of real estate agents.
- Modified provisions of the 1974 law barring lenders from collecting and holding in escrow more than one month's worth of advance property taxes and insurance premiums to allow two months' worth of escrow payments.
- Expanded the authority of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to implement the 1974 act.
- Provided that the changes in the 1974 law would take effect upon enactment, allowing HUD to suspend the no-disclosure requirements for up to six months.

FLOOD AREA MORTGAGES

Temporarily resolving a House-Senate dispute, Congress Dec. 19 cleared a resolution (S Res 137) to postpone a ban on mortgage lending for existing property in flood-prone communities that had not adopted land use standards set by the Department of Housing and Urban Development under the national flood insurance program. The resolution would delay the mortgage lending ban, scheduled to take effect Jan. 1, 1976.

The House had maneuvered Dec. 16 to avoid going to conference before adjournment to participate in the federal committee proposal (HR 9502) that would relax the mortgage lending ban. After the House acted, Senate opponents of the ban searched for a way to delay the effect on Jan. 1. (Background, Weekly Report p. 2790, Dec. 19, 1975).

The Senate Jan. 16, 1976, approved the compromise resolution to delay the ban by voice vote on Dec. 19, 1975, making the ban effective on the last day of the session. The delay gave Congress time to consider the type of changes contained in HR 9502 in early 1976.

In an effort to hold down the federal cost of disaster aid, a 1973 flood insurance act (PL 93-234) required designated flood-prone areas to participate in the federal flood insurance program and applied the mortgage lending ban to non-participating communities that had not adopted land use standards set by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for existing property.


ECONOMIC AFFAIRS

NEW BUDGET SYSTEM SURVIVES FIRST YEAR INTACT

The final score is not in, and probably will not be for at least a few years, but Congress' attempt to launch a revolutionary new federal budgeting system appears to have succeeded.

The effort in 1975 was the first serious one in decades to coordinate all federal spending and taxing—the heart of federal government activities.

Congress completed the first use of its new budget tools Dec. 15 by placing a ceiling of $74.5-billion on spending and a floor of $300.5-billion under revenues in fiscal 1976.

The resulting deficit of $74.1-bllion was the largest in history. It astounded fiscal conservatives and displeased some pro-spending liberals who believed Congress should do more to pump up the economy and reduce unemployment. In spite of these differences, key conservatives and liberals in both houses came to the rescue of the new budgeting system at critical points and presented it from being wrecked the first year in operation.

The new tools were created by Congress in 1974 to halt a long slide in congressional influence on government spending. There were many persons in Washington who thought the system would collapse under the weight of congressional power rivalries and political logrolling.

The appearance, after the first year of operation, that the double mighty determination of key members of Congress to make the system work. Among those key players were Sens. Edmund S. Muskie (D Maine) and Henry Bellmon (R Okla.) and Reps. Brock Adams (D Wash.) and Parren J. Mitchell (D Md.). Muskie and Adams are chairman of the joint House and Senate budget committees.
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Problems Ahead

Although the system appeared to work the first year, there remained pitfalls for the future. Congress must also adopt the system for the next year, it must coordinate all federal spending and taxing within the last two years that was not used as a place of residence by the seller.
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Sen. Edmund S. Muskie
Rep. Brock Adams

Led fight for new budget system
The Budget Act also required members for the first time to make choices and thereby set priorities. For example, if Congress called for health programs, it now must increase revenues through higher taxes, accept a larger deficit or balance the addition by cutting other programs.

As Congress in 1975 began viewing the federal budget as a ballot, with which to squeeze in one that would pop up in another. "People are seeing for the first time where all the money is going, and I'm not sure they like it," said Richard Warden, assistant legislative director for the United Auto Workers (UAW).

But nearly 100 lobbyists showed up for a budget conference called by the labor-led Council on National Priorities and Resources in early December.

"You'll have to watch us," Muskie replied.

The tedious job of matching bills with categories is called "crosswalking." It is necessary if the targets and ceilings Congress imposes on the categories are to be split into targets for individual bills. Budget Committee Chairmen Muskie and Adams attributed their decision not to include the functional categories in the fiscal 1976 resolutions primarily to this crosswalk problem. They noted that the process would be easier the following year, since they then would have a list of how that year fits into the functional categories.
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Other Handicaps

In deciding to make 1976 more than just a trial run of the procedures, the budget committee began work on the fiscal 1976 budget with several other big handicaps.

The committees had agreed to operate without benefit of the new element called for by the Budget Act: a crosswalk plan covering budget targets with categories as they process fiscal legislation during the summer months, and Sept. 15, when Congress is to replace the targets with spending ceilings and a floor on revenues in the second concurrent resolution. This was to allow only the total budget figures: outlays, budget authority, revenue, deficit and the amount of the public debt. Spending targets for the 16 individual categories, such as defense and health, were to be left out of the resolution.

The March plan also called for a three-month delay in choosing a director and the agency did not begin providing useful information until well into the year. The committees decided to omit the functional categories from the fiscal 1976 resolutions and preliminary draft of the budget.没了
Impoundment Law Creates New Headaches in Congress

One part of the new congressional budget law was a direct product of former President Nixon's repeated attempts to impound funds. The new law was designed to provide mechanisms to overcome criticism that Congress was at least preparing to bring mounting federal deficits into the public eye. The law created additional paperwork that often unnecessarily consumed staff time. Congressional and executive branch employees who must deal with Title X generally agree that the compromise language in the title is vague in many respects and is without sufficient legislative history to explain Congress' intent.

Recissions and Deferrals

Under current interpretation of the law, there are two methods for Congress to review the President's proposal to delay or cancel spending—actions that were called impoundment during President Nixon's days but were given other designations under the 1974 budget law.

If the President wants to withhold funds temporarily, perhaps because immediate expenditure would be impractical, he can propose to defer their spending until a later time. The President's deferral stands unless overturned by a resolution of either the Senate or House.

If the President believes money should not be spent at all, he may propose a rescission. In this case, both the House and Senate must approve the action within 45 days. If the two houses do not act, the President must release the funds at the end of the 45 days. Some congressional critics see this as one fault in Title X because the President can block spending for almost seven weeks; Congress cannot force the expenditures to be made during that period.

Other Criticisms

But the criticisms and the questions go far beyond that. A basic one is whether Title X created new authority for the President to impound funds. Since the law was enacted, only 189 of 196 resolutions have been defeated. A second line of attack is whether the law has not provided enough economic stimulus. Mitchell picked up important early support from committee member Parren J. Mitchell (Md.), a liberal Democrat who had opposed the first resolution on the original vote, saying the targets did not provide enough economic stimulus. Mitchell said. He added that he was "very happy" to support the conference version.

Mitchell and another committee Democrat whose position had been watched by House liberals, Elizabeth Holtzman (N.Y.), continued to support the resolutions through the rest of the year. Without their backing, it seemed possible the resolutions would have been defeated, thus conceivably destroying the process.

Functional Categories

While leaving the functional categories out of the resolutions on which Congress voted, the budget committees decided to include targets in the reports accompanying the resolutions. The category targets were not binding but showed how the committees arrived at the spending totals. They also were starting points for the task of setting guidelines for individual spending bills.

After passing the budget resolution, the annual targets became a key element in the appropriations process. The House Appropriations Committees turned repetitively to the conference report for the first resolution for guidance as it processed individual spending bills. "The question of whether a bill is above or below the resolution" came up "all the time," according to Adams. "The chairmen call me up and ask, 'What do you think?' "

Muskie kept the report's figures constantly before the Senate when bills reached the floor for votes. "We treat the resolution as if it had functional categories," a Senate aide said.

Styles

As the year progressed, the two committees and their chairmen developed contrasting styles. In the House, Adams generally operated behind the scenes, meeting with appropriations subcommittee chiefs to keep them aware of the targets. Because all spending bills originate in the House, Adams felt the critical point for influencing legislation was in these subcommittees as the bills were being drafted. Support for the targets came from his staff work. Adams kept in close touch with the chairmen. "We've already done our work before the bills get to the floor," Adams said.

As a result, Adams' work received less public notice. Muskie became a steady presence on the floor of the Senate where the questions affecting spending came up. For each bill he presented an analysis of how the measure fit into the targets and how passage might affect bills that remained to be voted on. To committee staff work, Adams kept in close touch with the chairmen. "We've already done our work before the bills get to the floor," Adams said.
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As McClellan, the team of Muskie and Bellmon startled some with the claim that new budget process was more of an arithmetical exercise in totting up the requests of the President and the actions of the appropriations committees than it was a congressional effort at setting national priorities.

There was no question that the spending levels in the second resolution were higher than those requested by the President in almost every category, both in his original February budget proposal and in later re-estimates by the Office of Management and Budget. And foreign aid was the only categories that were lower.

The second resolution's over-all ceiling was $8.4-billion higher than OMB's Oct. 21 projection of costs and $25.8-billion higher than the ceiling the President had set in the first resolution. The override vote was 379-41 in Congress on that day, and 85-12 in the Senate. (Weekly Report p. 174)

**What It Accomplished**

At several points during 1975 Rep. Holtzman and other liberals complained that the new budget process was no different from the old one. But the budget committees insisted that their higher deficit was due almost entirely to more realistic spending estimates.

At one point during consideration of the resolution, ranking Senate Budget Committee Republican Bellmon declared that the $8.6-billion figure was "plagious" and charged a "lack of candor on the part of the Office of Management and Budget." The Senate voted 297-10 in the Senate. (Weekly Report p. 218)

Although spending in the education bill was well below the first resolution's figure required to pay for all the programs and other budget "uncontrollables" that had pushed spending estimates up so far above Congress' spring projections.

**Overview**

It seemed likely that Congress would revise the budget authority ceiling in 1976 to include the $2.8-billion in federal loans to Ford that Nixon signed into law Dec. 9. 1981—PL 84-143. (Weekly Report p. 889)

The budget mechanism's worst enemy in 1976 might be Congress itself. Political battles were sure to take place over setting budget priorities in the 16 functional categories. And, having missed a 15 deadline for action on the second resolution in 1975 by three months, Congress seemed headed for trouble in meeting the set deadlines that will be operating in 1976.

"What we've got here is a kind of timetable that nobody's ever lived by before, and as a result, we're creating an institution that's already 200 years old and that's generated considerable momentum and habits over those years," Muskie told Congressional Quarterly.

—By Donald Smith

**Final Action**

**SMALL BUSINESS RELIEF ACT**

Congress Dec. 17 cleared the President a bill (HR 5474) to help small businesses that are facing hard times because of inflation and energy shortages while federal price controls were in effect from 1971 to 1974. The bill would allow the agency holding a fixed price contract with a small business to terminate the contract without penalty if the business could show that it had lost money or was likely to do so because of cost increases due to inflation.

The agency could modify the contract to accommodate higher prices if the modification would not cost as much as cancelling the contract and procuring the goods from another source.

The bill also authorized agencies to extend contract deadlines if inflation slowed contract delays. The bill applied only to contracts signed between Aug. 15, 1971, and March 31, 1974. The bill's price controls were in effect. HR 5541 was scheduled to expire Sept. 30, 1976.

House passed the bill April 22 on a 402-0 vote. The Senate did not take action until Oct. 30 when it passed an identical measure, HR 6572, by voice vote. (House action, Weekly Report p. 862)

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

The Senate Deb. 11 endorsed a substantial broadening of bank and thrift institutions power to make the nation's financial system more flexible and competitive. By a 76-14 vote, the Senate sent the House its version of wide-ranging federal regulatory revisions designed to assure competition among banks and other financial institutions - and through them to the nation's housing market.

The House, whose Banking, Currency and Housing Committee was conducting a massive financial industry study, was expected to act on most of the measure's complicated provisions until 1976. While making some changes through floor amendments, the Senate for the most part accepted its Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee's recommendations for allowing banks, savings and loan associations and similar financial institutions to offer more diversified services and expand their lending activities.

The panel's legislation in turn was based on the Ford administration's sweeping proposals for revamping the U.S. banking system along lines suggested by President Nixon's Commission on Financial Institutions and Regulation in 1971. (Background, Senate committee bill, Weekly Report p. 2860.)

Key provisions of the measure accepted by the Senate would allow federally regulated thrift institutions to hold checking accounts, remove restrictions on negotiable order of withdrawal accounts outside of New England states.

Since NOW accounts essentially amounted to checking accounts that pay interest, Helms argued that they should go nationwide use only at the same time that the general ban on checking account interest was ended.

Subcommittee Chairman Thomas J. McIntyre (D.N.H.) opposed Helms' amendment, arguing that NOW accounts were subject to regulatory requirements that allowed banks to delay paying savings withdrawals for up to 30 days. But "while there is a technical difference between NOWs and checking accounts," Helms insisted, "there is no real difference."

Other Changes

The Senate stripped out two provisions of S 1267 to protect the jurisdictions of other Senate committees.

With the banking committee's support, the Senate by vote accepted:

- McIntyre's amendment to drop provisions repealing tax preferences accorded savings and loan associations and instituting a new tax credit for mortgage interest.
- Helms' amendment to permit banks to hold checking accounts starting in 1977, with Federal Reserve authority to impose a one-year delay.

Checking Account Interest

Under premer's proposal, financial institutions could start paying interest on checking accounts on Jan. 1, 1976. The Federal Reserve Board found reason to delay their use for two additional years until 1978. As written by the committee, the bill would have permitted interest-paying checking accounts starting in 1977, with Federal Reserve authority to impose a one-year delay.

Recourse! How the 'GRINCH' FAILED TO STEAL CHRISTMAS

A lot of closed door negotiating - and a little bit of alacrity — marked the marathonings that led to the enactment Dec. 19 of an 18-month tax cut extension combined with a non-binding congressional pledge to hold down federal spending.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D. La.) may have been at his prevailing best when he noted that neither the President nor Congress wanted to be "acceded of being the grinche that stole Christmas.

There were substantial differences of opinion as to whether the President or Congress came off best in the exchange and there was much dispute about whether the anti-spending language under consideration actually meant anything.

But it could not be contested that without some sort of bill being passed by Congress and started by the President, personal and corporate federal income taxes would rise Jan. 1. And, as Sen. Long noted, no one was seen to be the "grinch" who caused the tax increase.

Impasse

As late as midnight Dec. 18, there seemed to be little chance of action in time to avoid a tax cut increase. The House that day failed by 17 votes (265-157) to override Ford's veto of a six-month extension of the tax reductions (HA. 5560). He had vetoed the measure because it did not contain the $965 billion spending ceiling for the 1977 fiscal year he had been demanding. (Background, Weekly Report p. 274-275.)

By a 76-14 vote on the veto the Senate reached an end Dec. 18. Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. (D. Mass.) said: "Let me tell this house the complete facts of life as they are right now, Mr. Minority Leader and members on that side. I had an idea that this was going to be a friendly veto and I think wrong in the majority side did. I am kind of surprised at the opposition, from the minority side to this. Let me just say this to the minority leader. There is no capitulation. This is it."

Moments after the vote, an angry House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Al Ullman (D. Ohio) said: "We're not going to take up this matter again in 1978."

Not 'it'

But the Dec. 18 vote was not "it." Congress did take up the matter again in 1978 and the Democratic leadership was forced to eat its words. Members and lobbyists who worked on the issue told Congressional Quarterly that a key part of the Democratic leadership's arguments before the override vote was that this was going to be Congress' last chance to cut the tax reductions. There were to be no more votes.

Republican leaders, on the other hand, were reassuring the members on their side of the aisle that if the veto was sustained, there still was time to pass a compromise bill that extended the cuts and incorporated the sort of anti-spending language the President was seeking.

Tax Cut Passages

HOW THE 'GRINCH' FAILED TO STEAL CHRISTMAS

A lot of closed door negotiating — and a little bit of alacrity — marked the marathonings that led to the enactment Dec. 19 of an 18-month tax cut extension combined with a non-binding congressional pledge to hold down federal spending.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D. La.) may have been at his prevailing best when he noted that neither the President nor Congress wanted to be "acceded of being the grinche that stole Christmas.

There were substantial differences of opinion as to whether the President or Congress came off best in the exchange and there was much dispute about whether the anti-spending language under consideration actually meant anything.

But it could not be contested that without some sort of bill being passed by Congress and started by the President, personal and corporate federal income taxes would rise Jan. 1. And, as Sen. Long noted, no one was seen to be the "grinch" who caused the tax increase.

Impasse

As late as midnight Dec. 18, there seemed to be little chance of action in time to avoid a tax cut increase. The House that day failed by 17 votes (265-157) to override Ford's veto of a six-month extension of the tax reductions (HA. 5560). He had vetoed the measure because it did not contain the $965 billion spending ceiling for the 1977 fiscal year he had been demanding. (Background, Weekly Report p. 274-275.)

By a 76-14 vote on the veto the Senate reached an end Dec. 18. Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. (D. Mass.) said: "Let me tell this house the complete facts of life as they are right now, Mr. Minority Leader and members on that side. I had an idea that this was going to be a friendly veto and I think wrong in the majority side did. I am kind of surprised at the opposition, from the minority side to this. Let me just say this to the minority leader. There is no capitulation. This is it."

Moments after the vote, an angry House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Al Ullman (D. Ohio) said: "We're not going to take up this matter again in 1978."

Not 'it'

But the Dec. 18 vote was not "it." Congress did take up the matter again in 1978 and the Democratic leadership was forced to eat its words. Members and lobbyists who worked on the issue told Congressional Quarterly that a key part of the Democratic leadership's arguments before the override vote was that this was going to be Congress' last chance to cut the tax reductions. There were to be no more votes.

Republican leaders, on the other hand, were reassuring the members on their side of the aisle that if the veto was sustained, there still was time to pass a compromise bill that extended the cuts and incorporated the sort of anti-spending language the President was seeking.

Individual Tax Cuts Under Final Bill

(Tax Liability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-$3,000</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td></td>
<td>$128</td>
<td></td>
<td>$128</td>
<td></td>
<td>$128</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000-$6,000</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$122</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$118</td>
<td>$7</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-$12,000</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$110</td>
<td>$12</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,000-$20,000</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$16</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$88</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$76</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-$35,000</td>
<td>$101</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-$50,000</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-$60,000</td>
<td>$85</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000-$100,000</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$68</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>$71</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>$81</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Measures Individual Personal Expenditure of 17 Per Cent of Income

SOURCE: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
"The amendment also said that Congress could reduce spending for "$1 for $1" of future tax cuts. Committee members later adopted the $1 for $1 phrase as the "equivalent" for the $950-billion ceiling. There was also an "escape clause" voiding the spending limitation in the event of changing economic conditions or other unforeseen circumstances.

Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) proposed a minor wording change suggested by Budget Committee Chairman Mathias D. Bueck (R-Minn.) with the one change to be voted on and affixed to the bill at an early debate.

Both moved to add the language to the tax cut and all 10 committee members present voted "aye." After a brief moment of procedural confusion, the panel voted on the question of the taxation-spending proviso to HR 9968. This gave Sen. Carl T. Curtis (R-Neb.) the opportunity he wanted to vote against the tax cut. The motion passed 7-1, with Curtis the lone dissenter.

Floor Action

About an hour later, the package was ready for Senate floor debate. In general, the discussions centered on three points: 1) establishing legislative history that the spending limitation did not mean much, that establishing that the White House would sign the measure and 3) congratulating everyone concerned for having worked out the agreement.

"We should keep in mind," Curtis said, "that a ceiling of a figure, or words committing us to restrain spending, are about the same in authority beyond the statute and they are of limited authority. Although Curtis was speaking against the bill, his arguments were echoed by many of the measure's proponents.

Muskie did much of the talking during the debate and most of what he had to say was to point out why the Senate and House Budget Committees were doing so, Congress dealt of attention to the spending language when they went to work on the 1975 budget.

Among other things, Muskie said that the nature of the $950-billion budget Ford plans to announce in connection with his 1976 budget, will be in the same bill (July 1977) than the one the "unforeseen circumstances" in the spending bill's escape clause, because the President has not yet revealed those circumstances.

Starting Point

Another point that emerged in the debate was that Congress was not committed to any specific starting point for calculating spending cuts. Ford's proposal is based on the President's $28-billion cut from $423-billion yields the $395-billion budget.

The following is the text of the "anti-spending" amendment to HR 9968 approved by the Senate Finance Committee Dec. 19:

**Amendment Text**

Congress is determined to continue the tax reduction for the first 3 months of 1976 in order to assure continued economic recovery. Congress is also determined to continue to control spending levels in order to meet the national deficit. The Congress affirms its commitment to the new congressional budget process, the fiscal-year 1976, Congress shall provide for the revenue-expenditure program as a whole, while the Republicans would say the Democrats had forced the President to call back the members back for a special session to deal with a tax cut extension.

This, in turn, would be added as an amendment to yet another chamber-House-passed bill pending in the Senate. This $3.5-billion bill (HR 9968) to finance the rebuilding of the American Falls Dam is Idaho. And, for good measure, Long had the Canadian railroad car legislation (voted along with the tax cut) thrown into the package.

The three-parish spending amendment said that "Congress shares the President's determination" to hold down the national deficit by reducing spending and affirmed Congress' commitment to the new congressional budget process. (Amendment Text, Dec. p. 2872)

"$1 for $1"

House Reaction

The House did not garner the support it needed to pass the amendment. Speaker Carl Albert (D-Ore.) was upset. O'Neill was at the White House. Committee Chairman Brock Adams (D-Wash.), the top Democrat, was upset.

House Reaction

The House did not garner the support it needed to pass the amendment. Speaker Carl Albert (D-Ore.) was upset. O'Neill was at the White House. Committee Chairman Brock Adams (D-Wash.), the top Democrat, was upset.

"Of course the language is being changed, but how does it look if we said yesterday that we must not allow any interference with the budget process but today we go ahead and do just that?" After about an hour, the committee members ended their "discussion" in the Speaker's room by agreeing on a substitute spending language.

Whimsical Note

The Senate's vote in all this was occasionally whimsical. For example, Sen. John O. Pastore (D-R.I.) rose after the debate on how Congress for awry to say, "I am afraid that unless us stop complimenting one another and that next bill to a vote, there will not be enough time for the House to join in on this venture."

Shortly thereafter, the anti-spending language was adopted into the bill and the House cleared the House 75-7. (Vote 598 and 599, p. 2889)
more than the Senate text. There was a change in emphasis to suggest that if Congress acted in response to the measure it would be because of the President's request. The "for $1.14" phrase gave way to an "equal to" wording. But, by and large, the House version differed only in slightly more awkward syntax.

House Debate

House debate did not quite follow the same lines as the Senate's. Ullman and Adams sought to demonstrate that the floor action had been adopted and sent to the House's amendment. This was further becoming academic. Members were leaving town for the Christmas recess. The possibility for a ranking minority member Henry Bellmon (R Okla.), Maiswith a statement from that evening, the House version by voice vote. The President signed the bill Dec. 23.

---By Al Gordon

Unfinished Business:

SB Amendments

Congress did not complete action in 1975 on a bill (S 2498) making several changes in the authority of the Small Business Administration (SBA). The House and Senate approved differing versions of the measure and the differences were to be resolved in a conference in 1976.

Senate Action

The Senate passed S 2498 Dec. 12 by a 69-5 vote. (Vote 580, Weekly Report p. 2827). The bill was approved by a 94-42 vote. (Rept 94-699) making extensive reforms within the Small Business Administration (SBA). The House and Senate approved differing versions of the measure and the differences were to be resolved in a conference in 1976.

One More Try

The White House made one more push to change the language as the measure went back to the Senate for consideration in the House's amendment. House leaders had said they were trying to present the language on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. They would not go to conference on the matter, nor would the Democrat minority vote. And the question of the House's willingness to deal further was rapidly becoming academic. Members were leaving town for the Christmas recess. The possibility for a House quorum was rapidly vanishing and, indeed, an adjournment resolution was passed and sent to the Senate.

Nevertheless, Long, Roth, Muskie, Budget Committee ranking minority member Henry Bellmon (R Okla.), Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D Mont.), Majority Whip Robert Byrd (D W.Va.) and Minority Leader Hugh Scott (R Pa.) were closed behind the closed doors of one of the majority leader's offices.

Joining in the two-hour discussion of the next move were House lobbyists John O. Marsh Jr. and Max L. Cohen, President Ford's close adviser.

Finally, at approximately 7:00 p.m., a decision was reached. The House would make one more push, passing momentarily to tell reporters: "Apparently we will accept the House's amendment. We have tried to make it clear that it's the same as the Senate language." Muskie's tone of voice indicated a certain animation at the idea. Long came out of the room and confirmed the deal, adding that the floor debate would be supplemented with a statement from Senator Mansfield. In a news conference that evening, Ullman and Adams had agreed that there was no "substantive" difference between the House and Senate versions.

Common-Site Picketing Veto

Apparently heeding political warnings from his own party, President Ford announced that he would veto HR 9668, the common-site picketing bill. Ford's veto message would have allowed a local union with a grievance against one contractor to picket all other contractors or subcontractors at the site. The expected veto would introduce an illegal secondary boycott by in the Supreme Court's decision of 1971 that held that (void previous, Weekly Report p. 215). As late as September, Ford had indicated publicly that he would sign the bill if long-standing conditions were met. Those conditions, including the establishment of a Construction Industry Collective Bargaining Committee to bring stability to wage negotiations in the building industry, were incorporated into the final bill. But contractors and other business opponents the bill, mounting an impressive mail campaign urging Ford to veto the bill. Perhaps more significant were warnings from fellow Republicans that a decision to sign the bill could drive valuable political support and campaign contributions to Ronald Reagan.
The act for six months, through June 30, 1976. (Vote 677, p. 2889)

The Senate passed the bill by voice vote Dec. 17 after amending it to authorize the nine-month extension. Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D La.) said his committee would need the time to develop reform legislation because it was committed to spending the first half of 1976 on tax reform legislation. The House then agreed to the Senate amendment by voice vote Dec. 18, clearing the bill for the President.

**Staff Report:**

**JINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE**

The Joint Economic Committee (JEC) staff warned Dec. 21 that President Ford's proposal to hold federal spending to $385-billion in fiscal year 1977 “could cause a severe setback to economic recovery.”

The staff report maintained that spending was more likely to rise to $420.3-billion without any changes in current policy.

The OMB current services budget, released Nov. 10, projected that spending in fiscal 1977 would rise to at least $310.7-trillion and as much as $414.5-trillion, with no changes in policy.

Based on current law, the deficit could range from $31-trillion to $51-trillion, according to the OMB report. The variations were due to a range of assumptions about the course the economy was likely to take.

The JEC evaluation praised the OMB report as “professional and competent.” However, staff director John R. Stark said the JEC staff differed with OMB on some economic assumptions and in some estimating techniques, and that the JEC in some cases used more up-to-date information provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

Humphrey announced that he has asked OMB Director James T. Lynn to submit an update of their budget spending along with Ford's fiscal 1977 budget proposal in January 1976.

**Provisions**

As cleared for the President, HR 1084:
- Stipulated that federal reimbursements to physicians for care of Medicare patients in fiscal 1976 could not be any lower than those furnished to patients in fiscal 1975.
- Extended to Jan. 1, 1976, the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to establish a statewide Medicare program to provide Medicare patients with services of a registered nurse around the clock.
- Directed HEW to carry out the required review.
- Clarified provisions of a 1972 law (PL 92-600) so that states need not comply with an existing law.
- Repealed a Senate amendment to allow Medicare patients with round-the-clock care by a PSRO to be admitted to non-hospital facilities.
- Amended the Medicare program to give physician groups that had not opposed the current review program another two years to set up PSROs and enable doctors in a few states to place control of a PSRO program under a state medical society.
- Revised the Medicare program (Weekly Report p. 2889)

The House voted 271-18 under suspension of the rules Dec. 19 to amend the broadened Senate version of the original House bill. The amendment retained some of the new Senate provisions, reworded others and killed several altogether. (Vote 606, p. 2889)

The more important Senate amendments rejected by the House would have set up the Medicare “buy-in” program and restricted the medical malpractice liability of PSROs. Dan Rostenkowski (D Ill.), chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, argued that the House should limit the bill to non-controversial items or changes needed to extend deadlines under existing law. He said his subcommittee would consider broader changes in the Medicare program in early 1976.

The Senate-passed amendments accepted by the House included provisions that had not been directly proposed by the original Senate bill and making it clear that medical peer review committees did not need to monitor the hospital admission of every Medicare patient. The House also insisted on its original version of provisions included in both the House and Senate-passed measures.

The House provisions reaffirmed Dec. 19 gave rural hospitals another three years to comply with an existing law. The House also rejected a Senate move to require HEW to base increases in physicians' fees under Medicare on the latest national index. Rostenkowski pointed out that HEW did not have the data to develop regional indices in the near future.

While some House members grumbled that the Senate had turned the bill into “Christmas tree” legislation, there was little debate over the House amendment.

**Public Law**

(Previous Public Laws, Weekly Report p. 2729)

**HOUSE REJECTS MEDICARE ‘BUY-IN’ PROPOSAL**

After throwing out a Senate proposal to allow individuals over age 65 to buy into the Medicare program for the aged, Congress agreed Nov. 17 to accept House amendments making a number of changes in the Medicare program. Final action came when the Senate agreed to accept House changes in the heavily amended version of the bill passed by the Senate Dec. 17. (Weekly Report p. 2785).

The House refused to accept the Senate provisions that would have allowed individuals aged 60 to 64 to buy into the Medicare program at cost. Most individuals did not qualify for subsidized Medicare coverage until they reached age 65.

But the House agreed to two other key Senate amendments modifying an existing law (PL 92-600) requiring local medical groups to set up professional standards review organizations (PSROs) to monitor the quality of in-patient care received by Medicare and Medicaid patients.

These amendments would give physician groups that had not opposed the peer review program an extra two years to set up PSROs and enable doctors in a few states to place control of a PSRO program under a state medical society.

The original House version of the bill, approved Nov. 17, would have made only minor changes in the Medicare program.

**Provisions**

As cleared for the President, HR 1084:
- Stipulated that federal reimbursements to physicians for care of Medicare patients in fiscal 1976 could not be any lower than those furnished to patients in fiscal 1975.
- Extended to Jan. 1, 1976, the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to establish a statewide Medicare program to provide Medicare patients with services of a registered nurse around the clock.
- Directed HEW to carry out the required review.
- Clarified provisions of a 1972 law (PL 92-600) so that states need not comply with an existing law.
- Repealed a Senate amendment to allow Medicare patients with round-the-clock care by a PSRO to be admitted to non-hospital facilities.
- Amended the Medicare program to give physician groups that had not opposed the current review program another two years to set up PSROs and enable doctors in a few states to place control of a PSRO program under a state medical society.
- Revised the Medicare program (Weekly Report p. 2889)

The House voted 271-18 under suspension of the rules Dec. 19 to amend the broadened Senate version of the original House bill. The amendment retained some of the new Senate provisions, reworded others and killed several altogether. (Vote 606, p. 2889)

The more important Senate amendments rejected by the House would have set up the Medicare “buy-in” program and restricted the medical malpractice liability of PSROs. Dan Rostenkowski (D Ill.), chairman of the Ways and Means Health Subcommittee, argued that the House should limit the bill to non-controversial items or changes needed to extend deadlines under existing law. He said his subcommittee would consider broader changes in the Medicare program in early 1976.

The Senate-passed amendments accepted by the House included provisions that had not been directly proposed by the original Senate bill and making it clear that medical peer review committees did not need to monitor the hospital admission of every Medicare patient. The House also insisted on its original version of provisions included in both the House and Senate-passed measures.

The House provisions reaffirmed Dec. 19 gave rural hospitals another three years to comply with an existing law. The House also rejected a Senate move to require HEW to base increases in physicians' fees under Medicare on the latest national index. Rostenkowski pointed out that HEW did not have the data to develop regional indices in the near future.
Bill Cleared: SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

Congress Dec. 19 cleared for the President a bill (HR 10727) aimed at reducing the backlog of cases appealing the government's denial of Social Security benefits and making other minor and technical changes in the Social Security laws.

A Senate-passed provision that would have amended the Work Incentive Program (WIN) was dropped from the legislation in hopes of providing some quick relief to the government's decision not to award them claims cases. It also gave applicants for the same administrative and judicial rights enjoyed by applicants for Social Security and Medicare benefits.

Committee
The Senate Finance Committee made several changes in the House version before reporting the bill (HR 9606) Dec. 13, 1975.

Provisions

As cleared, HR 10727:

- Gave applicants for Social Security benefits the same administrative and judicial rights enjoyed by applicants for Social Security and Medicare benefits.
- Authorized hearing examiners for the Supplemental Security Income program to be appointed on a state-by-state basis.
- Increased the amount of time applicants had to appeal a denial of a Social Security or Medicare benefit claim, from 60 days to 180 days, and the time period for appealing a decision.
- Increased the period of time in which one could file an appeal of a denial of claim.

Senate Action

The Senate passed the bill by voice vote Dec. 19, 1975, clearing the measure. There was little debate on the bill in either chamber.

Conference on Handicapped

The Senate Dec. 17 by voice vote passed S Res 154, extending until December 1977 the time period in which the President could convene a White House Conference on Handicapped. The bill, however, made no action on the conference, and the resolution was not cleared before adjournment.

READING IMPROVEMENT

Conference Dec. 19 cleared for the President a bill (HR 10304) that would extend the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the act that had been extended through Fiscal 1976 in 1974. The act was extended through Fiscal 1976 in 1974. (HR 10727)

At adjournment, the House had approved a version which would have extended the act for two years, through Fiscal 1978, while the Senate version would extend the act for only one year, through Sept. 30, 1977. A quick resolution of the issue was expected when Congress returned.

House Action

The House passed HR 11046 Dec. 10 by voice vote under suspension of the rules. The House also cleared for the President a bill that would authorize $1.454 million in fiscal 1977 and $760 million in fiscal 1978 for matching grants to states to assist in vocational rehabilitation programs for the physically and mentally handicapped. Fiscal 1976 authorizations and appropriations totaled $720 million. The federal government provided $200 million of the funds; the states, 20 cents per dollar.

As cleared, the bill also authorized $355 million in each of the two fiscal years for innovation and such sums as Congress might appropriate for several other supporting programs, such as training, research and facilities construction.

There was no opposition to the bill in the House floor. Its supporters said it was necessary to pass the bill quickly so that states would know how much to allocate for matching funds.

According to the House Education and Labor Committee, which had reported the bill Dec. 12 (H Rep 94-721), the act authorized $32,830,234 handicapped people and rehabilitation $22,649,009 in fiscal 1976.

Senate Action

The Senate passed the bill by voice vote Dec. 19, 1975, clearing the measure. There was little debate on the bill in either chamber.

The administration opposed the legislation. The legislation amended the Education Act and protected Head Start funds in fiscal 1977. The act also provided $25 million in each of the two fiscal years for innovation and such sums as Congress might appropriate for several other supporting programs, such as training, research and facilities construction.

There was no opposition to the bill in the Senate floor. Its supporters said it was necessary to pass the bill quickly so that states would know how much to allocate for matching funds.

According to the House Education and Labor Committee, which had reported the bill Dec. 12 (H Rep 94-721), the act authorized $32 million each for research and development programs.
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Following is the White House text of President Ford's Dec. 19 veto of HR 6068, a bill making fiscal 1976 appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. (Story, Dec. 23, 1975, p. 27D)

TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

I return without my approval H.R. 6068, which would have authorized for the fiscal year 1976 and which was not accompanied by a limit on Federal spending for the next fiscal year. H.R. 6068 is a classic example of the unchecked spending which I referred to in my earlier veto message.

H.R. 6068 would provide nearly $1 billion more in spending authority than I had requested. Not only would the $45 billion total in this bill add significantly to the already burdensome Federal deficits expected this year and next, but the individual items in the bill have not been justified, unnecessary, and unwise. This bill is, therefore, inconsistent with the discipline and with effective restraint on the growth of government.

I cannot be impressed by the argument that H.R. 6068 is in line with the Congress's second consecutive resolution on the budget and, in this sense, is in some sense proper. This argument does not say that the resolution, which expresses the Congress' view of appropriate budget restraint, approves a $50 billion, or 15 percent, increase in Federal spending in one year. Such an increase is not appropriate Federal budget restraint.

Effective restraint on the growth of the Federal Government requires effective limits on the growth of Federal spending. This bill provides an opportunity for such restraint. By itself, this bill would add $50 million in this year's deficit and would make next year's deficit $725 million more than if my recommendations had been adopted. In addition, the increases provided for in this bill would already burden the next year's budget and make the job of controlling inflationary pressures much more difficult.

Furthermore, if this bill became law, it would increase permanent Federal employment by another 105,000 workers over the next three years. It is, therefore, necessary that the appropriations committees of Congress by setting maximum funding levels years in advance for relatively small components of larger agencies have flexibility to determine whether such increases are appropriate.

As the Ford administration opposed the bill for similar reasons. Hart said he was voting against the measure because it would undermine proposed appropriations for the Justice Department's antitrust division.

The bill also included a three-year grant program to help states improve the effectiveness of their unemployment compensation programs. Hart added that the state grant program, which would provide up to $10 million a year for each state, was a "declaration of principle" among leading industrial concentration to unemployment, inflation and inefficiency was removed from the bill on the Senate floor. (Committee report, Week., Report p. 86.14)

Floor Debate

PRO: Philip A. Hart (D Mich.), chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, explained the theory behind the bill. "Without adequate funding and staffing, it is impossible to expect effective enforcement of antitrust laws," he said. "Continued neglect will inexorably lead to even increased economic regulation and possibly nationalization, of vast segments of the economy."

Hart said that the $21.6 million appropriation Congress gave the antitrust division in fiscal 1976—an increase of almost $5 million over the previous year's total—was a result of the publicity generated by hearings on S 1136. "If Congress does not provide appropriate input through the budget process," he said, "it is clear to me that adequate appropriations for antitrust enforcement will remain an illusionary dream." (Justice Department appropriation, fiscal 1976, Weekly Report p. 810)

CON: Roman L. Hruska (R Neb.), ranking member on the subcommittee, warned that the bill would undermine appropriated funds by creating a separate funding category for the Justice Department's antitrust division. And he said it would upset "the established division of responsibilities between the authorizing committees and the appropriations committees of Congress by setting maximum funding levels years in advance for relatively small components of larger agencies.

The Ford administration opposed the bill for similar reasons. Hruska added that the state grant program, which would provide up to $10 million a year for each state, was a "declaration of principle" among leading industrial concentration to unemployment, inflation and inefficiency was removed from the bill on the Senate floor. (Committee report, Week., Report p. 86.14)

Authorities for the Justice Department's Antitrust Division and the Federal Trade Commission's Bureau of Competition up to $25 million each in fiscal 1976, $35 million in fiscal 1977 and $45 million in fiscal 1978. Hart added both agencies to hire an additional 25 supergrade employees to improve litigation efforts. Hart also added the attorney general to distribute the states up to $10 million a year in fiscal 1976-78 to provide seed money for improvement of antitrust enforcement programs.

The Ford veto was overridden by the Congress, and the Senate bill became Public Law 94-265 on May 20, 1976.
COPE's Stance

The AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education (COPE), headed by Alexander Barkan, does not know what the coalition union is doing. Meany himself con­

fessed some union activity at his traditional Labor Day news conference. Individual unions could encourage their members to run for delegate, the AFL-CIO president replied, "I'm quite sure that a good many of them do. Yes. I don't see any reason why they wouldn't." But whether that blessing extends to the coalition itself is hard to say, Barkan insisted during his business. A COPE official told Congressional Quarterly. "They've areonous organizations.... If they all over the map, it will minimize their input anyway. And the indication is that they will be all over the map." He said there was hardly any contact between COPE and the coalition office a few blocks away.

Hands Off for AFL-CIO

The AFL-CIO has been officially out of party politics since Feb. 18, when the federation's executive council adopted a resolution renouncing involvement in the Democrats' affairs until after a candidate was chosen. Meany said the convention is "not the business of the AFL-CIO" and that the federation would take no part in it. The stay-out resolution was passed after several months of discussion among some of them now coalition members, sought to place the entire delegate selection process on the executive council's agenda.

Why was the decision made? The simplest theory is that Meany was just angry—angry at the Democrats for refusing to take some of their courting of minority groups, angry at Chairman Robert S. Strauss for ignoring Meany-backers, angry at Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D. Wash.) for his views on trade with Communist nations. There was some grumbling within COPE that, with CQ conceding that the Kansas City meeting had something to do with the decision, "Kansas City isolated was not a bell of a lot," he said. "But it was the culmination of a general and continuing repudiation of the labor movement by some elements that have gotten a foothold in the Democratic Party. We won with Strauss' victory for party chairman, for which we are sincerely grateful.

In any case, the coalition is not only expecting a convention to develop, but is preparing to respond with some of the advantages of the AFL-CIO—at the Democratic national convention, we will certainly try to have some influence," said Barkan. "But it's nothing more than that. "I think they'll be glad to get whatever help we could provide," he said of the national organization.

Some observers think the coalition would dominate any such labor caucus, a position of a decided one to participate. The nine unions will have an advantage over the others, said David Cohen, president of Common Cause and a former AFL-CIO official. "The unions have to work closely together to mobilize the groups who had opposed his selection, at the convention, but planning for it.

Another political director was even more specific. "My theory is that by February—or March we'll be in a position to decide whether to participate. We'll have to make a decision by then."

One union political director was even more specific. "My theory is that by February—or March we'll be in a position to decide whether to participate. We'll have to make a decision by then."

Roe of Minnesota

This official cited the COPE reaction to statement made by David Barksman, AFL-CIO's St. Paul chairman, that he supports Humphrey and will work for him in the pre-convention process. Roe is not only not acting as an independent candidate, he has mobilized most of the vice presidents and other top officials of the Minnesota AFL-CIO in Humphrey's behalf. "We're doing everything possible to get Humphrey delegates to the convention," Roe told CQ.

Roe, whose background is in the building trades, said his role is to help the labor movement take the federation out of the Democratic Party. "I don't think we should let up at any time," he said. "You can't turn this on and off like a water faucet."

Barkan made it clear in November that there would be no change in the national federation's policy that it was free to do whatever it chose, even though COPE officially dis­ approved. But Barkan's willingness to talk about it in public, he said, and Meany are backing down.

No Change—Maybe

Officials at COPE still say, however, that there will be no change. "There's nothing in the hours that indicates there'd be any change in this policy," one said. "It's likely that they'll call off the Binominalist."舞蹈是

Nevertheless, officials of unions within the coalition continue to speculate about the conditions, if any, under which Meany might decide to come in. "My personal theory," said Clark of AFSCME, "is that if Wallace poses a serious threat, they will get in to stop Wallace. If Wallace does not get a great surge in Florida and Massachusetts, and starts to fade, they may very well keep their present stance.

Another coalition participants say they are not paying much attention to the theory. "We're doing our thing," said Miller of the Communications Workers. "If the AFL-CIO wants to reverse itself and get involved, that doesn't bother me. If they want to stay out, that doesn't bother me either.

What the coalition wants to do, however, is to bring in as many individual AFL-CIO unions as it can. Some of the most important AFL-CIO affiliates, such as the United Steelworkers of America, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the American Federation of Teachers, started by doing just what Meany is doing—staying out. Some coalition people think they now see those and other unions moving closer to their point of view. The Amalgamated Meat­ cutters, who are not involved in the coalition nationally, are heavily involved in the Democratic state selection process in Iowa, where they are influential.

Meany's policy statement created a vacuum in labor activity. "What we have found in our organi­ nation is that other labor unions outside the coalition want to work with it. They're interested in who the nominee is."

The 'Boiler Room'

At the moment, however, the center of national labor influence is in the coalition, housed in the building in Washington, D.C., that also serves as headquarters of the Communications Workers. The coalition office is little like the "boiler room" operation of a national presidential campaign. There are regional desks and staff assistants who spend their time gathering and updating information about primaries and caucuses around the nation. "We discuss, almost on a daily basis," Miller said, "what is happening in various states—candidate strengths, weaknesses and key states where we think our opportunities lie. Beyond that, specifics of the coalition operation are hard to obtain. Speckman declined to give the site of the staff or to show a visitor around the office.

"We're very busy with requests for information. We're not going to try to mislead anybody. The thing we're trying to avoid is this: We don't want to have anyone think we're some big red machine roll­ ing across the land scoping up delegates. We're not try­ ing to operate the way some labor people have done in the past, which is by press release.

No Change—Maybe

"We have been very busy with requests for information. We're not going to try to mislead anybody. The thing we're trying to avoid is this: We don't want to have anyone think we're some big red machine roll­ ing across the land scoping up delegates. We're not try­ ing to operate the way some labor people have done in the past, which is by press release.

Beyond the clearhouse level, though, there are basic decisions to be made. A primary or caucus is coming up: Should the nine unions each throw their support to the same candidate? Should they scatter five ways? Should they go with two candidates and leave the rest out? 'It all depends on the support for Jackson among Miami, the coalition is backing Carter to try to crush Wallace. We have a group in Montgomery County, Maryland, outside Washington, D.C., Jackson is thought to have the best organization, so have been trying to persuade the Jackson delegate slate. Not far away, in the city of Baltimore, Jackson is being supported. The clearhouse is expected to qualify for delegates. The coalition is working with both.

The Communications Workers and Meatcutters are for Fay. The influential head of the state UAW, Edrai (Swo) Owens, is backing Carter, which adds to the support for the building trades unions. Labor is traditionally active within the Democratic Party in Iowa; in 1972, about a third of the state's national convention delegates had labor con­ connections. In some areas of the South, the way to stop Wallace may be to back Democratic Sen. Lloyd Bentsen of Texas. The coalition will do that. "There's a place where we'll be with Bentsen," Clark said. "Head on against Wallace! You don't get a chance like this again."
null
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Presidential Campaign:

SHAPP: STILL INSISTING THAT HE IS SERIOUS

Milton J. Shapp is an unusual politician. He plays the violin, writes poetry and songs and is the author of several unproduced Broadway musicals. He is also the governor of the nation's third largest state, Pennsylvania.

And soon, he expects to be the front-runner for the Democratic presidential nomination, although a nationwide survey indicated that he was known by only one-third of the country's Democratic voters in October 1975. With little visible support outside Pennsylvania, and with an aura of corruption surrounding his administration, the 68-year-old Shapp is regarded as one of the longest of the long shots in the crowded Democratic field.

A millionaire electronics manufacturer elected governor in 1970 as a liberal, he is describing himself as an economic expert who can get the nation's stagnant economy moving. He discards an anti-Washington sentiment—a growing dissatisfaction by voters across the country with the federal government, especially Congress. As a governor, Shapp is counting on his ability to tap such a mood in competition with his challengers for the nomination, many of whom are members of Congress.

The Campaign

"I think in four to six months I'll be looked at as the strongest contender in the race," Shapp declared Sept. 25 when he made his official announcement of a presidential candidacy that had been known for months. It was a brush statement for a man whose candidacy is considered by most observers to be a long shot. But, if serious, would not a very strong one at that. Even among some Pennsylvania Democrats, the response to Shapp's candidacy has not been enthusiastic. Of 25 members of Congress including the state Senate majority leader, have called Shapp's candidacy a "serious" and public comments from members of the state Democratic congressional delegation have been nonsupportive.

Elected governor of Pennsylvania in 1970 to succeed the late Democrat John W. Buchanan, Shapp was a controversial choice. He is seen by some as a liberal Democrat, and by others as a "muckraker." But most consider him a genuine liberal, and his campaign manager, Norm D. Reece, says of his opponent: "He's the best one-on-one guy I've ever seen. He's more persuasive in a small group or one-on-one situation than in mass meetings."

But before he can go anywhere, Shapp must become better known. An October 1975 Gallup Poll ranked him 10th on a list of 14 possible Democratic candidates. But, because of the long list of Democratic candidates and the large number of undecided voters, he does not view his chances of making it to the November convention as very good.

But the heart of any effective campaign is money, and this is an enormous problem for Shapp. In his campaign for governor, he was able to contribute millions from his personal fortune. But under the new federal campaign finance law, a candidate and his family can contribute a total of only $10,000, a small fraction of the amount needed to run an effective presidential campaign. As of Sept. 30, 1975, the Shapp campaign had reported receiving a total of $121,742. More than 80 per cent of the money came from Pennsylvania, including a $15,000 contribution from his wife, Murriel.

Much of the money came from Jewish and black voters and liberal groups, which, along with labor and women's organizations, are expected to provide Shapp with his strongest support. Reece foresees his candidate as running as an "independent Democrat." Pulling some liberal voters from Arizona Rep. Morris K. Udall, some labor support from Indiana Sen. Richard Lugar, and some Jewish support from Washington Sen. Henry M. Jackson. Shapp is Jewish.

Business Career

Shapp was born in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1912, the son of Aaron Shapiro, a hardware wholesaler and traveling salesman. Shapp graduated from the Case Institute of Technology with a degree in electrical engineering. As a result of religious beliefs, Shapp was prevented from entering the military and he legally changed his name from Shapiro to Shapp.

After service as an officer in the Army Signal Corps in Europe, after the war, he moved to the Philadelphia area, and, with his background in engineering, he entered the fledgling cable television industry. In 1948, he established the Jerrold Electronics Corporation (founded after his middle name) with a $500 investment. The company initially employed two workers, but it expanded quickly and became profitable.

In 1956, when Shapp made his first run for the governorship of Pennsylvania, he resigned as president and chairman of the board of Jerrold and sold his 26 per cent share. Jerrold then employed 2,100 workers in six plants in the Philadelphia area, and Shapp's share sold for nearly $10-million.

In 1971, during his first year as governor, Shapp listed his personal worth at nearly $4-million. At a press conference in October 1975, his net worth had been $7.5-million in 1968 when he first ran for governor but had shrunk to $2.8-million. But the heart of any effective campaign is money, and this is an enormous problem for Shapp. In his campaign for governor, he was able to contribute millions from his personal fortune. But under the new federal campaign finance law, a candidate and his family can contribute a total of only $10,000, a small fraction of the amount needed to run an effective presidential campaign. As of Sept. 30, 1975, the Shapp campaign had reported receiving a total of $121,742. More than 80 per cent of the money came from Pennsylvania, including a $15,000 contribution from his wife, Murriel.

Much of the money came from Jewish and black voters and liberal groups, which, along with labor and women's organizations, are expected to provide Shapp with his strongest support. Reece foresees his candidate as running as an "independent Democrat." Pulling some liberal voters from Arizona Rep. Morris K. Udall, some labor support from Indiana Sen. Richard Lugar, and some Jewish support from Washington Sen. Henry M. Jackson. Shapp is Jewish.

Business Career

Shapp was born in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1912, the son of Aaron Shapiro, a hardware wholesaler and traveling salesman. Shapp graduated from the Case Institute of Technology with a degree in electrical engineering. As a result of religious beliefs, Shapp was prevented from entering the military and he legally changed his name from Shapiro to Shapp.

Nearly all of Shapp's campaign money came out of his own pocket, and he reported spending $1.4-million. It was money well spent. In an upset, Shapp defeated Casey in the primary. He lived in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, until 1969, when he moved to New York City. He was married to Bette Shapp, a former model, until her death. He is known for his honesty, and his campaign manager, Norm D. Reece, describes him as a hardworking, honest, and principled statesman.

Shapp is a politician who has been interested in national issues, particularly the economy, for the past decade. He has been a vocal opponent of the Vietnam War, and he has been a strong supporter of civil rights. He is also known for his ability to work across the aisle with Republicans, and he has been successful in getting legislation passed.

In 1970, Shapp ran for the governorship of Pennsylvania, and he won the Democratic nomination. After winning the primary, he faced Republican incumbent William Scranton in the general election. Shapp's campaign was well-funded, and he was able to outspend Scranton. Shapp won the election, and he took office as governor in January 1971.

Shapp was a controversial governor, and he faced a lot of criticism during his tenure. He was accused of corruption, and he was involved in several scandals. Despite these challenges, Shapp was able to accomplish a lot during his time in office. He was able to work with the state legislature to pass a number of important laws, and he was able to work with the federal government to secure funding for Pennsylvania. Shapp is known for his ability to work across the aisle, and he was able to work with both Republicans and Democrats.

In 1974, Shapp ran for re-election as governor, and he won the Democratic nomination. He faced Republican incumbent Dick Thornburgh in the general election. Shapp won the election, and he took office for a second term as governor in January 1975.

Shapp was a liberal governor, and he was known for his ability to work with both Republicans and Democrats. He was able to work with the state legislature to pass a number of important laws, and he was able to work with the federal government to secure funding for Pennsylvania. Shapp is known for his ability to work across the aisle, and he was able to work with both Republicans and Democrats.

In 1976, Shapp ran for re-election as governor, and he won the Democratic nomination. He faced Republican incumbent Dick Thornburgh in the general election. Shapp won the election, and he took office for a third term as governor in January 1977.

Shapp was a liberal governor, and he was known for his ability to work with both Republicans and Democrats. He was able to work with the state legislature to pass a number of important laws, and he was able to work with the federal government to secure funding for Pennsylvania. Shapp is known for his ability to work across the aisle, and he was able to work with both Republicans and Democrats.

In 1978, Shapp ran for re-election as governor, and he won the Democratic nomination. He faced Republican incumbent Dick Thornburgh in the general election. Shapp won the election, and he took office for a fourth term as governor in January 1979.

Shapp was a liberal governor, and he was known for his ability to work with both Republicans and Democrats. He was able to work with the state legislature to pass a number of important laws, and he was able to work with the federal government to secure funding for Pennsylvania. Shapp is known for his ability to work across the aisle, and he was able to work with both Republicans and Democrats.

In 1980, Shapp ran for re-election as governor, and he won the Democratic nomination. He faced Republican incumbent Dick Thornburgh in the general election. Shapp won the election, and he took office for a fifth term as governor in January 1981.

Shapp was a liberal governor, and he was known for his ability to work with both Republicans and Democrats. He was able to work with the state legislature to pass a number of important laws, and he was able to work with the federal government to secure funding for Pennsylvania. Shapp is known for his ability to work across the aisle, and he was able to work with both Republicans and Democrats.

In 1982, Shapp ran for re-election as governor, and he won the Democratic nomination. He faced Republican incumbent Dick Thornburgh in the general election. Shapp won the election, and he took office for a sixth term as governor in January 1983.

Shapp was a liberal governor, and he was known for his ability to work with both Republicans and Democrats. He was able to work with the state legislature to pass a number of important laws, and he was able to work with the federal government to secure funding for Pennsylvania. Shapp is known for his ability to work across the aisle, and he was able to work with both Republicans and Democrats.

In 1984, Shapp ran for re-election as governor, and he won the Democratic nomination. He faced Republican incumbent Dick Thornburgh in the general election. Shapp won the election, and he took office for a seventh term as governor in January 1985.
neutrality of the state labor leadership, many locals still opposed the graduated tax.

In conjunction with the revenue bill, Shapp commissioned 85 business and professional experts to undertake an independent management review of the state's fiscal policy. The result was cutbacks in state spending and a tax cut of $600-million in 1974. Although he dealt decisively with the economic chaos that engulfed the state government early in his administration, Shapp was faced with a budget deficit in 1975—a significant problem, because he promised in his campaign to increase tax revenues in the state. His critics in state government have complained that Shapp's choices were subsequently motivated by the decisions of leading Democratic advisors, such as Philadelphia Mayor Frank Rizzo, not to run for re-election in 1974—thus allowing Shapp to run for re-election in 1974— "the first Pennsylvania governor in the 20th century to do so." Shapp's re-election effort was aided by the decisions of some of his Democratic adversaries, such as Philadelphia Mayor Frank Rizzo, not to run for re-election in 1974.

As a consequence, Shapp was elevated to the Presidency of the United States doesn't have a clear sense of its own identity. Shapp advocated a national rail trust fund as a revenue-raising measure. He joined seven other northeastern governors, 10 utilities, and Rep. Robert P. Drinan (D. Mass.) in bringing suit against the Ford plan. On Oct. 11, the plaintiffs backed a favorable decision from the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, which upheld the railroad trust fund.

In addition, Shapp was also appealing the decision to the Supreme Court. Shapp's positions on various issues

### Economy

"No other issues will really be solved unless we have a balanced budget," Shapp declared in his presidential announcement speech. "Unless we stimulate the economy, you'll have a crisis in this country of such proportions that you'll have an unstable government."

Shapp's plan to revive the nation's economy involves revamping the federal budgetary system and establishing a national investment policy. "The United States doesn't have a true budget in the business sense," Shapp stated, "but a cash flow sheet. He advocates creation of a budget council that would separate government operating costs from long-term capital investment funds. The latter would be freed for investment in private sectors of the economy, according to Shapp.

Shapp has committed receiving the money from Baker, he denies any wrongdoing.

### Positions on Issues

Following is a summary of Shapp's positions on various issues:

#### Economy

"No other issues will really be solved unless we have a balanced budget," Shapp declared in his presidential announcement speech. "Unless we stimulate the economy, you'll have a crisis in this country of such proportions that you'll have an unstable government."

Shapp advocated a national rail trust fund as a revenue-raising measure. He joined seven other northeastern governors, 10 utilities, and Rep. Robert P. Drinan (D. Mass.) in bringing suit against the Ford plan. On Oct. 11, the plaintiffs backed a favorable decision from the U.S. Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia, which upheld the railroad trust fund.

In addition, Shapp was also appealing the decision to the Supreme Court. Shapp's positions on various issues:

### Energy

Shapp has opposed President Ford's tax on imported oil. In January 1975, he termed it a "blueprint for economic disaster" that would "create a shock wave of inflation through the country greater than the one we had when the Arab oil embargo was imposed."

His political power was enhanced by a change in the state's electoral system, allowing him to run for re-election in 1974. The Pennsylvania governor in the 20th century to do so. His re-election effort was aided by the decision of some of his Democratic adversaries, such as Philadelphia Mayor Frank Rizzo, not to run for re-election in 1974. With minimal opposition, Shapp won the primary. In the general election, he defeated Republican Andrew L. Lewis Jr. by a margin of 53.8 per cent to 46.2 per cent.

### The Corruption Issue

In spite of its reform rhetoric, the Shapp administration has been labeled by some observers as the most corrupt in Pennsylvania history. In 1965, state officials had been convicted since Shapp took office, and 29 others were under indictment. Among those convicted was Frank Hilton, Shapp's 1970 campaign manager and later the state secretary of property and supplies, and Democratic State Treasurer William Casper—both convicted of extortion. Among those under investigation for allegedly soliciting kickbacks were the Democratic state chairman, the secretary of revenue and officials of the Revenue Department, the Liquor Control Board and the State Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs. While there were signs of corruption in various parts of the state government, Shapp himself was not implicated until August, when Michael Baker Jr., head of a large engineering firm that does business with the state, testified before a Pittsburgh grand jury. He said that twice during the 1970 campaign he personally had given Shapp $10,000 in cash—money that did not show up in the financial records of the campaign. Shapp appeared voluntarily before the grand jury on Oct. 9 and, while he admitted receiving the money from Baker, he denied any wrongdoing.

### Transportation

Shapp has advocated a national rail trust fund as a specific part of his national investment policy. Under this proposal, the nation's railroads would receive $13-billion in federal money over a six-year period. The money would be spent for needed improvements such as track construction and repairs, electrification and new cars. Shapp estimated that this program would create about 120,000 new jobs in railroad construction and about twice as many in the steel industry. The federal government would apply a 4 per cent surcharge on rail shipping bills, paying off the entire $13-billion in 20 to 25 years.
While an unusually large number of representatives will be running for the Senate in 1976, a smaller number will be retiring voluntarily than in the last three congressional elections.

Only 16 House members have so far announced their intentions to leave at the end of the current Congress. Ten of them are running for the Senate and six are retiring. In 1974, 44 members chose to retire or run for other offices, compared to 53 in 1972 and 29 in 1970.

What is lacking in 1976 is the large corps of elderly members leaving to escape unfavorable redistricting or take advantage of sizable pension benefits. None of the six House members retiring this time will be over 70 when his term ends.

In addition to the retirements, two House members will be leaving early in 1976. Rep. Bob Casey (D Texas) confirmed by the Senate in December as a member of the Federal Maritime Commission, will leave the House on Jan. 3. On Jan. 1, Rep. James F. Hastings (R N.Y.) will resign to return to private life as president of Associated Industries of New York, a lobbying group based in Albany.

By Christmas, six senators had announced they would retire at the end of the 94th Congress, including Republican leader Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania. A seventh retirement, that of Sen. Hiram L. Fong (R Hawaii), is regarded as virtually certain. Fong, 68, has not made a formal announcement, but has said privately he does not plan to run.
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Retiring at 68
Alphonso Bell (R Calif.)
Bob Casey (D Texas)
Marvin L. Etch (D Mich.)
Edward D. Kasten (D Ill.)
James F. Hastings (R N.Y.)
H. John Heinz III (R Pa.)
William L. Hungate (D Mo.)
John Jarman (R Okla.)
Phil M. Landrum (D Ga.)
John Y. McCollister (R Neb.)
Pete F. Michaud (D Maine)
Charles A. Moher (R Ohio)
James G. O'Hara (D Mich.)
Pete A. Neyman (R N.Y.)
Donald W. Rayle Jr. (D Mich.)
Paul S. Sarbanes (D Md.)
Hereman T. Schneebeil (R Pa.)
Stan Steelman (R Texas)

Landrum Retires
Rep. Phil M. Landrum will leave the House after the 94th Congress, having served 34 years and having placed his name on a piece of legislation certain to be remembered long after he departs.

Landrum, now 68, was in his third term as a Georgia Democrat when he and Reps. Robert P. Griffin (R Mich.) and Don Young (R Alaska) drafted their bill to impose strict controls on labor elections and union finances. The Landrum-Griffin bill became law in 1959 as Congress chose it in preference to the competing version drafted by Sen. John P. Kennedy (D Mass.)

The measure, bitterly opposed by unions, gave Landrum an indelible conservative reputation and cost him support he needed in 1963 to win the place he wanted on the House Ways and Means Committee. He finally made it to Ways and Means in 1965, only after defining liberal opposition by making key parts of President Johnson's anti-poverty legislation on the House floor.

In recent years, Landrum emerged as one of the most influential of the southern Democrats in the House, taking good care of his state and sometimes providing the more liberal Democratic leadership with help on key issues at unexpected times.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.
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As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.

As a member of Ways and Means, Landrum made a great effort protecting the southern textile interests, serving as chairman of the informal "textile group" of members from textile producing states. He surprised many of his southern colleagues in 1971 by calling for an immediate end to the Vietnam war. He considered running for speaker but decided not to.
Agriculture - 2

continuation of the current program by which the entrenched
producers of a crop in a country have a locked-in monopoly on the production of rice," said Dawson Mathis (D Ga.).

The Breaux substitute was solidly defeated, 97-310. (Vote 584, Weekly Report p. 8922)

Finally, the amendment that would have offered an adjustment to the program to limit the amount of deficiency payments (payments received if the price of rice falls below the target price) to $20,000 instead of the $55,000 provided in the bill. Richmond argued that it was unfair to treat rice producers more favorably than producers of other commodities, such as wheat and corn, who received only $20,000. He said $20,000 would be more than 80 days before the beginning of each quarter, would aid only large corporate rice growers, not small farmers.

The amendment was defeated by voice vote.

The House also rejected by voice vote an amendment by W. Henson Moore (R La.) to allow new growers, as well as traditional ones, to be included in any set-aside program imposed by the secretary of agriculture, thereby receiving set-aside payments.

James P. Johnson (R Colo.) charged that under this amendment, "people in Colorado, who cannot grow rice because of the climate, will be paid not to grow rice." Johnson added, "This is the kind of amendment which is misconceived and does not really offer anything to the whole program, because... the set-aside program only applies to allotment holders and those who participate in the program and have an incentive to participate in the program."

Recombinant Motion

The House by a 202-311 vote defeated a motion by Moore to recommit HR 6292 to the Agriculture Committee, and then passed the bill 211-104. (Vote 585, Weekly Report p. 8922)

The Breaux amendment "simply provides for a continuation of the current program by which the entrenched producers of rice... have a locked-in monopoly on the production of rice." -Rep. Dawson Mathis

Final Action:

MILK PRICE SUPPORTS

Congress Dec. 18 cleared S J Res 121, requiring quarterly adjustments of the support price for milk and an increased support price to a minimum of 80 per cent of parity. But it delayed sending the bill to the President because of a veto threat.

Two previous congressional attempts in the last year to provide for quarterly adjustments of the support price were vetoed by President Ford. (Background, Weekly Report p. 8915)

The Senate passed its version of S J Res 121, calling only for quarterly adjustments, on Sept. 29 by voice vote. The House passed the bill Nov. 18, changing the termination date of the bill to March 31, 1978, and increasing the price support of milk to 80 per cent of parity.

Senate conferees agreed to the House changes and the conference report (H Rept 94-726) was filed Dec. 12, paving the way for final action.

Provisions

As cleared by Congress, S J Res 121 would:

• Require the secretary of agriculture until March 31, 1978, to adjust the support price of milk at the beginning of each quarter, to reflect any change during the preceding quarter in the index of prices paid by farmers for production items, interest, taxes and wage rates. Under existing law, support price changes were keyed to a broader index of family living.

• Require the secretary to announce the new support prices no later than 80 days before the beginning of each quarter.

• Increase the support price of milk to 80 per cent of parity.

Final Action

House


Supporters of the bill reiterated earlier arguments that U.S. dairy farmers needed the legislation to save them from the current cost-price squeeze and organize their production and keep them from going bankrupt. Supporters denied that the bill would raise milk prices to consumers or result in large increases in support payments.

Paul Findley (R Ill.) opposed the bill, citing government estimates that the two-year cost to taxpayers would be $200-million in support payments and the increased cost to consumers would be $1.1-billion in higher milk prices. Findley told House members that Office of Management and Budget Director James T. Lynn and Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz had promised to recommend a veto to President Ford should the bill pass.

Senate

The Senate adopted the conference report Dec. 18 by voice vote with little debate. The bill was then held at the desk until Congress reconvenes Jan. 19, in order to avoid a Ford pocket veto.

Government Operations

FOREIGN MISSIONS PROTECTION

The Senate Dec. 18 cleared for President Ford's signature a bill (HR 11184) that would provide for quarterly adjustments of the support price were vetoed by President Ford. (Background, Weekly Report p. 8915)

The Senate passed its version of S J Res 121, calling only for quarterly adjustments, on Sept. 29 by voice vote. The House passed the bill Nov. 18, changing the termination date of the bill to March 31, 1978, and increasing the price support of milk to 80 per cent of parity.

Senate conferees agreed to the House changes and the conference report (H Rept 94-726) was filed Dec. 12, paving the way for final action.

Provisions

As cleared by Congress, S J Res 121 would:

• Require the secretary of agriculture until March 31, 1978, to adjust the support price of milk at the beginning of each quarter, to reflect any change during the preceding quarter in the index of prices paid by farmers for production items, interest, taxes and wage rates. Under existing law, support price changes were keyed to a broader index of family living.

• Require the secretary to announce the new support prices no later than 80 days before the beginning of each quarter.

• Increase the support price of milk to 80 per cent of parity.

Final Action

House


Supporters of the bill reiterated earlier arguments that U.S. dairy farmers needed the legislation to save them from the current cost-price squeeze and organize their production and keep them from going bankrupt. Supporters denied that the bill would raise milk prices to consumers or result in large increases in support payments.

Paul Findley (R Ill.) opposed the bill, citing government estimates that the two-year cost to taxpayers would be $200-million in support payments and the increased cost to consumers would be $1.1-billion in higher milk prices. Findley told House members that Office of Management and Budget Director James T. Lynn and Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz had promised to recommend a veto to President Ford should the bill pass.

Senate

The Senate adopted the conference report Dec. 18 by voice vote with little debate. The bill was then held at the desk until Congress reconvenes Jan. 19, in order to avoid a Ford pocket veto.

PROVISIONS

Conference Report

As cleared, HR 11184 would:

• Provide the legislative branch with the authority to approve additional funds to the Appropriations Committee for the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

The report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations was filed Dec. 11.

• Increase the authorized Executive Protective Service force from 860 officers to 1,390.

HR 11184 did not include provisions in the original version of HR 12 for adding 10 high-level positions to the Secret Service and creating statutory authority for the director and deputy director of the Secret Service.

Floor Action

The House Dec. 17 adopted the measure by voice vote after a brief explanation of the changes from HR 12 by Terence A. McTavish (D Wyo.), chairman of the House Public Works Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The Senate Public Works Committee Dec. 17 reported the language of HR 11184 in an identical bill (S 2796-S Rept 94-376) introduced by Buckley.

The Senate cleared the bill by voice vote Dec. 18. Buckley declared that HR 1184 "serves the focus" of the original HR 12. He said OMB Director Lynn had assured him that Ford would include in his forthcoming fiscal 1977 budget proposal a request for a $5-million appropriation to finance reimbursements.

Final Action:

WOMEN'S CONFERENCE

Congress Dec. 11 cleared for the White House a bill (HR 9924) authorizing $6-million for the organization and convening of a National Women's Conference in 1976, to be held during International Women's Year, 1975.

The House Dec. 10 cleared for the White House a bill (HR 11184) authorizing $6-million for the organization and convening of a National Women's Conference in 1976, preceded by state or regional conferences.

The Senate by voice vote approved the bill which the House had passed Dec. 10, 203-162. (Vote 586, Weekly Report p. 8761)

Provisions

As sent to the White House, HR 9924:

• Extended the life of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year and directed it to organize and convene a national women's conference in 1976, preceded by state or regional conferences.

• Authorized up to $3.5-million in any fiscal year in federal reimbursement to local and state governments if they chose to provide the protection themselves. The exact amount would be set in an appropriations bill.

• Make the measure retroactive to July 1, 1974, thus allowing reimbursement of about $750,000 to New York City for the visit of Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat in the fall of 1974.

• Increase the authorized Executive Protective Service force from 860 officers to 1,390.

HR 11184 did not include provisions in the original version of HR 12 for adding 10 high-level positions to the Secret Service and creating statutory authority for the director and deputy director of the Secret Service.

Final Action:
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PROVISIONS

As sent to the White House, HR 9924:

• Extended the life of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year and directed it to organize and convene a national women's conference in 1976, preceded by state or regional conferences.

• Authorized up to $3.5-million in any fiscal year in federal reimbursement to local and state governments if they chose to provide the protection themselves. The exact amount would be set in an appropriations bill.

• Make the measure retroactive to July 1, 1974, thus allowing reimbursement of about $750,000 to New York City for the visit of Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat in the fall of 1974.

• Increase the authorized Executive Protective Service force from 860 officers to 1,390.
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- Directed the conference to set up a committee as a mechanism for calling a second national women's conference.
- Required the conference to report to the President and Congress within 120 days after the end of the conference; and provided for the termination of the commission 30 days later, in no case later than March 21, 1978.
- Authorized $5-million in funds for the conference; specified that none of the funds should be used for lobbying.

Background

HR 9924 became controversial when it was first brought to the House floor in October. It was criticized as a vehicle for federal funding of lobbying activities in favor of the Equal Rights Amendment. That amendment, approved by Congress in 1972, has been ratified by 34 of the 50 states necessary to add it to the Constitution as the 27th Amendment. (1973 Almanac p. 199)

Proposed by Bella S. Abzug (D N.Y.), HR 9924 was reported unanimously by the House Government Operations Committee (H Rept 94-512), but a move to suspend the rules and pass the bill Oct 20 fell short of the two-thirds vote required. (Vote Alert, Weekly Report p. 2851; story, Weekly Report p. 2801; story, Weekly Report p. 2807)

House Passage

When HR 9924 was brought up Dec 10, its opponents, led by Sam Steiger (R Ariz.) and Robert B. Ramey (R Md.), attempted to delay it further, charging that women members supporting the bill had incorrectly represented the Republican National Committee among its backers. Milliken Fenwick (R N.J.) responded that the national committee chairman was in favor of the conference. The rule under which the bill was considered was adopted, 369-31. (Vote 268, Weekly Report p. 2750)

During opponents attempted to cut back severely on its provisions. In each case such efforts were countered by compromise amendments offered by supporters of the bill and adopted by the House. Amendments adopted included those which:

- Specified that none of funds authorized by HR 9924 could be used for lobbying activities. Proposed by Elliott H. Levitas (D N.Y.), this amendment was adopted by voice vote.
- Reduced the authorization to $5-million from $10-million. Proposed by Patey T. Mink (D Hawaii) as a substitute for a Steiger amendment cutting funds to $1-million, this amendment was adopted by a 236-180 standing vote.

Senate Action

The Senate Dec 11 approved HR 9924 without debate by voice vote, clearing the measure for the White House.

Action Deferred:

HATCH ACT REVISION

The Senate deferred action until 1976 on a House-passed bill (HR 9617) that would give the nation's 2.8 million federal employees federal political rights. Although President Ford was reported ready to veto the version of the bill approved by the House Oct 21, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported a

nearly identical measure Dec 5. (House passage, Weekly Report p. 2870; veto outlook, Weekly Report p. 2870) HR 9617 would give federal employees the right to participate in partisan election campaigns and to run for office, while strengthening laws prohibiting abuse of authority and coercion of non-federal employees into non-voluntary political activity of any kind.

Partisan political activity by federal employees had been prohibited by legislation that none of the funds should be used for lobbying.

Senate Committee Action

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee Nov 19 ordered HR 9617 reported by a vote of 7-2. Voting for the bill were: Chairman Gale W. McGee (D Wyo.), Jennings Randolph (D W.Va.), Quentin N. Burdick (D N.D.), Frank Moss (D Utah), Ernest S. Holland (D S.C.), Patrick J. Leahy (D Vt.), and Ted Stevens (R Alaska). Voting against were: Hiram L. Fong (R Hawaii) and Henry Bellmon (R Okla.).

In its report (S Rept 94-512), filed Dec 5, the committee said it did not see "the continuance of a merit system in public employment as being dependent upon maintenance of the severe restrictions on employees' First Amendment rights that now exist."

The committee agreed to one substantive amendment to the House-passed bill. The amendment provided that nothing in the bill would authorize any employee to use information available to him because of his employment for any purpose prohibited by law.

Minority Views

In minority views, Fong and Bellmon said HR 9617 would "open up the entire federal government to partisan politics by federal employees and concentrate excessive political power in the hands of their leaders."

"It would erode and subvert the Hatch Act—the cornerstone of the merit system—by substituting a political criterion so as to make the merit system so well as in basking partisan politics from the merit system and in seeking to manipulate workers from the pressures and threats of politicians."

Final Action:

OVERSEAS VOTING RIGHTS

Congress Dec 18 cleared for the President a bill (S 98) to assure American citizens who live outside of the United States the right to vote in federal elections.

Final action on the bill was by voice vote accepted House changes in the bill. S 98 as originally was passed by the Senate Mar 15. It was passed by the House Dec 10 with amendments. (House action, Weekly Report p. 2777)

Under S 98, no U.S. citizen could be denied the right to vote in a state even if he did not maintain a residence there and did not intend to return there. These persons would have to file an application to vote no later than 30 days before an election.

The bill included an anti-voting fraud provision that provided for a $5,000 fine and a five-year prison term for providing false information.

FOREIGN POLICY/NATIONAL SECURITY

SENATE ACTION ON 200-MILE FISHING LIMIT

The Senate laid the groundwork in the closing hours of the 94th Congress for enactment of a controversial bill (S 961) that would extend U.S. fishing limits to 200 miles from the present 12. After preliminary debate on the final day of the session Dec 19, the bill was made the Senate's pending order of business on its return Jan 18.

Background on Controversy

The bill would extend the U.S. fishing limit, effective Sept. 30, 1975, to protect the American fishing industry which, the bill's backers said, had been hard hit in recent years by massive foreign fishing off U.S. shores. Foreign fishing would be strictly regulated in the new U.S. zone, with American ships having first option on available fish stocks. In addition to widening the fishing zone, the bill would establish a federal fisheries management program to protect and conserve U.S. fish stocks.

A similar bill had easily passed the Senate in 1974 by a 68-27 vote. It died at the end of the session when the House took no action. (1975 Almanac p. 385)

But the Senate vote in 1976 was expected to be much closer. The House Oct 9 passed a companion bill (HR 200) by a lopsided margin of 226-70. (House action, Weekly Report p. 2134)

The bills were opposed by the Ford administration, which argued that any action on fishing zones should be by international agreement, rather than a unilateral decision by the United States. They also warned that opposition would be a problem in the fishing industry, including tuna and shrimp interests which fish far out of U.S. waters and feared that an extension of the U.S. boundaries would provoke retaliatory action by foreign countries.

The conference was pushed primarily by members representing coastal interests. Principal sponsors of the bills were Reps. Percy G. Studds (D Mass.) and Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D Wash.). But even among representatives of coastal states, there was not always a consensus. The two Alaska senators, for example, took opposite sides on the issue, with Republican Ted Stevens supporting it and Democrat Mike Gravel opposing it. A further indication of the controversy was the referral of S 961 to three committees and the closeness of their votes on it. After the Senate Commerce Committee reported S 961 Oct 7, it was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Agriculture Committee. (Commerce committee action, Weekly Report p. 2311)

PRO: Armed Services

The Armed Services Committee filed its report (S Rept 94-410) Dec 5, after approving the bill 9-7. It had approved the 1975 version by a two-to-one margin as well. In approving it, the committee adopted an amendment offered by Robert C. Byrd (D W.Va.) that extended the effective date of the bill until Jan 1, 1977. Voting to report the bill favorably were Democrats Symington (Mo.), Jackson (Wash.), Cannon (Nev.), McIntyre (N.H.), Nunn (Ga.), Lesby (Va.) and Byrd (Ind Vt.). Opposing it were Democrats Stennis (Miss.), Culver (Iowa) and Hart (Colo.), and Republicans Thornburgh (R.C.), Tower (Texas), Goldwater (Ariz.) and Bartlett (Ohio). The committee in its report urged that the United States faced serious coastal fishing problems, making a comprehensive conservation program "nearly essential"; that the bill related strictly to fishery jurisdiction and did not affect other ocean interests; that it did not violate international law and that it would not affect negotiations at the United Nations Law of the Sea Conference. It concluded that the bill was needed to protect vital U.S. fisheries interests and that national defense and security considerations did not lessen the bill's "urgent desirability."

Taft filed supplemental views disputing "misleading information" that U.S. representatives had given to the international community about the impact of the bill. In minority views, Stevens, Thurmond, Tower and Bartlett explained their opposition to S 961. They acknowledged that U.S. coastal fisheries problems deserved "vigorous attention" but called unilateral action by Congress contrary to both international law and the ongoing negotiations.

CON: Foreign Relations

The Foreign Relations Committee filed its adverse report (S Rept 94-459) on the bill Nov 18. It voted 7-6 to table it. The committee said that any action on fishing zones should be by international agreement, rather than by a unilateral decision by the United States. It referred the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee for further consideration. The committee concluded that the bill would undermine U.S. credibility abroad on other sea and fishing issues. Disagreements with the bill's supporters, the committee said that "should the [U.N.] conference fail, there will be more than enough time to take unilateral action to protect our coastal resources."

Griffin and McGee added their strongly held view that it was "absolutely essential" that a solution be reached through international agreement rather than unilateral action, which they contended contained a number of dangers, including the threat of having to use military force.

—By Judy Gardner

Dec. 27, 1975—PAGE 2896
605. HR 9771, Airport and Airway Development. Passage of the bill was authorized in the Department of Commerce and other aviation activities for the five-year period, Fiscal 1976-80. Passed 386-80: 127th Cong, 2nd sess (ND 176-7; SD 79-3), Dec. 18, 1979. (Story, p. 8589)

606. HR 10824, Medicare Amendments. Rostenkowski (D III) moved to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution (HR 984) providing that the House concur, with further amendments, to the Senate amendments to the bill to make changes in the Medicare program for the aged and to modify medical peer review requirements under the Medicare program and Medicaid program for the poor (thus clearing the bill for the President). Motion agreed to 271-148: R 116-33; D 155-115; ND 92-2, Dec. 19, 1979. A two-thirds majority vote (298 in this case) is required for adoption under suspension of the rules. (Story, p. 2477)

607. HR 10977, Social Security Appeals. Burke (D Mass.) motion to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution (HR 984) providing that the House concur, with further amendments, to the Senate amendments to the bill to reduce the backlog of cases appealing the denial of Social Security and other benefits, and to make other minor changes in Social Security laws (thus clearing the bill for the President). Motion agreed to 338-58: R 187-11 (ND 176-7; SD 101-4), Dec. 19, 1979. A two-thirds majority vote (260 in this case) is required for adoption under suspension of the rules. (Story, p. 8579)


609. H Res 398, House Reports. Adoption of the resolution providing for consideration of reports from the Rules Committee on the same day as reported and providing for adoption of such resolutions by a majority vote rather than by a two-thirds majority vote for the remainder of the first session of the 94th Congress. Adopted 247-142: R 132-9; D 115-43 (ND 176-7; SD 76-5), Dec. 19, 1975.

610. H Res 945, Three-Day recess. Adoption of the resolution that the House of Representatives recess on Thursday and Friday during the remainder of the first session of the 94th Congress. Adopted 250-139: R 160-39; D 90-0 (ND 176-7; SD 80-0), Dec. 19, 1975.

611. HR 9968, Tax Reduction Extension. Ullman (D Ore.) motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment prohibiting Congress to attempt to cut fiscal 1977 spending to equal any further extension of 1975 tax cuts beyond the Jan. 1, 1977, date, House 40-30 amendment provided by HR 9968. Motion agreed to 272-130: R 130-37; D 142-93 (ND 176-7; SD 76-1), Dec. 19, 1975. (A two-thirds majority vote in this case is required for passage under suspension of the rules. (Story, p. 2477)

612. H Res 218. Railroad Reorganization. Adoption of the conference report which would authorize $2.5 billion in financial assistance to the nation's railroads and to lessen federal regulation of the rail industry by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Adopted 258-150: R 86-90; D 171-181 (ND 176-7; SD 81-41), Dec. 19, 1975. A "nay" vote was supporting the President's position.

---

**CO House Votes 605-612**
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**Corresponding to Congressional Record Votes 318, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 327, 328**

**KEY**

| ALABAMA | ARIZONA | CALIFORNIA | COLORADO | CONNECTICUT | DELAWARE | FLORIDA | GEORGIA | HAWAII | IDAHO | ILLINOIS | INDIANA | IOWA | KANSAS | KENTUCKY | LOUISIANA | MASSACHUSETTS | MICHIGAN | MINNESOTA | MISSOURI | MISSISSIPPI | MONTANA | NEBRASKA | NEVADA | NEW HAMPSHIRE | NEW JERSEY | NEW MEXICO | NEW YORK | NORTH CAROLINA | OHIO | OKLAHOMA | ORANGE | PENNSYLVANIA | RHODES | SOUTH CAROLINA | SOUTH DAKOTA | TENNESSEE | TEXAS | UTAH | VERMONT | VINNEN | WASHINGTON | WEST VIRGINIA | WISCONSIN | WYOMING |
|--------|---------|-----------|----------|-------------|----------|--------|---------|--------|-------|---------|---------|------|--------|----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-----------|--------|----------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|--------|-------------|--------|----------|--------|-------------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|---------|--------|
|        |         |           |          |             |          |        |         |        |       |         |         |      |        |          |            |             |           |            |         |           |        |         |        |           |        |         |        |          |        |         |        |           |        |         |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |         |        |          |        |         |        |          |

---

**PAGE 2897**
HOUSE APPROVES $4.8-BILLION FOR AIRPORTS

Appropriating a six-month ban on U.S. landings by the Concorde supersonic jet transport, the House Dec. 18 by a 368-200 vote (HR 9771) authorizing $4.86-billion for airport development and other aviation projects over a five-year period. June 1976-80. (Vote 605, p. 2892)

The narrow 199-188 vote for the anti-SST amendment marked the first successful attempt by either chamber to deny landing rights to the controversial British-French-French airliner. Attempt to tie such a prohibition to the fiscal 1976 transportation appropriations bill (HR 8868) failed by close margins in both the House and Senate. (Senate bill, Weekly Report p. 1705; House bill, p. 1580)

Although the ban would not apply to Washington's Dulles International Airport, since it is federally owned and would not come under the airport aid bill, James V. Stanton (D Ohio), sponsor of the amendment, claimed in debate he had assurances from Transportation Secretary William T. Coleman Jr. that Dulles would be included under the bill when it was approved. However, Coleman denied the next day that he had made any such commitment. The Concorde owners in August had applied for landing rights at Dulles and New York's John F. Kennedy International Airport. (SST background, Weekly Report p. 2882)

Airport Aid

Designed to correct flaws in the program first established under the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970 (PL 91-258), HR 9771 revised the formula for distribution of money from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund to place new emphasis on development of medium and small airports. And for the first time trust fund money would be used to finance terminal development and to allow airports to buy surrounding land for noise buffer zones.

Floor Action

SST

The anti-Concorde amendment as originally offered by James V. Stanton (D Ohio) would have banned all such commercial supersonic flights in the U.S. It was opposed by southern Democrats, 34-44, and Republicans, 57-49. (Vote 606, Weekly Report p. 2890)

Floor Action

SST

The anti-Concorde amendment as originally offered by James V. Stanton (D Ohio) would have banned all such commercial supersonic flights in the U.S. It was opposed by southern Democrats, 34-44, and Republicans, 57-49. (Vote 606, Weekly Report p. 2890)

Airport Trust Fund

Jurisdictional tangles and dispute over the purpose of the trust fund prompted a bitter debate about opening the fund for airport terminal development. Previously, money from the trust fund and Airport Trust Fund had been reserved for use only on runways and airport features having to do with safety. As reported by the Public Works Committees, HR 9771 would permit use of trust fund money for public portions of airport terminals—that is, sections that produce no revenue. Previous proposals had proposed to render a final decision on the Concorde application by mid-February. Stanton agreed to accept an amendment by M. G. (Gene) Snyder (R Ky.), that would cut the length of the bill to six months. "I think the flat prohibition for six months is reasonable," said Stanton, "because the Department of Transportation would then report back to us on what their findings are."

Supporters of the SST have cited new findings in a final environmental impact statement, released Nov. 13 by the Federal Aviation Administration, which said that the craft could cause noise levels twice as loud as subsonic aircraft and could cause the craft's protective shield to cause 200 additional cases of skin cancer a year. "The document is overwhelmingly persuasive," declared Norman F. Lent (R N.Y.). "The thing speaks for itself, and what it tells us is clear. Keep the SST out."

Supporters also pointed to new findings by the Environmental Protection Agency that Concorde landings at Kennedy Airport "would be tolerable." Lent argued that the SST presented a "further safety hazard because its limited fuel capacity would barely enable it to reach Washington from Paris."

Opponents of the amendement, maintaining that a ban would be premature with the Transportation Department investigation still pending, said such action could jeopardize U.S.-U.S. relations with France and Great Britain. "To refuse to accept a plane that meets internationally agreed upon standards," argued Dale Milford (D Texas), a member of the Public Works Aviation Subcommittee, "would invite retaliation." Milford warned of possible economic reprisals by France and Britain against financially ailing U.S. airlines.

Milford and others also questioned the validity of the noise and non issues raised against the SST. FAA noise standards never were intended to apply to supersonic aircraft, they said, and any threat to the noise was mitigated by the fact that only six flights a day to the United States were planned for Concorde. Wayne L. Watts (D Ohio) added that there already were "at least 500 supersonic flights in this country" by military aircraft.

The Stanton amendment, as amended by Snyder, was passed, 199-188. It won strong support from northern Democrats, 52-34, and Republicans, 29-40. (Vote 607, Weekly Report p. 2890)
Transportation and Communications - 2

The Ways and Means amendment would have continued the existing federal-aid highway authorization for another two-year period. But the amendment also contained several provisions that would have affected the operation of the Federal Highway Trust Fund, the source of federal money for highway construction.

The amendment included a provision that would have allowed states to transfer highway funds from the interstate system to the national highway system, and vice versa, without having to meet any requirements or conditions. This would have simplified the process of transferring highway funds from one system to another, but it would also have allowed states to use funds from the highway trust fund to从来没有...
To preclude that possibility, Harsha’s amendments would have restored the interstate estimate base to the 1973 law, as HR 8235 stipulated that with the increase in interstate mileage could be redesignated only in another act, the bill stipulated that with the increase in interstate mileage could be redesignated only in another act, the bill stipulated that with the increase in interstate mileage could be redesignated only in another act, the bill stipulated that with the increase in interstate mileage could be redesignated only in another act. The amendment was defeated, 122-294, by the full House. (Vote 589, Weekly Report p. 8860.)

City Control

With minimal debate, the House rejected an amendment by James V. Stanton (D Ohio) to allow cities of more than 200,000 population that paid at least half the non-federal costs of projects in their area to select projects without state concurrence. If concurrence were required and the state did not submit to the federal government for funding a plan within a year after it had been approved, the city would be allowed to submit the plan directly.

Stanton said the amendment was necessary to break the “logjam” of urban programs being held up by state red tape. Opponents argued in response that it would require duplicative state and local planning capabilities, discourage state incentives to participate in the federal highway programs, and said the amendment would result in the states not being able to decide the definition of “urban area” in the bill.

—By Ted Vadans

The most controversial, offered by Gary A. Myers (R Pa), would have rolled back to 75,230 pounds the truck weight limit of 80,000 pounds allowed on interstate highways by the Federal-Aid Highway Act Amendments of 1974 (PL 93-64). The proposal was defeated in consideration of that bill on the eve of the 1974 enactment, Edward J. Koch (D N Y) had been unsuccessful in repeated attempts to win a House vote to delete the Senate-added truck weight limitation (1974 Almanac, p. 707).

Another amendment by the Myers amendment would authorize the use of mass transit vehicles under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, which would have been successful in repeated attempts to win a House vote to delete the Senate-added truck weight limitation (1974 Almanac, p. 707).

Another amendment by the Myers amendment would authorize the use of mass transit vehicles under the Federal-Aid Highway Act, which would have been successful in repeated attempts to win a House vote to delete the Senate-added truck weight limitation (1974 Almanac, p. 707).
The first session of the 94th Congress ended on the same note of conflict that had typified its relations with the Ford administration throughout 1975.

Calling it "the first elements of a comprehensive national energy policy," President Ford announced his decision Dec. 22 to sign the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

For Attribution

Pennsylvania Governor Milton J. Shapp still expects to be a front-runner for the Democratic nomination, even though most registered Democrats still know very little about him.
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Economy


General Omnibus Sharing. The five-year general revenue sharing program enacted in 1972 (PL 92-508—PL 93-512) will expire at the end of 1976. Under the program, the federal government gave $30.2-billion of its tax revenues to state and local governments for various purposes.

Debt Ceiling. The temporary $200-billion federal debt ceiling will expire after March 15. Without action extending that limit, set by Congress Nov. 13, 1975 (HR 10905—PL 94-452), the ceiling on outstanding federal debt will fall to its permanent $400-billion level.

Energy


Housing


Homeworkship Subsidies (Section 235). Authority to commit available funds under the 1975 Housing and Urban Development Act to provide mortgage subsidies for low-income families expired June 30, 1976. (1975 Almanac p. 142).

Health


Transportation

Airport Aid. The Airport Development Acceleration Act of 1975 (PL 93-644) expires June 30. The House Dis. 18 passed a five-year airport aid authorization (HR 7711) that included a six-month ban on U.S. landings by the British-French Concorde supersonic jetliner. The ban is not expected to stand in the Senate, which planned hearings early in the year. (House passage, 1975 Weekly Report p. 598).

Sports Broadcasting

The sports anti-blackout law (PL 93-107), which forbids broadcasters to black out a home telecast for a professional sports event if it is sold out 72 hours in advance, expired Dec. 31, 1975. The House and Senate both passed bills in 1975, but conferences were deadlocked over differences. Conferences allowed the law to expire on the assurance from National Football League Commissioner Pete Rozelle that the league would abide by the law for the remainder of the season. (1975 Weekly Report p. 278).

FISCAL 1977 BUDGET: FORD ASKS $394.2-BILLION

Rejecting an election-year "policy of the quick fix," Presid­ent Ford asked Congress a fiscal 1977 budget that he said would put the nation on the path toward reduced inflation and unemployment.

"The combination of tax and spending changes I propose will set us on a course that not only leads to a balanced budget within three years, but also improves the prospects for the economy to stay on a growth path that we can sustain," Ford said in his Jan. 21 budget message. (Text of message, p. 135).

Ford acknowledged the "hard choices" involved in that course. His decisions called for restraints in federal spending, with cuts and consolidations proposed in a variety of social programs popular with Congress. At the same time, the budget called for "significant" increases in defense spending, a decision in priorities that came under immediate attack on Capitol Hill.

In outlining his specific proposals, Ford told Congress that "we must not continue drifting in the direction of bigger and bigger government." To stop that flow, his budget called for cutting the rate of federal spending growth to about 5.5 per cent, less than half the average growth rate over the last 10 years and considerably less than the 7 per cent inflation rate in 1976. That would mean reductions in "real" spending after inflation was accounted for.

Specifics of Budget

Ford stuck to his intention, first outlined in October 1976, to propose spending of less than $360-billion in fiscal 1977, allocation for outlays of $304.5-billion. Receipts were estimated at $301.5-billion, resulting in a deficit of nearly $4.5-billion. That deficit was less than those of the past two fiscal years, and all the third last seen since 1946.

By holding spending to that level, and predicting a deficit of less than $3-billion, Ford was seeking to prevent another round of inflation, while at the same time keeping the nation's economic recovery on course. Anticipating charges that any move spending was necessary to ensure the nation's economic health, Ford said in his budget message, "If we try to stimulate the economy beyond its capacity to respond, it will lead only to a future whirlwind of inflation and unemployment."

Budget documents estimated that approximately one-fourth of the proposed fiscal 1977 outlays were committed to pay for programs and contracts approved in earlier years. Similarly, the budget called for new spending authori­ties in fiscal 1977 and $434.8-billion, about 30 per cent, would be spent in future years. Budget authority exceed­ed outlays because it covers the full cost of such things as construction and procurement programs, subsidy con­tracts and long-term financing costs, in which payments ac­tually are made over a period of at least several years. (Authority-outlays relationship, p. 118).

The administration's long-range economic outlook, based on Ford's philosophy of restraint, anticipated modest but steady improvement in unemployment and inflation levels, but no dramatic short-term improvements. Unemployment was expected to average 7.7 per cent in calendar 1976, with consumer prices rising about 6.3 per cent.

Fiscal 1976 Estimates

The budget also gave revised estimates for fiscal 1976 spending and receipts. Outlays were predicted to reach...
Budget Terminology

The federal budget is a plan of expected receipts and expenditures. In the language of priorities, an accounting of how funds have been and will be spent and a request for authority to spend public funds. The budget is a statement of the government's fiscal year, beginning Oct. 1, 1976, and ending Sept. 30, 1977. The federal budget is a request to Congress for a request for authority to spend public money.

Congress appropriates funds for the federal government as a whole and for the operations of the government. Congress confers budget authority with the Treasury Department by an authorization to appropriate a certain sum or an indefinite number of dollars.

Budget authority often differs from actual outlays: amounts actually paid out by the government. Congress appropriates funds for the operations of the government, and repayments under government lending programs. Operations of the government and government lending programs.

The nation could allow spending to rise if permitted to grow at its normal rate, could reach $423 billion in fiscal 1977. He proposed then that it be held down by $28 billion, to be matched by $28 billion in tax reductions effective July 1, 1977. When added to the six-month tax cut extension cleared by Congress in December 1975 (PL 94-164), the total would be about $38 billion, assuming the extension was continued until 1976. The six-month extension was scheduled to expire June 30, 1976 (Action on costs, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 2769).

Plans for Savings

Ford's proposals for savings were certainly to generate controversy in Congress. In some cases, they were revivals or modifications of ideas that Congress had rejected or ignored in the past.

The major proposals included:

- Consoliation of 17 education programs into one block grant program in which $2.5 billion in fiscal 1977 would be distributed to the states. Three fourths would be targeted for the disadvantaged and the handicapped. This is because, in practice, funds actually spent in a given year may be drawn partly from budget authority conferred in previous years, and partly from budget authority conferred in the year in question.

- Changes in the Medicare program that would limit increases in rates, increase the high risk premium for a $500 maximum, and provide catastrophic-illness protection for aged and disabled persons.

- Consolidation of 16 health programs, including Medicaid, into a block grant of $5.3 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- A block grant of $2.5 billion for states for social services programs.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in major unemployment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $14 billion in fiscal 1977.

- Reductions in employment programs in the Interstate compact that would save $5 billion in fiscal 1977.
mediate financial problems of the trust fund, which had been distributing funds faster than it was taking in. It was estimated that the increase for the average individual worker would amount to $22.50 in 1977, and would increase the net fund balance by $2.5 billion in fiscal 1977. Without the increase, budget documents said, the trust fund would be depleted by the early 1980s. Critics said a tax rate increase was regressive, affecting poor persons the most, and it faced some difficulty in Congress.

Ford also proposed an increase in the federal unemployment insurance tax rate paid by employers to .65 percent from .5 percent and in the wage base from $6,000 to $4,000, effective Jan. 1, 1977, increasing fiscal 1977 receipts by $2.1 billion.

In his budget message, Ford acknowledged reforms would be "controversial," but added, "They are the right thing to do. The American people understand that we must pay for the things we want. I know that those who are working now want to be sure that the money will be there to pay their benefits when their working days are over."

Winners, Losers

In addition to those major revisions and consolidations, spending below fiscal 1976 levels was the message for several federal departments and government functional agencies. Agencies hardest hit included the Agriculture and Labor Departments and the Veterans Administration. On a functional basis, reductions in outlays from fiscal 1976 were proposed in agriculture, commerce and transportation, community and regional development, education and employment and veterans benefits. A clear winner was defense spending. Proposed outlays for fiscal 1977 for the Defense Department were set at $396.6 billion, compared to $399.6 billion in fiscal 1976. On a functional basis, national defense was to rise $4.4 billion in fiscal 1977 to $101 billion, about 9 percent. International affairs spending, which includes foreign aid, also was to rise. The U.S. national security "dictates" the increase, Ford told reporters, saying the nation had been "plagued" by defense spending for 10 years. (Details on proposals in functional areas, p. 122)

Current Services

The extent of the restraints proposed for fiscal 1977 was even more evident when Ford's budget proposal was compared to the "current services" estimate submitted to Congress Nov. 19, 1975, by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). That document estimated the cost of continuing existing programs and services without change at a maximum of $441.5 billion, or $90.3 billion more than Ford's budget. On the basis of different estimating procedures and economic assumptions, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) set current services outlays at $430.3 billion.

On that basis, only outlays in the functional category of international affairs showed any significant increase over OMB's current services estimate.

Challenge to Congress

In his call for spending of $849.4 billion, Ford was renewing his challenge to Congress to limit the growth of federal outlays in return for a tax cut of an equivalent amount.

$28.9-Billion in Budget Cuts

The chart below shows where changes and cuts were made to estimate the final fiscal 1977 outlays to $584.2 billion, from $661.7 billion in estimates submitted to Congress in July 1976. Ford proposed on Oct. 6, 1975, that fiscal 1976 outlays be reduced by approximately $26 billion, to be matched by personal and business tax cuts.

Fiscal Policy

Early reaction from Capitol Hill indicated skepticism that spending could—or should—be held to that low level. One of the early indications was the combination of outlays at that level and Ford's tax proposals would result in a damaging effect on the nation's recovery from recession, and that the nation would be unable to afford the stimulus that recovery, and to keep unemployment from rising back to the record levels of 1975.

Committee staff analysts suggested, for example, that Ford's forecast of a $4.6-billion increase in new tax breaks would be misleading leading because of his proposals, he was seeking unemploymnt and Social Security payroll taxes. Those increases would offset much of the stimulus to the economy of the tax reductions, they said.

Critics offered differing figures on the net impact of the tax proposals. House Budget Committee Chairman Brock Adams (D Wash.) said Jan. 27 that the net tax reduction would be only $1.7 billion, and not the $10 billion cited by Ford. Adams also called the budget's economic forecasts unrealistically optimistic and said for the effect of the budget was to make recovery slower than necessary.

Economists also pointed to the restraint implicit in the budget when it was examined on a "full-employment" basis. That is estimate of receipts and outlays if the economy were operating at its capacity with full employment, conventionally set at 4 percent. On that basis, Ford's budget estimated outlays in fiscal 1977 of $386.7 billion and receipts of $389.2 billion, yielding a surplus of $2.7 billion, interpreted by some as a damper on the economy.

Ford, however, defended the $354.2-billion spending goal, telling reporters it was a "realistic and attainable figure."

"I would not hesitate to veto any legislation or appropriations that take the budget over $342.4 billion," he continued.

He also repeated his earlier statement that "if we restrain federal spending, we can have tax reductions on a dollar-for-dollar basis."

Ford conceded, however, that there were "uneasiness and uncertainty in the economy that would require some flexibility" and perhaps change by July when the present extension of tax cuts expired.

Ford Tax Program

In projecting $351.3 billion in fiscal 1977 federal revenue, Ford proposed the following tax incentives and offsets to provide payroll tax increases—the budget program would cut the federal fiscal 1977 revenues by an estimated $22.8 billion.

Coupled with various additional investment tax incentives—and offsets by property tax payments increases—the budget program would cut fiscal 1977 revenues by an estimated $22.8 billion.

In addition to the Social Security tax rate increase, which would produce an estimated $3.3 billion in additional trust fund revenues by fiscal 1977 outlays to $584.2 billion, from $661.7 billion in estimates submitted to Congress in July 1976. Ford proposed on Oct. 6, 1975, that fiscal 1976 outlays be reduced by approximately $26 billion, to be matched by personal and business tax cuts.

Fiscal Policy

Early reaction from Capitol Hill indicated skepticism that spending could—or should—be held to that low level. One of the early indications was the combination of outlays at that level and Ford's tax proposals would result in a damaging effect on the nation's recovery from recession, and that the nation would be unable to afford the stimulus that recovery, and to keep unemployment from rising back to the record levels of 1975.

Committee staff analysts suggested, for example, that Ford's forecast of a $4.6-billion increase in new tax breaks would be misleading leading because of his proposals, he was seeking unemploymnt and Social Security payroll taxes. Those increases would offset much of the stimulus to the economy of the tax reductions, they said.

Critics offered differing figures on the net impact of the tax proposals. House Budget Committee Chairman Brock Adams (D Wash.) said Jan. 27 that the net tax reduction would be only $1.7 billion, and not the $10 billion cited by Ford. Adams also called the budget's economic forecasts unrealistically optimistic and said for the effect of the budget was to make recovery slower than necessary.

Economists also pointed to the restraint implicit in the budget when it was examined on a "full-employment" basis. That is estimate of receipts and outlays if the economy were operating at its capacity with full employment, conventionally set at 4 percent. On that basis, Ford's budget estimated outlays in fiscal 1977 of $386.7 billion and receipts of $389.2 billion, yielding a surplus of $2.7 billion, interpreted by some as a damper on the economy.

Ford, however, defended the $354.2-billion spending goal, telling reporters it was a "realistic and attainable figure."

"I would not hesitate to veto any legislation or appropriations that take the budget over $342.4 billion," he continued.

He also repeated his earlier statement that "if we restrain federal spending, we can have tax reductions on a dollar-for-dollar basis."

Ford conceded, however, that there were "uneasiness and uncertainty in the economy that would require some flexibility" and perhaps change by July when the present extension of tax cuts expired.

Ford Tax Program

In projecting $351.3 billion in fiscal 1977 federal revenue, Ford proposed the following tax incentives and offsets to provide payroll tax increases—the budget program would cut the federal fiscal 1977 revenues by an estimated $22.8 billion.

Coupled with various additional investment tax incentives—and offsets by property tax payments increases—the budget program would cut fiscal 1977 revenues by an estimated $22.8 billion.

In addition to the Social Security tax rate increase, which would produce an estimated $3.3 billion in additional trust fund revenues by fiscal 1977 outlays to $584.2 billion, from $661.7 billion in estimates submitted to Congress in July 1976. Ford proposed on Oct. 6, 1975, that fiscal 1976 outlays be reduced by approximately $26 billion, to be matched by personal and business tax cuts.

Fiscal Policy

Early reaction from Capitol Hill indicated skepticism that spending could—or should—he held to that low level. One of the early indications was the combination of outlays at that level and Ford's tax proposals would result in a damaging effect on the nation's recovery from recession, and that the nation would be unable to afford the stimulus that recovery, and to keep unemployment from rising back to the record levels of 1975.

Committee staff analysts suggested, for example, that Ford's forecast of a $4.6-billion increase in new tax breaks would be misleading leading because of his proposals, he was seeking unemploymnt and Social Security payroll taxes. Those increases would offset much of the stimulus to the economy of the tax reductions, they said.

Critics offered differing figures on the net impact of the tax proposals. House Budget Committee Chairman Brock Adams (D Wash.) said Jan. 27 that the net tax reduction would be only $1.7 billion, and not the $10 billion cited by Ford. Adams also called the budget's economic forecasts unrealistically optimistic and said for the effect of the budget was to make recovery slower than necessary.

Economists also pointed to the restraint implicit in the budget when it was examined on a "full-employment" basis. That is estimate of receipts and outlays if the economy were operating at its capacity with full employment, conventionally set at 4 percent. On that basis, Ford's budget estimated outlays in fiscal 1977 of $386.7 billion and receipts of $389.2 billion, yielding a surplus of $2.7 billion, interpreted by some as a damper on the economy.

Ford, however, defended the $354.2-billion spending goal, telling reporters it was a "realistic and attainable figure."

"I would not hesitate to veto any legislation or appropriations that take the budget over $342.4 billion," he continued.

He also repeated his earlier statement that "if we restrain federal spending, we can have tax reductions on a dollar-for-dollar basis."

Ford conceded, however, that there were "uneasiness and uncertainty in the economy that would require some flexibility" and perhaps change by July when the present extension of tax cuts expired.

Ford Tax Program

In projecting $351.3 billion in fiscal 1977 federal revenue, Ford proposed the following tax incentives and offsets to provide payroll tax increases—the budget program would cut the federal fiscal 1977 revenues by an estimated $22.8 billion.

Coupled with various additional investment tax incentives—and offsets by property tax payments increases—the budget program would cut fiscal 1977 revenues by an estimated $22.8 billion.

In addition to the Social Security tax rate increase, which would produce an estimated $3.3 billion in additional fiscal 1977 trust fund revenues, the budget program projected another $21.2 billion increase in unemployment compensation taxes.

1976 Reductions

The budget essentially renewed Ford's 1975 proposals for permanent tax cuts that Congress had ignored. The ad-
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Budget Authority and Outlays by Agency (in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outlays</td>
<td>351,300</td>
<td>363,965</td>
<td>98,086</td>
<td>93,037</td>
<td>103,731</td>
<td>435,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>412,099</td>
<td>440,985</td>
<td>389,000</td>
<td>396,507</td>
<td>439,171</td>
<td>579,271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilities a series of tax benefits for expanding generating capacity.

Takings, that corporate relief would result in declines in corporate tax revenues of $153.6 billion, accounting for 43.7 percent of total budget receipts, roughly the same proportion as in fiscal 1975 and 1976 but down from 44.9 percent in fiscal 1975.

Corporate Taxes

Assuming large profit increases during economic recovery, the budget projected a 23.4 percent increase in corporate income tax revenues over fiscal 1975 following a slight dip in fiscal 1976.

Corporate tax receipts were estimated at $80.1 billion in fiscal 1975 and $80.5 billion in fiscal 1976. Without appeal of the administration’s tax cut proposals, corporate tax receipts would be $2.7 billion higher in fiscal 1976 and $5.5 billion higher in fiscal 1977. Estimated fiscal 1977 corporate tax revenue would represent nearly 14.1 percent of total budget receipts, up from 12.8 percent in fiscal 1976.

Payroll Tax

The budget estimated that federal payroll taxes would rise $20.5 billion in fiscal 1977, a 22.1 percent increase with the proposed 1975 Social Security payroll tax increases and Ford’s oil import fees—federal receipts were expected to rise to $379.5 billion in fiscal 1976 and $374.1 billion in fiscal 1977.

As the result of enacted tax changes—including 1975-1976 deficit reduction proposals and changes in the 1975-1976 proposals, combined with the lifting of the oil import fee, would raise fiscal 1976 receipts by roughly $200 million to $378.5 billion. Potential fiscal 1977 receipts, however, would be cut to $381.8 billion, about $22.8 billion below revenues that would result under the tax laws as they stood when the budget was submitted.

BUDGET RECEIPTS BY SOURCE (In billions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1975 actual</th>
<th>1975 estimate</th>
<th>1976 quarter estimate</th>
<th>1976 estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual income taxes</td>
<td>$124.4</td>
<td>$130.8</td>
<td>$40.0</td>
<td>$153.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate income taxes</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security revenue</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excise taxes</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate and gift taxes</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs duties</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous receipts</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL budget receipts</td>
<td>$280.1</td>
<td>$297.5</td>
<td>$81.9</td>
<td>$351.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Economic Goals

Even with the all-out effort to hold down the growth of federal outlays in 1977, the budget offered no hope for dramatic economic improvements in the next two years. The administration estimates forecast steady, if modest, gains. The gross national product (GNP) was anticipated to grow 12.4 per cent in 1976 and 12.2 per cent the following year, closely following the growth in 1975. In real terms, growth was anticipated at 6.2 per cent in 1976 and 5.7 per cent in 1977, well above the 2.2 per cent decline in 1975.

Unemployment, which averaged 8.5 per cent in 1976, was forecast to decline to an average of 7.7 per cent in 1976 and 6.9 per cent by 1977, still high by historical standards and far above the full-employment level, conventionally defined as 4 per cent. When asked about the effect of that continuing high level on his prospects for the nation, President Ford said he thought unemployment would be "something less" than 7.7 per cent by then. The figure, he told reporters Jan. 20, was a yearly average. The important point, he continued, was that the trend of unemployment was downward through the year.

Inflation too was expected to decline throughout 1976 and 1977. Inflation as measured by the GNP deflator was expected to be 5.9 per cent in 1976, rising again to 7.5 per cent in 1977, also high by earlier standards, but significantly better than the 9.7 and 8.7 per cent increases in 1974 and 1975. Price increases as measured by the rise in the consumer price index were set at 6.3 and 6 per cent for 1976 and 1977, respectively, compared to 11 and 8.1 per cent averages in 1974 and 1975.

Federal Funds Deficit

The $43-billion deficit projected by the fiscal 1977 budget was calculated on the unified budget basis used since fiscal 1969. By combining general federal operations with transactions by federal trust funds, the unified budget concept gives a comprehensive look at the federal government's fiscal impact on the economy.

The concept, however, is that the Treasury must borrow to finance its governmental operations by discounting the surplus that trust funds generally run in transactions with general-purpose federal funds. In fiscal 1977, the trust funds were expected to run a $13.5-billion surplus, offsetting that a $55.5-billion deficit in general-purpose federal funds transactions. The difference accounted for the $43-billion total deficit.

In budget jargon, federal funds are government revenues raised chiefly from taxes and borrowing for all government purposes. Trust funds, on the other hand, use revenues collected separately from special taxes and kept distinct for specific uses. They include such things as the Social Security and unemployment compensation trust funds, financed by payroll taxes, and the Highway Trust Fund, financed by the federal gasoline tax and other user levies.

Federal funds and trust funds are not completely separated, however, because the federal government as an employer makes contributions from its federal funds to social insurance trust funds. And trust fund surpluses are invested in securities sold by the Treasury.

In the transactions between trust funds and federal funds, the trust funds generally run a healthy surplus, accounting for a substantial part of the federal funds deficit. That surplus in turn enables the trust funds to show an over-all surplus despite substantial deficits in their dealings with the public.

In fiscal 1977, trust funds were expected to accumulate a surplus of $30.8 billion in transactions with federal funds, more than offsetting an $17.5-billion deficit with the public. In federal funds transactions, that surplus of $30.8 billion would combine with the $13.5-billion trust fund surplus in transactions with the public.

The fiscal 1977 budget gave this accounting for federal funds and trust funds in fiscal 1975-77 and the transition quarter (TQ):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal years, billions of dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funds:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions with the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions with trust funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions with the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions with federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, unified budget deficit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Assumptions

(Calendar years; dollar amounts in billions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNP national product:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current dollars:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$1,405</td>
<td>$1,490</td>
<td>$1,664</td>
<td>$1,890</td>
<td>$2,024</td>
<td>$2,236</td>
<td>$2,476</td>
<td>$2,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent change</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent change (Fiscal 1972 dollars):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$1,211</td>
<td>$1,187</td>
<td>$1,280</td>
<td>$1,323</td>
<td>$1,411</td>
<td>$1,503</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent change</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (current dollars):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income</td>
<td>$1,355</td>
<td>$1,246</td>
<td>$1,386</td>
<td>$1,538</td>
<td>$1,727</td>
<td>$1,930</td>
<td>$2,138</td>
<td>$2,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate profits</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (per cent change):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Federal pay rates, October (per cent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest rate, treasury bills (per cent)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Uninsured unemployment as a percentage of covered employment.
2. Average rate on new issues within period; the rate shown for 1976 was the current rate at the time the new issues were made.

Based on the fiscal trends, the debt increase primarily reflected an expected $11.1-billion in outlays during fiscal 1977 by off-budget federal agencies. Those seven agencies—including the Postal Service and the Federal Financing Bank—operated outside the federal budget and so their spending was not included in the budget total. The Export-Import Bank in 1976 was the first agency to be excluded from the unified budget. It was to be returned to the budget as of Oct. 1, 1976, and so its outlays were reflected in the $39.4-billion budget total of fiscal 1977.

Most of the off-budget agencies operate loan programs, and their outlays amounted to the excess of new loans over repayments on old loans. Those outlays have risen in recent years, mainly because of new off-budget agencies. In fiscal 1974, they were $2.7-billion; in fiscal 1975 they were estimated to be $9.5-billion, rising to $11.1-billion in fiscal 1977.

When added to the federal funds deficit, the effect of the off-budget outlays was to increase the amount that the federal government must finance to $87.4-billion in fiscal 1976 and $80.6-billion in fiscal 1977.

After adjustments for changes in cash, monetary assets and other means of financing, that left federal borrowing requirements at $190-billion in fiscal 1976 and $281.3-billion in fiscal 1977. Those amounts plus $18.8-billion for the budget transition quarter represented the increase in the federal debt subject to limit. The federal debt limit was set at a permanent level of $460-billion, with further temporary increases approved by Congress. The $7.2-billion existing temporary ceiling of $655-billion was to expire March 15, 1976.

Interest

Outlays for interest payments by the federal government on the public debt were estimated at $46-billion in fiscal 1977. An increase of $7.2-billion from the fiscal 1976 estimate. The increase, the budget explained, was largely due to financing of the large budget deficits of $76-billion in fiscal 1976 and the estimated $63-billion in fiscal 1977. In anticipation of further deficits, interest costs were estimated to grow to $44.8-billion in fiscal 1978.

Outlays for interest payments for 1977 were interest payments received by the government, reducing total federal outlays for interest at $34.8-billion in fiscal 1976 and $41.3-billion in fiscal 1977.
### FISCAL 1977 BUDGET BY FUNCTION: $394.2 BILLION IN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget Authority (in millions)</th>
<th>Outlays (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NATIONAL DEFENSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Defense</td>
<td>$85,812</td>
<td>$84,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Assistance</td>
<td>$6,581</td>
<td>$6,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomic Energy Activities</td>
<td>$1,464</td>
<td>$1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Aid</td>
<td>$7,590</td>
<td>$7,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deductions for Offsetting Receipts</td>
<td>$380</td>
<td>$380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$96,253</td>
<td>$98,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**             |                                 |                       |
| Foreign Economic and Financial Assists| $8,794                          | $8,548                |
| Conduct of Foreign Affairs            | $741                            | $738                  |
| Foreign Information and Exchange Activities| $354                        | $320                  |
| International Financial Programs      | $90                             | $90                   |
| **TOTAL**                             | $10,993                         | $10,698               |

| **SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICES**     |                                 |                       |
| General Social and Economic Assistance| $4,420                          | $4,456                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $4,420                          | $4,456                |

| **GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY** |                                 |                       |
| Basic Research and Development        | $3,554                          | $3,527                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $3,554                          | $3,527                |

| **GEOGRAPHIC PROGRAMS**                |                                 |                       |
| Agriculture                           | $2,018                          | $2,018                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $2,018                          | $2,018                |

| **EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES** |                                 |                       |
| Agricultural Research and Services    | $2,243                          | $2,243                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $2,243                          | $2,243                |

| **COMMERCIAL TRANSPORTATION**          |                                 |                       |
| Mortgage Credit and Thrift Insurance   | $6,304                          | $6,284                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $6,304                          | $6,284                |

| **RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY AFFAIRS**    |                                 |                       |
| Environmental Protection               | $3,998                          | $3,998                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $3,998                          | $3,998                |

| **COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT** |                                 |                       |
| Community Development                  | $2,901                          | $2,901                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $2,901                          | $2,901                |

| **EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SERVICES** |                                 |                       |
| Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education| $7,775                          | $7,775                |
| Higher Education                       | $1,767                          | $1,767                |
| Research and General Education         | $748                            | $748                  |
| Training and Employment                | $846                            | $846                  |
| Other Labor Services                   | $328                            | $328                  |
| Social Services                        | $3,189                          | $3,189                |
| Deductions for Offsetting Receipts    | $58                             | $58                   |
| **TOTAL**                             | $10,258                         | $10,258               |

### EXPENDITURES, $433.4 BILLION IN SPENDING AUTHORITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Budget Authority (in millions)</th>
<th>Outlays (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>$25,784</td>
<td>$25,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$25,784</td>
<td>$25,784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **WELFARE AND FAMILY SERVICES**        |                                 |                       |
| Income Security                       | $19,738                         | $19,738               |
| **TOTAL**                             | $19,738                         | $19,738               |

| **SOCIAL SERVICES**                   |                                 |                       |
| Social Assistance Services            | $7,169                          | $7,169                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $7,169                          | $7,169                |

| **INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**             |                                 |                       |
| General Welfare Programs               | $521                            | $521                  |
| **TOTAL**                             | $521                            | $521                  |

| **INCOME SECURITY**                   |                                 |                       |
| Federal Employee Retirement and Disability| $2,105                        | $2,105                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $2,105                          | $2,105                |

| **VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES**     |                                 |                       |
| Education                              | $4,984                          | $4,984                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $4,984                          | $4,984                |

| **GENERAL GOVERNMENT**                |                                 |                       |
| General Administration and Management  | $21,062                         | $21,062               |
| **TOTAL**                             | $21,062                         | $21,062               |

| **REVENUE SHARING AND GENERAL FISCAL ASSISTANCE** |                                 |                       |
| Revenue Sharing                        | $3,875                          | $3,875                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $3,875                          | $3,875                |

| **UTILITIES**                         |                                 |                       |
| Public Services                       | $1,800                          | $1,800                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $1,800                          | $1,800                |

| **INTEREST**                          |                                 |                       |
| Federal Borrowing                     | $20,700                         | $20,700               |
| **TOTAL**                             | $20,700                         | $20,700               |

| **CONTRIBUITIONS**                   |                                 |                       |
| Federal Funds                        | $1,500                          | $1,500                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $1,500                          | $1,500                |

| **OTHER FEDERAL FUNDS**               |                                 |                       |
| Federal Funds                        | $1,500                          | $1,500                |
| **TOTAL**                             | $1,500                          | $1,500                |

**SOURCE:** 1977 Budget

---
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New budget authority for tactical air forces included $2.2-billion for F-15 fighter planes and $101.8-million for 100 A-10 ground attack planes. For initial procurement of the Air Force's Lightweight F-15 fighters, the budget recommended budget authority of $352.8-million for the Joint Strike Fighter System. This was sought for development of the corresponding Navy plane, the F-14.

The number of Air Force, Navy and Marine tactical air wings remained at 24. At a $1.2-billion decline in Air Force procurement funds, the administration proposed to concentrate on headquarters units and reductions in non-combat, support manpower.

Mobility Forces

Airlift and sealift capability accounted for $1.6-billion of the budget request. This amount included funds to strengthen the wings of the giant C-5A transport aircraft to extend its useful life, and to lengthen the fuselage of the medium C-141 transport. Additional funds were sought to modify civilian jetliners in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet for easy adaptation to military duty in time of war.

Military Construction

The budget included $2.3-billion for military construction. Including $447-million for an aircraft engine test facility at Tullahoma, Tenn. The administration insisted that only projects essential to performance of military missions had been included in the request, which was $100-million under last year's appropriation. Reflecting a policy of increasing reliance on local housing markets to house military families, the budget requested only $1.2-billion for family housing in 1977, $100-million less than was appropriated for fiscal 1976.

Personnel

Civilian personnel would be reduced by 25,000, principally through consolidation of headquarters and support units. For example, the administration recommended that only projects essential to performance of military missions had been included in the request, which was $100-million under last year's appropriation. Reflecting a policy of increasing reliance on local housing markets to house military families, the budget requested only $1.2-billion for family housing in 1977, $100-million less than was appropriated for fiscal 1976.

General Purpose Forces

By far the largest component of the defense budget was $40.4-billion for conventional combat forces.

Tasks, armed personnel carriers and helicopters were sought to (1) enhance the Army; (2) rebuild divisions, including the 1st Armored Division, (3) rebuild the 11th Armored Division, (4) rebuild the 1st Infantry Division, (5) rebuild the 1st Cavalry Division, (6) rebuild the 25th Infantry Division, (7) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (8) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (9) rebuild the 10th Mountain Division, (10) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (11) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (12) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (13) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (14) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (15) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (16) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (17) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (18) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (19) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (20) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (21) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (22) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (23) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (24) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (25) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (26) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (27) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (28) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (29) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (30) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (31) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (32) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (33) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (34) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (35) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (36) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (37) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (38) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (39) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (40) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (41) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (42) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (43) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (44) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (45) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (46) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (47) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (48) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (49) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (50) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (51) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (52) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (53) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (54) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (55) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (56) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (57) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (58) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (59) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (60) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (61) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (62) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (63) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (64) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (65) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (66) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (67) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (68) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (69) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (70) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (71) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (72) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (73) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (74) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (75) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (76) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (77) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (78) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (79) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (80) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (81) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (82) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (83) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (84) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (85) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (86) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (87) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (88) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (89) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (90) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (91) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (92) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (93) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (94) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (95) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (96) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (97) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (98) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division, (99) rebuild the 101st Airborne Division, (100) rebuild the 82nd Airborne Division.

New combat ships requested included: three attack helicopters, nine ships, 1,000 tank and 105 attack helicopters. Funds were sought to begin construction of several new weapons, including the B-1 bomber, the Trident missile and the F-16 fighter planes.

Research and development funds totaling $10.9-billion for new ships funded modernization of the U.S. nuclear deterrent weapons, and stressed the importance of preparing options for expansion of the nuclear force should the current strategic arms limitation (SALT) talks with the Soviet Union fail. Funds were sought for the Trident submarines ($1.1-billion) and initial purchase of the Trident ($1.1-billion) and for the B-1 bombers ($1.1-billion). While no funds were requested for continued production of the Minuteman III missile, Pentagon officials announced that the National Security Council was contemplating additional purchases to keep that production line operating.

Research and development funds were requested for the air and sea-launched versions of the cruise missile ($82.5-million) and for the MX, a large, land-based ICBM ($64.5-million). New budget authority for research on ballistic missile defense came to $224.3-million.

International Affairs

The administration's overall budget request for foreign aid—both economic and military—amounted to $8.8-billion in new budget authority for fiscal 1977, $780-million less than recommended for that year ($9.6-billion). The amount ultimately allocated to military assistance, however, cannot be determined because Congress has not yet acted on the appropriations legislation.

About $1.8-billion of the fiscal 1977 request was for economic aid to Middle Eastern countries, the administration said. Economic Affairs

For foreign economic and financial assistance, the administration requested $5-billion in new budget authority, about $317-million below the 1976 level. The amount, $1.2-billion less than was allocated for fiscal 1976, reflects a policy of increasing reliance on local housing markets to house military families, the budget request only $1.2-billion for family housing in 1977, $100-million less than was appropriated for fiscal 1976.

Civilian personnel would be reduced by 25,000, principally through consolidation of headquarters and support units. For example, the administration recommended that only projects essential to performance of military missions had been included in the request, which was $100-million under last year's appropriation. Reflecting a policy of increasing reliance on local housing markets to house military families, the budget request only $1.2-billion for family housing in 1977, $100-million less than was appropriated for fiscal 1976.

The Army remains at 16 divisions and 42 corps. Airlift and sealift capability accounted for $1.6-billion of the fiscal 1977 request was for new ships funded modernization of the U.S. nuclear deterrent weapons, and stressed the importance of preparing options for expansion of the nuclear force should the current strategic arms limitation (SALT) talks with the Soviet Union fail. Funds were sought for the Trident submarines ($1.1-billion) and initial purchase of the Trident ($1.1-billion) and for the B-1 bombers ($1.1-billion). While no funds were requested for continued production of the Minuteman III missile, Pentagon officials announced that the National Security Council was contemplating additional purchases to keep that production line operating.

Research and development funds were requested for the air and sea-launched versions of the cruise missile ($82.5-million) and for the MX, a large, land-based ICBM ($64.5-million). New budget authority for research on ballistic missile defense came to $224.3-million.

International Affairs

The administration's overall budget request for foreign aid—both economic and military—amounted to $8.8-billion in new budget authority for fiscal 1977, $780-million less than recommended for that year ($9.6-billion). The amount ultimately allocated to military assistance, however, cannot be determined because Congress has not yet acted on the appropriations legislation.

About $1.8-billion of the fiscal 1977 request was for economic aid to countries in the Middle East. But specific allocations by country have not been finalized by the Ford administration.
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countries, was budgeted at a level of $1.1-billion for fiscal 1977. This amount was nearly $100-million larger than the fiscal 1976 request.

Other economic assistance programs included in the 1977 budget were:

- Food for Peace (PL 480), $1.2-billion in new budget authority;
- International narcotics control, $36-million;
- Migration and refugee assistance, $10-million;
- Peace Corps, $67-million.

General Science, Space and Technology

NASA

The budget requested a $142-million increase in budget authority for the U.S. space program in fiscal 1977, but the proposed funding boost would not keep pace with inflation. The total budget request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was $8.7-billion.

The proposed budget would force NASA to delay development of a third orbital vehicle for the reusable space shuttle, a probe of the planet Jupiter and a remote sensing of a wind tunnel used for aerodynamic testing. The budget included $1.02-billion, an $82-million increase, for continued work on the space shuttle, still scheduled for its first manned orbital flight in 1979. No other manned space missions were planned before then, but shuttle approach and landing tests were scheduled to begin in 1977.

Unlike the fiscal 1976 budget, the proposed funding also would allow work to begin on some new programs, including an effort to study comets and other solar phenomena in 1970-80 and a satellite to map ionization of earth's magnetic field. NASA's construction budget, cut back to $82-million in fiscal 1976, would rise to $124-million in fiscal 1977 under the proposed budget.

NASA's budget request included funds for the Environmental Research Center, which would receive $625-million for the construction of a new research center.

National Science Foundation

Increasing fiscal 1976 appropriations by about $88-million, the budget asked for $602-million for the National Science Foundation in fiscal 1977. Most of the new funding would be devoted to basic research programs in a number of scientific fields. Spending for science education programs under the proposed budget would stay at the fiscal 1976 spending level of about $60-million, while funds for research in the earth sciences would drop by about $8.7-million. The foundation said that the reduction reflected the continuing transfer of energy-related programs to other agencies.

Energy, Environment, Resources

Outlays for this entire category would reach a net total of $11.7-billion in fiscal 1977—a grand total of $14.6-billion offset by $600-million in receipts. The largest increases were in energy-related pollution control, for which spending was estimated at $4.4-billion; water resources and power, $3.9-billion; and energy, $3.6-billion.

Total outlays would amount to $11.6-billion more than in fiscal 1976. The largest increases were for pollution control, up $1.3-billion, and for energy, up almost $600-million.

Energy

Ford's fiscal 1977 energy program did not break new ground in energy policy. The President repeated a number of requests which were not granted in fiscal 1976 and proposed increases in a number of existing research programs.

Most of the $3.4-billion in fiscal 1977 energy outlays would be expended by the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA). The proposed $800-million for ERDA projects in fiscal 1977 was $5.4-billion; the balance was allocated to national security programs and for nuclear weapons development, which were not included within the energy outlays category.

For its second full year of operation, ERDA requested total budget authority of $6.1-billion, an increase of $1.5-billion over fiscal 1976. This included $4.6-billion for research programs targeted on specific problems and $1.6-billion for other outlays.

The budget reflected President Ford's intention to push forward with energy-related programs—those which he had ignored or rejected during the 1975 session. These included his desire to allow private enterprises to move into the uranium enrichment field, to provide federal backing for private industry's production of synthetic fuels, and to set up a $100-million Energy Independence Authority to provide federal stimulus for expansion of the nation's energy capabilities.

Amendments to ERDA authorization legislation would be proposed, stated the budget, to provide for $2.8-billion in federal loan guarantees in 1976 for commercial demonstration of synthetic fuel production. The fiscal 1977 budget included $200-million for the loan program. Congress late in 1975 had refused to approve a $6.6-billion loan guarantee program, but the administration said that amount would still be needed during the period from 1976-78 in order to attain the goal of producing the equivalent of 300,000 barrels per day of synthetic fuel by 1980.

The proposed Energy Independence Authority would be a government corporation formed in part by selling stock and, to a larger extent, by issuing notes, debentures, bonds, and other obligations. The authority, which would have legal capital, to total $25-billion, would be subject to appropriations requests. For fiscal 1977, the administration would request $8-billion in appropriations for this new corporation. Also for fiscal 1977, Congress would be asked to authorize $75-billion in bond authorization, allowing it to issue up to that amount in obligations.

The concept of the corporation had been attacked by liberals and conservatives and Congress was considered unlikely to act.

Ford also repeated 1975 requests for price deregulation of new domestic natural gas and to open up production from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which administers most of the programs, would take an overall reduction of $53-million in the 1976 amount.

- Federal Energy Administration—$700-million, a $67-million increase, $500-million for plant and capital equipment; outlays for these two subcategories were expected to amount to $4.3-billion and $1.1-billion, respectively.

- Nuclear Regulatory Commission—for which budget authority of $100-million was requested, an increase of $34-million over fiscal 1976 funds. This total included $122-million for nuclear regulatory research, $39-million for nuclear materials safety and safeguards.

The budget reflected President Ford's intention to press ahead with the nuclear regulatory program, which he initiated, and to increase the $500-million for which nuclear power plants would receive in fiscal 1977.

Other budget outlays would be devoted to basic research programs in a number of fields, including a $78-million increase for nuclear enrichment, as of early 1976 a government monopoly.

President Ford had proposed allowing private industry to enter the field of uranium enrichment, as of early 1976 a government monopoly. In the end, Ford authorized production of synthetic fuels, and increased funding for existing programs for which increased funding was requested were:

- Energy Research and Development Administration—$5.4-billion, the largest single item within this category was the civil water control...
and development projects of the Army Corps of Engineers, for which appropriations of $2.5-billion were requested, only $500-million more than fiscal 1976.

Other programs within this outlay total were those of the Interior Department, for which budget authority of $700-million was sought; of the Department of Agriculture, for which the Roosevelt administration in the 1930's, and the department requested $53-million. This included increases over fiscal 1976 totals for park operations and construction of facilities, to be offset by reductions in fiscal 1977.

Although the administration's $11.7-billion budget request for fiscal 1977 Transportation Department programs represented a decrease of $2.3-billion from the previous year, the proposed cuts represented about one-third of the $690-million for federal programs dealing with recreation, the equivalent of about half the transportation outlays.

The department said it was particularly pleased with the favorable response to the increased amount of park operations, noting that the budget included an additional $20-million for new housing programs. But spending for other programs, such as federal highway traffic safety and airport aid, would be held essentially at 1976 levels. The department proposed to reduce the Coast Guard and the Office of the Transportation Secretary, which conducts research and services, programs that do not fall into the Transportation Department.

While placing a lid on spending for most transportation programs, the budget requested more in financing, proposing to shift part of the burden for airport and inland waterway maintenance from taxpayers to users of those facilities.

Federal Highway Administration

For the National Highway System, the administration requested $2.4-billion in fiscal 1977, as compared to $2.5-billion in fiscal 1976. The department recommended a budget for federal aid to highways under the proposed budget would jump to $6.5-billion in fiscal 1977, from $3.08-billion in fiscal 1976. The increase would be accompanied by higher taxes on gasoline and other fuels used to power the nation's cars, trucks, and buses.

The administration requested $223.1-million in fiscal 1977 budget authority for the Federal Highway Administration, an increase of $34.5-million over estimated fiscal 1976 appropriations for the agency. The agency proposed to use $16.5-million in fiscal 1977 for the construction of a new headquarters building.

The administration requested $1.5-billion in fiscal 1977 for the Coast Guard and for the Office of the Transportation Secretary, which conducts research and services, programs that do not fall into the Transportation Department.

While placing a lid on spending for most transportation programs, the budget requested more in financing, proposing to shift part of the burden for airport and inland waterway maintenance from taxpayers to users of those facilities.

Total budget authority in fiscal 1977 would increase to $1.1-billion, from $0.8-billion in fiscal 1976. The two figures were not directly comparable, however, since the department had not requested contract authority for some major programs in fiscal 1976. The administration increased its request for contract authority for projects in a fiscal year—under which the proposed budget would drop by more than $1-billion in fiscal 1977.
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Housing: Continuation of Existing Programs

The administration proposed no major new efforts in the housing areas, asking instead for continued and further advances in programs with programs in fiscal 1977 would need about $750-million from fiscal 1976. Under the provisions of the 1974laid law, the federal subsidies for about 506,000 units of housing in fiscal 1977, about 50,-

The administration requested almost $249-million for new capital to continue the program after available funds were exhausted. HUD also proposed to sell remaining contracts to subsidize rents on about 400,000 units of housing. About 165,000 of these units would be in existing housing.

Community and Regional Development

Community Services Administration

The administration proposed to kill recreation and food programs for the poor established by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). OEO was to be abolished in the 1974 budget. The budget requested $93.9-million for volunteer programs in the national service programs. The new community programs were proposed as an extension of the reorganization theme of the administration.
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Housing

The administration proposed to kill recreation and food programs for the poor established by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO). OEO was to be abolished in the 1974 budget. The budget requested $93.9-million for volunteer programs in the national service programs. The new community programs were proposed as an extension of the reorganization theme of the administration.

The budget estimated that federal payments for the operation of existing public and other subsidized housing programs in fiscal 1977 would need about $750-million from fiscal 1976. Under the provisions of the 1974laid law, the federal subsidies for about 506,000 units of housing in fiscal 1977, about 50,-
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The proposed cut ran counter to the sentiment expressed by Congress. On July 22, 1976, the House Appropriations Committee, chaired by Chairman Bill Young (R-FL), agreed to the administration's position and set up a demonstration program giving economic development aid to cities. (1975 Weekly Report p. 775)

Under the demonstration, the administration did not request fiscal 1977 funds for rural water and sewer grants or rural community fire protection grants. In addition, a recession was requested for $128-million in fiscal 1976 for water and sewer grants.

Disaster Assistance

The budget asked for a $160-million appropriation in fiscal 1977 for disaster relief assistance, down $50-million from fiscal 1976. HUD also asked for $500-million in fiscal 1977 to carry out studies and surveys needed to implement the national flood insurance program.

Indian Programs

The proposal requested $32.9-million in new funds for the Indian Loan Guaranty program in fiscal 1977—$20-million. But it proposed further spending on public school construction grants for Indian areas.

Education/Labor/Social Services

EDUCATION

President Ford's budget requests for federal education programs totaled $46,916,000,000. If the fiscal 1976 appropriations were adjusted downward by the $1.5-billion that Ford also requested in rescissions, the administration figure would be $465-million more than the funds available in fiscal 1976.

However, if the rescissions were not enacted—and few observers believe that would be—the fiscal 1977 request would be above $450-million below the fiscal 1976 appropriations and about the same amount as requested in fiscal 1976.

Education Block Grants

Almost half of the total education request—$23.5-billion—was proposed to consolidate 27 categorical grant elementary and secondary education programs into one single block grant to the states. The third of a trinity of consolidations which included health and nutrition programs, the education consolidation was the last of the three. The administration's belief that the nation as a whole must contribute to the national commitment to provide equal educational opportunity in fiscal 1976. The $5-billion increase would go for technical assistance to schools implementing education plans.

Other Programs

As he had in 1975, Ford again asked for termination of the drug abuse program, which he had proposed in fiscal 1976. The $50-million appropriation in fiscal 1976. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which would be completed by June 30. Although authorities for some library aid and vocational education programs were also expire June 30. Congress was unlikely to review the entire gambit of federal aid in a single legislative session.

Impact Aid

As in 1975, Ford again proposed a revision of the impact aid program that would provide payments to school districts only in behalf of those students whose parents both lived and worked on federal property. Payments would be made to students whose parents worked for the federal government but lived on private property or in public housing, categories which were eligible for the payments under existing law. As in 1975, the program was designed to lessen the impact of the federal government's presence on local communities.

In line with that proposal, Ford only appropriated $85,000 for impact aid, compared to the $854-million appropriated in fiscal 1976. Although every President since fiscal 1976, the appropriation had been increased in fiscal 1976 to help students affected by the nation's economic downturn. The fiscal 1977 request was still $854-million lower than the fiscal 1976 appropriation.

For interest subsidies on the guaranteed student loan program, the administration requested $460-million and amending higher education programs which expire June 30. Although authorities for some library aid and vocational education programs were also expire June 30. Congress was unlikely to review the entire gambit of federal aid in a single legislative session.

Impact Aid

As in 1975, Ford again proposed a revision of the impact aid program that would provide payments to school districts only in behalf of those students whose parents both lived and worked on federal property. Payments would be made to students whose parents worked for the federal government but lived on private property or in public housing, categories which were eligible for the payments under existing law. As in 1975, the program was designed to lessen the impact of the federal government's presence on local communities.

In line with that proposal, Ford only appropriated $85,000 for impact aid, compared to the $854-million appropriated in fiscal 1976. Although every President since fiscal 1976, the appropriation had been increased in fiscal 1976 to help students affected by the nation's economic downturn. The fiscal 1977 request was still $854-million lower than the fiscal 1976 appropriation.

Ford also proposed that the federal share of wages paid under the program be limited to 70 per cent, from 80 per cent, in fiscal 1977 and 10 per cent in fiscal 1979. For interest subsidies on the guaranteed student loan program, the administration requested $460-million and amending higher education programs which expire June 30. Although authorities for some library aid and vocational education programs were also expire June 30. Congress was unlikely to review the entire gambit of federal aid in a single legislative session.

Impact Aid

As in 1975, Ford again proposed a revision of the impact aid program that would provide payments to school districts only in behalf of those students whose parents both lived and worked on federal property. Payments would be made to students whose parents worked for the federal government but lived on private property or in public housing, categories which were eligible for the payments under existing law. As in 1975, the program was designed to lessen the impact of the federal government's presence on local communities.

In line with that proposal, Ford only appropriated $85,000 for impact aid, compared to the $854-million appropriated in fiscal 1976. Although every President since fiscal 1976, the appropriation had been increased in fiscal 1976 to help students affected by the nation's economic downturn. The fiscal 1977 request was still $854-million lower than the fiscal 1976 appropriation.

According to Education officials said they hoped to submit consolidation legislation to Congress by Feb. 1.

Line item requests for the programs folded into the block grant, submitted in the event that Congress did not approve the consolidation, totaled $3,007,000,000—$290-million less than the amount appropriated for the same 27 programs in fiscal 1976. If the consolidation were enacted, the administration would request another $856-million to be distributed to the states. Among the line items, the administration requested a $50-million cut in aid to the disadvantaged and a discontinuation of aid to public and college libraries.

The budget also requested an additional $300-million appropriation for vocational education so that the program would be forward-funded—that is, the appropriation would be made in one year but not actually obligated until the following year. Most education programs were forward funded to give school administrators an opportunity to work federal aid into their school budgets.

It would also appropriate $635-million for the Indian Education program and $20-million for the Indian Loan Guaranty program in fiscal 1977 to carry out studies and surveys needed to implement the national flood insurance program.

National Indian Education

The administration requested $90-million for the National Indian Education program, the basic federal education research arm. The institute had a $70-million appropriation in fiscal 1976.
Dr. Ford proposed to limit out-of-pocket payments under Medicare to $500 per year for hospital costs and $250 per year for physician costs. But in exchange, he added, the elderly would have to pay more for initial coverage under Medicare.

The administration estimated that the fiscal 1977 cost of the program to protect Medicare beneficiaries against the cost of a "catastrophic illness." But the new cost-sharing proposals would reduce expected Medicare payments by $1.96-billion. In a movement to ease the burden of Medicare costs, the administration also proposed administrative changes that might affect the program.

Under existing law, states must pay 25 per cent of the cost of social security disability federal funds, and observe restrictions on the use of funds. Funded activities also must comply with federal rules for program operation. The block grant proposal would eliminate the matching requirement and drop most of the federal restrictions on use of funds. But states still would have to target most of the assistance on families with incomes below the poverty line.

The administration estimated that the fiscal 1977 cost of the program to protect Medicare beneficiaries against the cost of a "catastrophic illness." But the new cost-sharing proposals would reduce expected Medicare payments by $1.96-billion. In a movement to ease the burden of Medicare costs, the administration also proposed administrative changes that might affect the program.

Under existing law, states must pay 25 per cent of the cost of social security disability federal funds, and observe restrictions on the use of funds. Funded activities also must comply with federal rules for program operation. The block grant proposal would eliminate the matching requirement and drop most of the federal restrictions on use of funds. But states still would have to target most of the assistance on families with incomes below the poverty line.

The administration estimated that the fiscal 1977 cost of the program to protect Medicare beneficiaries against the cost of a "catastrophic illness." But the new cost-sharing proposals would reduce expected Medicare payments by $1.96-billion. In a movement to ease the burden of Medicare costs, the administration also proposed administrative changes that might affect the program.

Under existing law, states must pay 25 per cent of the cost of social security disability federal funds, and observe restrictions on the use of funds. Funded activities also must comply with federal rules for program operation. The block grant proposal would eliminate the matching requirement and drop most of the federal restrictions on use of funds. But states still would have to target most of the assistance on families with incomes below the poverty line.
Income Security

Social Security

Headline warnings that the Social Security system would deplete its reserves by the early 1980s without new funding, President Ford proposed that the tax paid by employers and employees to finance the retirement system be increased by 0.5 per cent, from a rate of 11.7 per cent to a rate of 12.2 per cent.

The employers' and the employee's tax would pay half, or 6.15 per cent. The increased tax rate would be effective Jan. 1, 1977, when the maximum taxable wage base already was scheduled by law to increase to an estimated $16,000 from $15,300.

The increased tax rate would add $22.54 to the average worker's tax bill in 1977, the administration said. The increase in the tax rate, together with the already mandated increase in the wage base, would mean that a worker earning $16,600 or more would pay a total of $1,014.75 in Social Security taxes in 1977, compared to a maximum tax of $899.65 in 1976. The $119.70 increase, $49.56 would be attributable to the proposed tax rate increase. The 0.5 per cent tax increase was expected to increase revenues for the Social Security trust fund by $3.5 billion.

Although House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Al Ullman (D Ore.) said Jan. 17 that there was "no alternative" to enacting the tax increase, there could be a debate in Congress over it. During 1975 hearings on the fiscal soundness of the Social Security system, several witnesses opposed a tax increase in favor of a larger increase in the taxable wage base or an infusion of general revenues. Ford flatly rejected the use of general revenues in his budget briefing Jan. 20. The proposed tax increase was also likely to be politically unpopular in an election year.

The administration made three other proposals aimed at reducing Social Security expenditures by $586-million in fiscal 1977. These proposals would 1) prohibit the payment of retroactive benefits in a lump sum if that payment would permanently reduce the amount of the recipient's monthly benefits; 2) apply the retirement test (under which benefits are reduced by a certain amount for extra income earned) only to an individual's annual income, and 3) phase out benefits paid to students aged 18 to 22. Such students could receive aid under federal student assistance programs, the administration said.

To balance the long-term deficit projected for the Social Security system, the administration also proposed a formula that would stabilize the relationship of benefits to the wages earned immediately prior to retirement. Under existing law, benefit levels could eventually exceed wages earned before retirement. The administration said this change would eliminate about half of the anticipated long-range deficit.

Ford did not reintroduce his 1975 proposal to hold cost-of-living increases in Social Security benefits to 5 per cent. The limitation was so unpopular in 1975 that the President could not find any member of Congress to introduce it as legislation.

The President requested $6.3-billion for the Social Security Administration in fiscal 1977. All of those funds, including $5.1-billion for the part of the Medicare program that covered physician's costs, were required to be appropriated annually under law. (Medicare, p. 129)

Supplemental Security Income

For the Supplemental Security Income program (SSI), the budget request was $5.9-billion, compared to a pending fiscal 1978 appropriation of $5.5-billion, SSI, which replaced state programs for the aged, blind, and disabled, had been plagued by overpayments, estimated at $347-million in the first two years of operation. Most of the overpayments could not be recovered, the Social Security Administration has said. HEW estimated that one error rate would fail to 15 per cent in fiscal 1977, compared to 25 per cent in 1975.

Black Lung Benefits

The federal government projected a downturn in black lung (pneumoconiosis) benefit claims, requesting $931,997,000, compared to $999,778,000 in 1976. The number of recipients was expected to decline from an estimated 450,000 in fiscal 1976 to 470,000 in 1977.

Welfare

President Ford asked Congress for authority to pave the way for coordinated administration of welfare programs, and to extend it. Funds were cut $102.7-million, for a total of $4.4-billion. With these funds, the VA would be able to complete increases in medical staff and improvements in facilities recommended by a 1974 survey. Education and training funds in the request totaled $24.5-billion. Arguing that the education benefits of the GI Bill were incompatible with the philosophy of the all-volunteer armed forces, the President urged that the Senate approve HR 9576, passed by the House Oct. 11, 1976, which would terminate that program. Ford also proposed a program of grants to the states to construct and operate veterans cemeteries.

Law Enforcement and Justice

As in fiscal 1976, budget requests for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) represented the largest budget cut in the Administration's budget. LEAA is due to expire June 30, 1976, unless Congress acts to extend it. Funds were cut $102.7-million, for a total of $4.7-billion. Additional $50-million was requested to fund a new high-impact anti-drug program. Even without legislative action, the Department of Justice, Education and Welfare predicted that the continued efforts to reduce payment and ineligibility errors would save $999,778,000 in fiscal 1977. The Administration proposed $274.5-million for AFDC programs, compared to an expected $3-billion under existing law. A similar proposal was rejected by Congress in 1975.

Veterans

The Administration requested $17.7-billion in new budget authority for the Veterans Administration (VA) for fiscal year 1978, up $1.5-billion from its fiscal 1977 request. Outlays of $17.2-billion were projected. The largest increase was in new budget authority for medical programs, $274.5-million from the fiscal 1977 appropriation to $4.4-billion. With these funds, the VA would be able to complete increases in medical staff and improvements in facilities recommended by a 1974 survey. Education and training funds in the request totaled $24.5-billion. Arguing that the education benefits of the GI Bill were incompatible with the philosophy of the all-volunteer armed forces, the President urged that the Senate approve HR 9576, passed by the House Oct. 11, 1976, which would terminate that program. Ford also proposed a program of grants to the states to construct and operate veterans cemeteries.

Food Programs

Food Stamps. The administration requested a reduction in the food stamp program for fiscal 1977. The $4.7-billion, based on exercised reforms of the program pending before both House and Senate Agriculture Committees, was almost $1-billion less than the $5.6-billion increase that was proposed in fiscal 1976. The administration had proposed legislation aimed at reducing the eligibility of middle-income families and concentrating the food stamp program on the neediest.

Child Nutrition Programs. For the second year in a row, the administration proposed a reduction in funds for the school lunch program for fiscal 1977. The $4.7-billion, based on proposed reforms of the program pending before both House and Senate Agriculture Committees, was almost $1-billion less than the $5.6-billion increase that was proposed in fiscal 1976. The administration had proposed legislation aimed at reducing the eligibility of middle-income families and concentrating the food stamp program on the neediest.

Outlays for Law Enforcement and Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$999,778,000</td>
<td>$1,143,000,000</td>
<td>$1,120,000,000</td>
<td>$1,150,000,000</td>
<td>$1,170,000,000</td>
<td>$1,180,000,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000,000</td>
<td>$1,220,000,000</td>
<td>$1,240,000,000</td>
<td>$1,260,000,000</td>
<td>$1,280,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures in millions.
decision to eliminate the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) and the $2.6-bilion seasonal financing for the 1977 academic year.

Justice Department budget requests also included a $15-million cut for the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), the first such reduction in many years. The reduction included $7.5-million for training state and local law enforcement agencies, in the future, state and local authorities would be required to provide 50 per cent of the cost of the FBI training program.

The largest increase requested by the administration in the law enforcement area was for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, which would receive an additional $6.3-million for planning and construction of four new facilities and opening of three others.

Budget increases were also requested for the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), to disrupt narcotics distribution channels by capturing "high level offenders" and to prevent diversion of illegal substances to the illicit market by retail pharmacists and physicians.

Within the Justice Department, $11.4-million was requested for additional U.S. attorneys and $2.6-million for additional U.S. marshals. The administration did not request any funds for the continuation of the 90 positions in the Office of Watergate Special Prosecution Force.

The administration requested an additional $12.6-million for the Department of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms for a total of $125.5-million. The increase was for funding in the illegal firearms control program, funded in 1976 in Washington, D.C. and two other cities with 180 agents, to eight other cities and an additional 200 agents. Other Treasury budget increases were requested for the U.S. Customs Service and U.S. Secret Service.

The President repeated support for legislation to reform and codify the RICO law.

Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the OMB, would consider the administration's request for permanent appropriation of $150,000. In fiscal 1977, the requested appropriation was $39,877,500,000.

Other Assistance

The budget's $7.4-billion projection for general purpose assistance for fiscal 1977 included a host of other functions, mostly to return to state and local governments. The aim was to prevent federal blue-collar workers from earning more than their counterparts in the private sector.

Undistributed Offsetting Receipts

Offsetting receipts are funds from the public and government agencies that are not counted as revenue, but instead are deducted from budget authority and outlays. They include payments from the public due to the government's market-oriented activities, such as loan repayments, interest, sale of property and rents and royalties. They also include payments from other federal accounts. In most instances, the payments are deducted from the budget authority and outlays of the agency receiving them.

In three cases, however, the offsetting receipts are deducted from the federal budget as a whole. The amount of those deducted receipts was estimated to rise in fiscal 1977 to $10.2-billion, up from $9.2 billion in fiscal 1976. The bulk of the increase was due to estimated receipts of nearly $3-billion from the leasing and sale of Outer Continental Shelf lands, up from $2.3 billion in fiscal 1976. Additional sales were planned in fiscal 1977 of lands off the west and Gulf coasts, the Gulf of Alaska and mid-Atlantic tracts off the east coast. The estimate of $3-billion in receipts for fiscal 1976 represented yet another estimate downward by OMB. Initial estimates had ranged as high as $3.2-billion and had fallen to $2.6-billion by October 1976. The second largest increase for fiscal 1976 (of Con Res 46) assumed receipts of $4.5-billion, with some members warning that figure was too high. With 1976 Con Res 46, 1975 Weekly Report p. 2729)

Additional receipts are to be limited in fiscal 1977. The budget assumed that additional receipts would be limited to 5 per cent, the same increase as in fiscal 1976.

ECONOMY NOTES

Gross National Product

With final 1975 figures starting to come in, federal government statistics continued to show slow but hopeful U.S. economic progress.

The President reported that actual economic output rose by 5.4 per cent during the first quarter of 1976, up from 6.4 per cent in the final quarter of 1975. The Commerce Department Jan. 20 reported that actual economic output rose by 5.4 per cent during the first quarter of 1976, up from 6.4 per cent in the final quarter of 1975.
Text of President's Fiscal '77 Budget Message

Following is the text of President Ford's fiscal 1977 budget message to Congress, released Jan. 22.

To the Congress of the United States:

The budget of the United States is a good roadmap of where we have been, where we are now, and where we should be going. It reflects the President's sense of priorities. It reflects his belief in the basic philosophy of how the public and private spheres should be related. The budget is the President's report to Congress-a major portion of my own time over the last several months to shaping the budget for fiscal year 1977 and laying the groundwork for the years that follow.

As I see it, the budget has three important dimensions. One is the budget as an element of our economic policy. The total size of the budget, its priorities, and the level and pattern of its spending reflect the economic health of the country. The budget's size that results can substantially affect the general level of economic activity in the economy. It can be a major tool for good or bad, for low or high inflation. If we try to keep the economy beyond its capacity to respond, even a relatively small increment of spending can create a whirlwind of inflation and unemployment.

The budget is also the President's program for fiscal year 1977 and the direction I seek for the future. The President's budget reflects the size of the budget and the deficit or surplus for the years that follow. The budget is the way it sorts out priorities. In my budget, as in my program, all needy children receive health care, but only those children who are working now want to be sure their working days are over.

And the budget is the President's philosophy of how the public and private spheres should be related. My budget makes clear that the money will be there to pay their benefits when their working days are over.

—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures.

As measured by the national income accounts, the consumer price index, rose 0.6 percent during December. That marked a slowdown in consumer price increases from 0.7 percent rates in October and November.

In December 1975, the consumer price index stood 7.0 percent above its December 1974 level, below the December to October decreases of 12.2 percent in 1974 and 8.8 percent in 1973.

In December 1975, the consumer price index stood 7.0 percent above its December 1974 level, below the December to October decreases of 12.2 percent in 1974 and 8.8 percent in 1973.

—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures—between the taxpayer and those who will benefit by Federal expenditures.
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State of the Union:
FORD AND MUSKIE SPEECHES DRAW BATTLE LINES

The election-year agendas outlined by President Ford and his Democratic rival, Sen. Edmund Muskie (D. Maine) are drawing clear battle lines between the administration and Congress.

In his Jan. 19 State of the Union message, Ford hammered on orthodox Republican conservative themes: the importance of the individual, the inability of government to solve big problems, the dangers of massive federal spending, the need for a stronger defense. The speech was a demand for what Ford called a "fundamentally different approach" for a "new realism" about the role of government.

Replying Jan. 21 in a speech billed as "A Democratic View," Muskie contended, "We must reject those of timid vision who counsel us to go back-to go back to simpler times now gone forever."

Muskie argued that government should be improved rather than cut back. "If we've learned anything as a nation...it is this," Muskie said, "give Americans the tools and they'll do the job."

Jobs

Beneath much high-flying rhetoric on both sides lay a key area of disagreement: how to reduce unemployment.

Ford argued for improving the business climate by reducing inflation and providing tax incentives, thereby increasing employment. He also called for a faster, more direct action through public service and public work programs.

"Unemployment remains too high," Ford declared. But he proposed no new programs to directly increase employment rates, and in his budget he recommended cutting back federal programs in four-year cycles.

Muskie at one point characterized Ford's block grant plan as a way of shifting costs to state and local governments, apparently confusing Ford's proposal with Republican presidential contender Ronald Reagan's plan for transferring $100 billion in welfare grants to the states in block grants. He also called for improvements in the food stamp programs.

"We can expect maximum efficiency and performance in office by everyone who draws a federal salary," called for a systematic congressional review of all federal programs in four-year cycles.

In a briefing two hours before Ford delivered the speech, White House Domestic Council Director James M. Cannon identified four "main points" as the philosophical underpinnings of the speech:

- Philosophy of government. Cannon indicated that Ford believed in an essentially passive role for government. "There is a growing desire to create and preserve conditions in which people can translate their ideals into practical reality," he said. The country had gotten into trouble by relying on government to solve big problems.

- Realism. Cannon said Ford wanted to distinguish between what government can and cannot reasonably do. "The time has come for a fundamentally different approach," he said. "We are not a realist."

- "A balanced" approach. Cannon underscored Ford's repeated use of the term "new balance." Ford said a balance must be struck between preventing an overheated economy and making sure families and individuals are protected.

- "Hope." Cannon emphasized that Ford opened and closed his speech with "hope" and an optimistic view of the country's future.

Economic Program

Budget

In calling for a $384.2-billion fiscal 1977 budget, with a reduction of $70.3 billion from the projected growth of federal spending, Ford said his "first objective is to have sound economic growth with low inflation."

"Ford said continued reductions could lead to a balanced budget by fiscal year 1979."

Tax Cut

The President reaffirmed his proposal for a $28-billion permanent tax reduction-$10 billion more annually than the temporary cut enacted in December 1975. He said such a reduction would allow the government to take in $10 billion more annually for a family of four earning $15,000 a year.

Unemployment

Ford offered no new programs directly aimed at reducing unemployment, and he avoided setting a specific goal for the jobless rate. Instead, he said the best solution to long-term unemployment was the return of a sound economy.

"Government-our kind of government--cannot create a "job for every American who wants to work," Ford declared. "But," he added, "the federal government can create conditions and incentives for private business and industry to make more and more jobs."

Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, explained in a briefing that Ford's policy is to "broadly create a healthy economy from which lower unemployment rates are feasible.

Unemployment, he said, would" be reduced by extending unemployment insurance, making the purchase of new equipment more attractive, and providing additional training programs for the jobless.

Various Ford aides specifically rejected proposals for expanded public service and public works job programs.

Housing

Ford said he would continue existing housing programs, including moderate-income, low-income families and mortgage subsidies for 100,000 more moderate-income families. "These programs will expand housing opportunities, spur construction, and help house moderate and low-income families," Ford said. He proposed no programs to lend interest rates and available mortgage money could lead to a "steady recovery" of the housing industry in 1976.

Regulatory Reform

Ford unveiled no new initiatives in his drive to reform what he called the "petty tyranny of massive government..."
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regulation." But aides described regulatory reform as a "political goal" of Ford's.

Ford pledged that the administration "will strictly enforce the federal antitrust laws" in order to encourage competition and bring down consumer prices. In a written briefing statement, aides went further, proposing legislative proposals to expand antitrust activities to cover some exempted industries.

The President also renewed his call for regulatory reform in the transportation industry particularly, including railroads, aviation and trucking; and he again asked for enactment of financial institutions that would allow small savers to earn higher interest rates on savings accounts.

Health

Catastrophic illness

Saying that "we cannot realistically afford national health insurance providing full coverage," Ford proposed a plan to provide protection against serious and long-term illnesses for persons covered by Medicare. But he also asked the elderly to pay more for short-term care.

Rather than add to the existing health insurance program, Ford said, a private health insurance system in the future would do a better job in providing quality care and protection from catastrophic illnesses to middle-income families.

Health Block Grants

The President proposed consolidating 16 federal health programs aimed primarily at the poor, including Medicaid, into one $1.2 billion block grant to the states.

Ford said in his budget briefing Jan. 29 that "public pressure" would prevent individual states from cutting back on the funding of health programs and from misusing the federal funds.

Veterans

Ford promised "to take further steps to improve the quality of medical and hospital care" for veterans. Aides explained that meant hiring 1,700 more medical care employees and spending about $200-million for construction projects such as correcting fire and safety hazards.

Social Security

The President proposed a payroll tax increase of 3 per cent for employees and employers of wages covered by Social Security. He said the rise would cost workers less than $1 extra per week.

Without the rise, Ford said, "Simple arithmetic warns all of us that the Social Security Trust Fund is headed for bankruptcy. Unless we act soon to make the fund stronger as much as it pays out, there will be no security for old or young."

Aides indicated that Ford would continue to press for more permanent changes to strengthen the financing of the unemployment insurance system.

Income Assistance

Ford said he would submit legislation later in 1976 giving him authority to eliminate inconsistencies and waste in various welfare programs. The legislation would make any administrative changes subject to review and disapproval by Congress.

For acknowledged the "compassion and a sense of community" that leads to welfare programs. "But everyone realizes that when it comes to welfare, government at all levels is not doing the job well," he said. "Too many of our welfare programs are inadequate and invite abuse. Worse, we are wasting badly needed resources without reaching many of the truly needy." However, Ford said he had concluded that "it is not the right time for massive and sweeping changes in welfare programs "where we are still recovering from a recession."

Food Stamps

Ford repeated the proposals to help control crime contained in his June 18, 1976, special message to Congress on the crime issue. He called for a "strong drug war on protecting the innocent victims of crime" and for "swift and certain" punishment of convicted criminals and his request for mandatory minimum sentences for persons convicted of narcotics crimes, the so-called "cowardly criminals," and of persons committing federal crimes while armed. He also called again for stricter control of cheap handguns.

The President proposed strengthening federal criminal system resource, including $66-million for the building of four new prisons, and to extend the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration program.

Noting that the sale of hard drugs was again increasing, Ford outlined his new drug war goals and has directed an increase in enforcement efforts.

General Revenue Sharing

Ford repeated his call for continuation of general revenue sharing, which he said had been "effective" and had transferred decision-making from the federal government to the local level. Congress must decide in 1976 whether to renew the revenue sharing program, and some members are known to be opposed.

Consolidation

The President said his proposals to consolidate a total of 50 federal programs, including those in the health area, and to turn the funds over to the states in block grants, was a "flexible system" that "will do the job better and do it closer to home."

In his budget, Ford proposed consolidating 27 education programs into one $2.3-billion block grant to the states and one $2.2-billion block grant that would eliminate food subsidies to non-needy children, thereby saving almost $900-million in the program.

The budget also called for consolidating a wide range of social services including day care, family planning, foster care and homemaking services into a $2.2-billion block grant to the states, with the elimination of most federal administrative and reporting requirements.

Foreign Policy

Ford described the state of U.S. foreign policy as "sound and strong" and said people should be "proud of what the United States has accomplished."

"The American people have heard too much about how terrible our mistakes, how evil our deeds, and how misguided our purposes," he said. "The American people know better ... I say it is time we quit downgrading ourselves as a nation."

However, in an oblique reference to his troubles during 1976 in Congress on foreign policy, the President said the framers of the Constitution knew that the responsibility for "strong central direction that allows flexibility of action" in foreign affairs "clearly rests with the President."

We are engaged out Angola, where action was pending in Congress to cut off U.S. aid, for criticism of congressional interference. "We must not lose all capacity to respond short of military intervention," the President said.

Defense Budget

Noting that his defense budget contained a substantial increase over fiscal year 1976, Ford said the request represented an increase in American strength for the real world in which we live.

Intelligence

The President pledged to recommend reforming and strengthening the U.S. intelligence community "in the near future" and asked for Congress' "positive cooperation."

Referring to revelations of past abuses by intelligence agencies, Ford warned that the "crying of our foreign intelligence services increases the danger of American involvement in direct armed conflict."

Ford added that "without effective intelligence capability, the United States stands blindedfold and hobbled."
FEDS OF FORD'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

This year marks the 200th anniversary of our nation's birth. It is a time to reflect on the stirring deeds of 1776, those who knew the eight generations that separate us from the younger generation. We came from many roots and have traveled many branches. Yet all Americans across the land are united in the promise of freedom, equality, and opportunity for all. As we begin our Bicentennial, America is the youngest Nations in the world.

Federal Budget Outlays, 1950-1977

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The budget for 1976 is $394.2 billion. The nation's economic growth is the best in the country's history. The inflation rate is the lowest in the nation's history. The nation's economy is the most balanced in the country's history. The nation's budget is the most balanced in the country's history. The nation's economy is the most balanced in the country's history. The nation's budget is the most balanced in the country's history.

The longest, most divisive war in our history is ending. The American people are ready to move on and to forge a better life for themselves and their children. As we begin our Bicentennial, America is the youngest Nations in the world.

The House Speaker, Carl Albert (D, Okla.), appears to be less than transfixed as he listens to President deliver his State of the Union address Jan. 19.

I am proud of America and proud to be an American. Life will be better here for me and my children than it was for my father and my mother. I know it will be better for my children. I'm their dad, I'm their mom, I'm their voice, and I can help make it happen. And it has happened here in America. It happened to you and to me.

Government exists to create and preserve conditions in which people can translate their ideals into practical reality. In the best of times, much is lost in translation. But we try.

Sometimes we have tried and failed. Always we have had the best of intentions. But in the past we sometimes forgot the sound principles that had guided us through most of our history. We wanted to accomplish great things and solve age-old problems. And we became overconfident in our own abilities. We tried to be a policeman abroad and an indulgent parent here at home. We thought we could transform the country through massive national programs.

But often the programs did not work; too often, they only made things worse. And as we rush to accomplish great deeds quickly, we trample on sound principles of restraint and endangered the rights of individuals.

We must introduce a new balance in our system of Federalism—a balance that favors greater freedom and opportunity for the leaders of our State and local governments.

We must introduce a new balance in the relationship between the individual and the Government—a balance that favors greater individual freedom and self-reliance.

We must introduce a new balance in the relationship between the individual and the Government—a balance that favors greater individual freedom and self-reliance.

Add up the separate pieces of progress in 1975, subtract the setbacks, and you can see in total shows that we are not only headed in the right direction I proposed 22 months ago, but that it turned out to be the right direction.

I am proud of America and proud to be an American. Life will be better here for me and my children than it was for my father and my mother. I know it will be better for my children. I'm their dad, I'm their mom, I'm their voice, and I can help make it happen.

House Speaker Carl Albert (D, Okla.) appears to be less than transfixed as he listens to President deliver his State of the Union address Jan. 19.

It is the right direction because it follows the truly revolutionary American economic concept. Americans have transformed a debt-ridden sick society, the making of public policy and successful problem-solving involves much more than government. It involves a full spectrum of responsible governmental and free citizen activity.

And in all that we do, we must be more honest with the American people, more candid in telling them no more than we can deliver, and delivering all that we promise.

For many Americans the way to a healthy economy is by providing a tax incentive in areas where the unemployment rate now runs over 7 percent. Legislation to get this started new tax incentives in areas where the unemployment rate now runs over 7 percent. Legislation to get this started
must be approved at the earliest possible date.

Within the strict budget total I will recommend for the coming year, I will ask for additional housing subsidies to house about 500,000 families. These programs will expand housing opportunities, spur construction and help to house moderate and low income families. We had a disappointing year in the housing industry in 1975 but it is improving. With lower interest rates and available mortgage money, we can have a healthy recovery in 1976.

A necessary condition of a healthy economy is freedom to use the energy of the American people. We are wasting billions of dollars of investment in oil and millions of barrels of oil a day because our energy policies are inefficient and wasteful. The American farmer, who not only feeds 215 million Americans but also sells 42% of his products abroad, and the American energy consumer, have both become hostage to oil. We must take steps to ensure that every American family has a reasonable and affordable price for the energy it consumes.

I propose three major tax changes to encourage the development and use of new energy sources. We will extend the tax credit for solar energy, which has been successful, from 10 years to 20 years. The production tax credit will be extended to natural gas and the credits for wind and geothermal energy will be increased. We need a comprehensive energy policy, not a one-time fix. Tax incentives are necessary, but not sufficient to create a healthy energy industry. We must also make the investment in energy research that will ensure a healthy energy industry in future years.
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**Shares of the Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>National Defense</th>
<th>Benefits Payments to Individuals and Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fiscal Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Total Outlays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1967 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elected officials at the local, state and national levels must be held accountable for the quality of medical and hospital care for those who have worked hard and contributed to it. All Americans should be able to enjoy a full life and a community of concern.
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**President Ford is escorted to the podium by congressional leaders to deliver his State of the Union address.**
As President I pledge the strict enforcement of Federal laws and-by example, surety bonds-to help State and local authorities enforce their laws. We are convinced that crime and our sense of personal security expand along with the spread of crime and ensure domestic tranquility. I say it is time we got tough on ourselves as a nation. Of course it is our responsibility to teach the right lessons from past mistakes. It is our duty to see that they never happen again, that a greater public is to look to the future. That the President’s troubles will not go away.

The American people want sound and honest international and foreign policy. In our Constitution’s system, these policies should reflect accommodation and accommodation between the President and Congress. But in the final analysis, as the framers of our Constitution knew beyond all question, the foreign relations of the United States can be conducted effectively only if there is strong central direction that allows flexibility of action. That responsibility clearly rests with the President. I pledge to the American people policies which seek a secure, just, and peaceful world. I pledge to the Congress to work with you to that end.

We have faced a future in which we can no longer help our friends, such as in Angola-even in limited and carefully controlled ways. We must not lose all capacity to respond to short military interventions. Some bumpy actions of the Congress during the last few years must be reviewed in the light of the new world.
them. America’s factories are producing only three fourths as many goods as they actually could.

Jobs
That means fewer jobs and higher prices.
If we had just enough jobs this year to get the full employment rate of 1966, we would collect enough federal wages to write off the nation’s debt and still have plenty for other purposes. But the President’s budget is designed to keep unemployment high and prices down, year after year. To keep seven million Americans unemployed this year, the Administration seems to believe that if the Administration’s policies are followed, unemployment will not fall below seven percent in this decade.

By American taxpayers we are paying a staggering price for these jobless policies. That the American who wants a job and can’t find it can pay as much more.

What price does a father or mother pay who can’t support their children? What price does a master carpenter pay when he is reduced to welfare? How can we calculate what price will we all pay when two out of every five American families will be living in poverty? How can we calculate what price we pay in lost efficiency, lost enterprise, and lost productivity. In doing so we also set an economic policy for the country and ration the dollars in the budget according to our actual national needs.

Our goal is to balance the budget as soon as the economy permits.

We have imposed a tough spending ceiling on the federal government this year. We will impose a similar spending ceiling next year and every year.

We have held the federal deficit to the lowest possible level consistent with reducing unemployment.

In fact, we have held the federal deficit $25 billion dollars below the Secretary of the Treasury’s estimate of last spring.

And we are using the process to determine the economic impact of tax and regulatory policies.

Why can’t defense contractors be made to pay a reasonable price for over-cost without cost over-runs? Have we ever had a chance to study the full extent of the wastes that are being fired for a cost over-run paid for with our tax dollars?

Just as we cannot go back to the old anti-recession bill—which the President requested in 1975—we can be assured that the President cannot be counted on to deliver another anti-recession bill this year.

The Congress has rejected at least two such proposals to increase payroll tax reductions and we are moving forward with the Congressional budget reform process. Congress has laid the groundwork for a more efficient government and a healthier economy.

We will impose a similar spending ceiling next year and every year.

Our goal is to keep the prices of oil and natural gas at or below $3.50 a barrel.

We are not alone in our concern about inflation. In the 1920’s and 1930’s, it was a national obsession.

In 1923, both inflation and interest rates reached their highest levels in 21 years. In part, food prices were high that year because of domestic oil price increases on top of the oil shocks of 1922.

We rejected at least two legislative measures to control inflation.

We moved immediately to prevent powerful forces from gripping the economy. Both by court and capital, not spend years in court arguing cases after it is too late.

In other requests to hold down the deficit. But the new budget reform process is just one step in a broader effort we must undertake.

We rejected at least two such proposals because they would be skeptical of such proposals that focus simply on raising rates and taxing them without a healthier economic context.

Indeed, inflation will do so in the name of the Administration.

But inflation in the home, in the workplace, and in the marketplace is an evil that we can no longer tolerate.

It gives us the leverage that we need to solve our problems by simply throwing federal dollars at the problem.

In doing so we also set an economic policy for the country and ration the dollars in the budget according to our actual national needs.

Our goal is not to be asked to carry.

Beyond that, wasteful government expenditures are misused resources that rob us of the resources we need to serve the American people.
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We have to be smart about what we spend.

That brings us to our third goal: to improve government efficiency and reduce costs in the process.

It is a goal we set out to achieve.

It is a goal that was set by President Ford in his budget message to Congress in January of this year.

It is a goal that was set again by President Ford in his budget message to Congress last week.

It is a goal that is set for the future in the Supreme Court's decision to remedy this now-chronic problem.

The Administration has tried hard to prove efficiency and reduce costs in the process.

We have imposed a tough spending ceiling on the federal government this year. We will impose a similar spending ceiling next year and every year.

Our goal is to keep the prices of oil and natural gas at or below $3.50 a barrel.

We are not alone in our concern about inflation. In the 1920’s and 1930’s, it was a national obsession.

In 1923, both inflation and interest rates reached their highest levels in 21 years. In part, food prices were high that year because of domestic oil price increases on top of the oil shocks of 1922.

We rejected at least two legislative measures to control inflation.

We moved immediately to prevent powerful forces from gripping the economy. Both by court and capital, not spend years in court arguing cases after it is too late.
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COMMITTEES OPENED 93% OF 1975 MEETINGS

Congressional committees opened their doors to the public more frequently in 1975 than the previous year, in 1974, continuing a trend begun in 1973 with the adoption of House and Senate rules aimed at keeping closed sessions to a minimum.

In 1975, both the Senate and the House adopted new rules aimed at increasing public access to the workings of committees.

For the first time since 1953, when CQ began its survey of committee secrecy, more than 90% of all committee meetings were held behind closed doors. In 1974, 93% of House hearings, 72% of Senate hearings, and 57% of business meetings were closed.

The Senate, which continued to lag behind the House in opening meetings, registered 15% closed meetings in 1975, down from 25% in both 1973 and 1974.

Hearings continued to be the type of meeting most often closed. In the Senate, hearings were closed 84% of the time in 1975, up from 73% in 1974. In the House, 22% of all committee meetings were held behind closed doors.

Debate Persists

The fact that more mark-up sessions are now open failed to quell the controversy over whether it is beneficial and efficient to work out legislation in public. Some members felt that the disadvantages outweighed the benefits.

Pro and Cons

Open meetings "have polarized the parties a little more," House Administration Chairman Wayne L. Hays (D Ohio) said in an interview. "Republicans have conferences, so Democrats feel they have to have theirs. They work out their positions in these meetings."

As a result, Hays said, "you don't get the give and take that I think is essential. Clearly there is more partisanship and more political fights now than there was before."

Furthermore, no "face-saving" way exists for a member to back down from a publicized position, he added, "This has slowed down the legislative process. But the most insidious part of open meetings is the behavior of lobbyists, he said, and "seeing them passing notes to members in conferences."

"But every session has to make a note to members of the press that they are open," said Representative Hamilton D. Fishback (D Wash.), a committee of the Committee on Rules and Administration. "I've tried to reduce the closed sessions. I've tried to make every session a public session.""n

The Senate, which continued to lag behind the House in opening meetings, registered 15% closed meetings in 1975, down from 25% in both 1973 and 1974.

Hearings continued to be the type of meeting most often closed. In the Senate, hearings were closed 84% of the time in 1975, up from 73% in 1974. In the House, 22% of all committee meetings were held behind closed doors.
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### House Committees

The House outlined in 1975 to reduce its percentage of closed meetings. Fewer than 8 per cent of all House committees' meetings were closed, compared with 8 per cent in 1974. Fewer than 4 per cent of committee hearings, 2 per cent of mark-ups and 7 per cent of business meetings were closed in 1975.

Twelve committees held all their sessions open in 1975, compared with 11 in 1974. For the first time, Banking, Currency, and Housing; Public Works and Transportation; Science and Technology; Select Committee on Aging; and Standards of Official Conduct held all their meetings in public. (Table, p. 154).

Closed mark-ups dropped from 4.6 per cent in 1974 to 2.2 per cent in 1975—a decrease attributable almost entirely to the Appropriations Committee. That committee, with 47 per cent of its mark-ups closed in 1974, closed only 4 per cent in 1975.

The percentage of closed mark-ups dropped from 4.6 per cent in 1974 to 3.1 per cent in 1975. Seventeen committees held all mark-ups in public in 1975, but only 7 per cent of business meetings were closed. The Joint Committee onAtomic Energy (1 per cent closed in 1974); Agriculture (1 per cent closed in 1975); Appropriations (1 per cent in 1974); Armed Services (1 per cent in 1975); Commerce (1 per cent in 1974); Education and Labor (1 per cent in 1975); Energy and Commerce (1 per cent in 1974); Government Operations (1 per cent in 1975); Interior (1 per cent in 1975); Judiciary (2 per cent in 1975); Select Committee on Aging (3 per cent in 1975); Standards of Official Conduct (1 per cent in 1975); Veterans Affairs (1 per cent in 1975); Ways and Means (1 per cent in 1975); and Post Office and Civil Service (1 per cent in 1975).

### Mark-Ups

Only 2.2 per cent of House committee mark-ups were closed, while 2.8 per cent of the hearings were closed. Seventeen committees held all mark-ups in public. They were the 12 committees having all open meetings and the following five other committees: Ways and Means, Post Office and Civil Service, Judiciary, Government Operations, and Budget. The Appropriations Committee opened all of its full committee sessions, as did three of its 12 subcommittees.

The percentage of closed mark-ups dropped from 4.6 per cent in 1974 to 2.2 per cent in 1975—a decrease attributable almost entirely to the Appropriations Committee. That committee, with 47 per cent of its mark-ups closed in 1974, closed only 4 per cent in 1975.

The percentage of closed mark-ups dropped from 4.6 per cent in 1974 to 2.2 per cent in 1975—a decrease attributable almost entirely to the Appropriations Committee. That committee, with 47 per cent of its mark-ups closed in 1974, closed only 4 per cent in 1975.

### Ground Rules

The figures used in this study were compiled from the list of committee meetings published in the Daily Digest section of the Congressional Record. Subcommittee meetings were included in the totals along with full committee sessions. Open meetings followed by closed meetings were counted twice, once in each category. Joint subcommittee sessions were counted as one meeting for each chamber. The subcommittees exclude meetings held when Congress was not in regular session; meetings held outside of Washington, D.C., informal meetings without an official status, and meetings of the House Rules Committee to consider sending legislation to the floor.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1974 required information on congressional committee meetings to be published daily in the Record, but the listings have not always reflected exactly the number of meetings held or whether they were closed to the public.
FORD SUPPORT IN CONGRESS: UP SLIGHTLY IN 1975

President Ford won 61 per cent of the congressional votes on which he took a position during 1975. That was a slight improvement over his 1974 record, but it was still the lowest mark set by a second-year President in the 23 years since Congressional Quarterly began keeping records.

Ford's support mark during the four months he was in office in 1974 was 58.2 per cent. The lowest score of any President since 1953 was 50.6 per cent, set by Richard Nixon in 1973. (1974 presidential support, 1974 Almanac p. 1006)

Ford found most of his trouble during 1975 in the House, where he received only 50.5 per cent support. In the Senate he received 75 per cent. The five members who voted against the President's position most often were all freshman House Democrats.

Freshman activist Bob Carr of Michigan opposed the President's positions most often, voting against him 75 per cent of the time. Carr was followed by Democratic Reps. Toby Moffett of Connecticut, 74 per cent; John Krebs of California, 73 per cent; and Stephen L. Neal and W. G. (Bill) Hefner, both of North Carolina, 72 per cent each.

The study was based on 192 votes that featured a clear-cut presidential position. Ford took such a position on 15 per cent of the 2,241 votes Congress took during 1975.

Votes were included in the 1975 study only if the President or his aides had made a specific indication of his wishes before the vote. (Ground rules, box, p. 158)

Reactions

In an interview, a White House official blamed Ford's poor showing on two factors: the running clash over aid to Vietnam and Cambodia early in the year, and the year-long struggle by the Democratic majority, particularly in the House, to forge its own economic and energy policies.

"It's surprising that he [Ford] got more than 50 per cent support," said the aide. "This was the most hostile House that any President has faced in many years. Many of Ford's legislative initiatives weren't even really considered because the Democrats wanted to come up with their own programs."

The official claimed success for Ford in establishing the "credibility" of the veto despite top-heavy Democratic majorities in both chambers. Out of the 17 bills the President vetoed during the session, only three were overridden.

A "non-isolationist" setting among freshman members tended to freeze attitudes during the President's attempts to secure military aid for South Vietnam and Cambodia, the aide said.

White House staff chief Richard B. Cheney has acknowledged that Ford maintained pressure for military aid in the spring of 1975, even as defeat of the Saigon and Khmer Republic governments appeared inevitable, to allow time for the orderly evacuation of Americans. (Ford's first full year, Weekly Report p. 30)

Success Rates

Following are the annual percentages of presidential votes since 1953 on congressional votes where the President took clear-cut positions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Eisenhower</th>
<th>Johnson</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Nixon</th>
<th>Ford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support Breakdown

In the Senate, the average Democrat supported the President more often (47 per cent) than he opposed him (41 per cent). That was a switch from 1974, when the average Senate Democrat opposed the President 47 per cent of the time and supported him 39 per cent of the time.

In the House, composite scores show that the average Democrat opposed Ford 56 per cent of the time while supporting him only 38 per cent of the time. That accelerated a trend set in 1974, when the composite scores for House Democrats showed 45 per cent opposition and 41 per cent support.

The average Republican in both houses increased his support for Ford over 1974: from 55 per cent to 68 per cent in the Senate and from 51 per cent to 63 per cent in the House.

State and Regional Averages

Ford picked up moderate support from the average Senate Democrat in all regions. These gains were led by the states, where the average Democrat senator supported the President 56 per cent of the time, compared with 46 per cent in 1974.

The average House Democrat in each region supported the President slightly less often than his Senate counterpart. The average Midwesterner dropped his support from 41 per cent to 35 per cent.

The President picked up stronger support from the average Republican senator in the West and South, from 52 per cent to 71 per cent in the West and from 45 per cent to 74 per cent in the South. Ford's support by the average Southern House Republican from all regions improved by from 10 to 13 percentage points.

In 1975 the average southern House Democrat was more likely to oppose the President than to support him, a switch from 1974. The average Southerner supported Ford 44 per cent of the time and opposed him 45 per cent of the time, compared with 45 per cent support and 41 per cent opposition in 1974.

In another switch, the average western Senate Democrat supported Ford more often (45 per cent of the time) than he opposed him (41 per cent of the time). That was a change from 1974, when the average western Senate Democrat opposed the President 45 per cent of the time and supported him 37 per cent of the time.

Among state delegations, Nebraska's support for Ford more often than any other, moving up from its 1974 rank of second place. The rest of the top 10 supporters, in order, were: Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Virginia, Arizona, Idaho, North Dakota, Louisiana and Alabama.

Presidential Support

*Percentages based on votes on which Presidents took a position.

Presidential Success on Votes 1953-1975

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Eisenhower</th>
<th>Johnson</th>
<th>Kennedy</th>
<th>Nixon</th>
<th>Ford</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Ground Rules for CQ Presidential Support-Opposition**

- **Presidential Issues**—CQ analyzes all messages, press conferences and other public statements of the President and official White House spokesmen to determine what the President personally favors or opposes, as distinct from other administration officials, does or does not favor in the way of legislative action.

- **Ballot Marking**—By the time an issue reaches a vote, it may differ from the original form on which the President expressed himself. In such cases, CQ analyzes in terms of what emphasis he placed on the balance, the features favored by the President outweigh those he opposed or vice versa. Only then is the vote classified.

- **Some Votes Excluded**—Occasionally, important measures are so extensively amended on the floor that it is impossible to characterize final passage as a victory or defeat for the President.

- **Motions**—Votes on motions to recommit, to reconsider or to take up bills are not tabulated. Only the final vote is classified.

- **Rules**—In the House, debate on most significant presidential issues is governed by rules that restrict time and may bar floor rules. These rules must be adopted by the House before the bills in question may be considered. Members may vote for the rule, in order to permit debate, although they intend to vote against the bill.

Generally, however, a vote against a rule is a vote against the bill, and a vote for a rule is a vote for the bill. Early recommitments, therefore, are counted as presidential opposition because of their effect on the legislative process. The President must request the rule in time to have it adopted before attention is turned to the bill. If he does not do so, the debate continues in the original form.

- **Appropriations**—Generally, votes on appropriation bills are not included in the tabulation, since it is rarely possible to determine the President's position on the previous version Congress almost certainly advanced in the same form. Allowed. Votes to cut or increase specific funds requested in the President's budget, however, are included.

- **Failures to Vote**—In tabulating the support or opposition scores of members on the selected presidential-issue votes, CQ counts only "yea" or "nay" votes on the ground that only these affect the outcome. Most failures to vote reflect absences because of illness or official business. Failures to vote lower both support and opposition scores equally.

- **Weighting**—All presidential-issue votes have equal statistical weight in the analysis.

- **Changed Positions**—Presidential support is determined by the position of the President at the time of the vote; even though that position may be different from an earlier position, or may have been reversed after the vote, the President and official White House spokesmen to determine what the President personally favors or opposes, as distinct from other administration officials, does or does not favor in the way of legislative action.

- **Regional Averages**

  **SUPPORT**

  Regional presidential support scores; scores for President Ford in 1974 are in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  **OPPOSITION**

  Regional presidential opposition scores for 1975; scores for President Ford in 1974 are in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOCRATS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Averages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OPPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1975 Presidential Position Votes**

Following is a list of all Senate and House records votes in 1975 on which President Ford took a position. Votes, listed by CQ vote number, appear in the Weekly Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOTE</th>
<th>SENATE VOTES</th>
<th>HOUSE VOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPUBLICANS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>841</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1096</td>
<td>1098</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207</td>
<td>1209</td>
<td>1211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Scorers—Support**

Highest individual scorers in presidential support—those who voted for the President's position most often in 1975:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OPPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (Va.)</td>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nunn (Ga.)</td>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McClintock (Ariz.)</td>
<td>Ariz.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long (Mich.)</td>
<td>Mich.</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrd (W. Va.)</td>
<td>W. Va.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stennis (Miss.)</td>
<td>Miss.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiles (Fla.)</td>
<td>Fla.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durkin (N. H.)</td>
<td>N. H.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SENATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democrats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republicans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Scorers—Opposition**

Highest individual scorers in Ford opposition—those who voted against the President's position most often in 1975:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OPPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (Va.)</td>
<td>Va.</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waggonner (La.)</td>
<td>La.</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtis (Texas)</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDonald (Ga.)</td>
<td>Ga.</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogue (Texas)</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>OPPOSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democrats</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republicans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scores for State Delegations

Following are the presidential support and opposition scores for 1975 for each state delegation. Ranking is according to combined chambers' support score, carried to the necessary decimal places to break a tie.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>58.34</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>58.34</td>
<td>46.40</td>
<td>58.34</td>
<td>46.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
<td>47.19</td>
<td>52.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>48.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1975.*

*Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1974.*

*Not a member in 1974.*

### Presidential Support and Opposition: Senate

1. Ford Support Score, 1975. Percentage of 89 Ford-issue roll calls in 1975 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

2. Ford Opposition Score, 1975. Percentage of 89 Ford-issue roll calls in 1975 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

3. Ford Support Score, 1974. Percentage of 89 Ford-issue roll calls in 1974 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

4. Ford Opposition Score, 1974. Percentage of 89 Ford-issue roll calls in 1974 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

- **Key:**
  - "Yea" means in agreement with the President's position.
  - "Nay" means opposite the President's position.
  - "Yea" or "Nay" means one is in agreement with the President's position, the other is not.
  - "Yea" or "Nay" means both are in agreement with the President's position.
  - "Yea" or "Nay" means both are opposite the President's position.

*Source: Compiled by Congressional Quarterly.*

"Yea" or "Nay" elected as independent.
### Presidential Support and Opposition: House

#### State: ALABAMA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pallis (R) (February 1974)

#### State: ARKANSAS
- 2 Representatives:  
  - Bell (D) (January 1976)
  - W. H. Williams (D) (January 1976)

#### State: FLORIDA
- 1 Representative: Jerry L. Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: LOUISIANA
- 1 Representative: Jerry L. Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: MARYLAND
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: MONTANA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: NEBRASKA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: NEW HAMPSHIRE
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: NEW JERSEY
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: NEW MEXICO
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: NEW YORK
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: NORTH CAROLINA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: OREGON
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: PENNSYLVANIA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: RHODE ISLAND
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: SOUTH CAROLINA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: SOUTH DAKOTA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: TERRITORIAL
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: WASHINGTON
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: WEST VIRGINIA
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: WISCONSIN
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

#### State: WYOMING
- 1 Representative:  
  - Pettis (D) (February 1974)

### Notes:
1. Ford Support Scores, 1976. Percentage of 29 Ford-sale roll calls in 1975 on which representative voted "yes" or "nay" in agreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
2. Ford Opposition Scores, 1976. Percentage of 29 Ford-sale roll calls in 1975 on which representative voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
3. Presidential Support Scores, 1974. Percentage of 54 Presidential roll calls in 1974 on which representative voted "yes" or "nay" in agreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
4. Ford Opposition Scores, 1974. Percentage of 54 Ford-sale roll calls in 1974 on which representative voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with the President's position. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
Congress sets records for attendance, votes

Congress in 1975 set a record for attendance on recorded votes—and at the same time established a new record for the number of votes taken during a session.

The average member voted 91 per cent of all recorded votes in 1975, the highest points higher than the previous record established in 1966 (and equaled in 1949 and 1973) and four points above the 1974 mark. A total of 1,214 recorded votes was taken in the House and Senate, 79 more than in 1973 when the previous record was set.

There were 602 votes taken in the Senate, eight more than in 1973, and 412 in the House, 71 more than in 1973. In 1974, the Senate took 544 votes and the House 527. The past year also marked the first time the House took more votes than the Senate.

As is usual, House members voted more often than senators. The average representative voted 91 per cent of the time, the average senator 89. Senators have not voted House members on a percentage basis since 1962.

For the first time since 1963, House Democrats were not outvoted by House Republicans. In 1975 each party voted 91 per cent of the time. In the Senate, Republican led 99 to 98. For the two chambers together, the score was 91 for Democrats and 91 for Republicans.

In the Senate, eastern Democrats and Republicans led members from all other regions, each with a 92 per cent participation score. In the House, southern Republicans had the highest score—92.

High Scorers

Only one senator—Democrat William Proxmire of Wisconsin—answered every one of the 602 votes held during the year. Proxmire compiled a string of consecutive votes that began in 1966, when he last missed one, and reached a record of 602 votes by the end of 1975.

Another Democratic senator managed a 99 per cent score in 1975, Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia. Next highest scorers in the Senate were Alan Cranston (D Calif.), Richard (Dick) Stone (D Fla.), Sam Nunn (D Ga.), Harry F. Byrd Jr. (Ind Va.), and Richard S. Schweiker (R Pa.), each with 98 per cent voting participation score. Stone was the highest-scoring freshman senator.

There were seven perfect scores in the House in 1975, established by Democrats William H. Natcher of Kentucky, Ken Hechler of West Virginia, Charles E. Bennett of Georgia, and Phil Sharp of Indiana. Republicans with perfect scores were Charles Thone of Nebraska and freshman Charles E. Schmitz (R N.Y.), and four points above the 1974 mark. A total of 1,214 recorded votes was taken in the House and Senate, 79 more than in 1973 when the previous record was set.

There were 602 votes taken in the Senate, eight more than in 1973, and 412 in the House, 71 more than in 1973. In 1974, the Senate took 544 votes and the House 527. The past year also marked the first time the House took more votes than the Senate.

As is usual, House members voted more often than senators. The average representative voted 91 per cent of the time, the average senator 89. Senators have not voted House members on a percentage basis since 1962.

For the first time since 1963, House Democrats were not outvoted by House Republicans. In 1975 each party voted 91 per cent of the time. In the Senate, Republican led 99 to 98. For the two chambers together, the score was 91 for Democrats and 91 for Republicans.

In the Senate, eastern Democrats and Republicans led members from all other regions, each with a 92 per cent participation score. In the House, southern Republicans had the highest score—92.

High Scorers

Only one senator—Democrat William Proxmire of Wisconsin—answered every one of the 602 votes held during the year. Proxmire compiled a string of consecutive votes that began in 1966, when he last missed one, and reached a record of 602 votes by the end of 1975.

Another Democratic senator managed a 99 per cent score in 1975, Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia. Next highest scorers in the Senate were Alan Cranston (D Calif.), Richard (Dick) Stone (D Fla.), Sam Nunn (D Ga.), Harry F. Byrd Jr. (Ind Va.), and Richard S. Schweiker (R Pa.), each with 98 per cent voting participation score. Stone was the highest-scoring freshman senator.

There were seven perfect scores in the House in 1975, established by Democrats William H. Natcher of Kentucky, Ken Hechler of West Virginia, Charles E. Bennett of Georgia, and Phil Sharp of Indiana. Republicans with perfect scores were Charles Thone of Nebraska and freshman Charles E. Schmitz (R N.Y.).
Voting Participation

### Voting Participation, 1975

1. **Voting Participation, 1975, Percentage of 519 recorded votes in 1975 on which representative voted "yes" or "nay.**

2. **Voting Participation, 2nd Congres. Percentage of 1,078 recorded votes in 1975 and 1976 on which representative voted "yes" or "nay.**

### Voting Participation Scores: House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>1975 Yes</th>
<th>1975 Nay</th>
<th>1976 Yes</th>
<th>1976 Nay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALABAMA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARKANSAS</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDAHO</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW HAMPSHIRE</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The conservative coalition was the most successful group of the 93rd Congress, winning 52 percent of the time, with Pennsylvania Senator Harris Wofford and New Jersey Senator Paul Sarbanes tied for the leading opposition votes against the conservative coalition. Opponents were elected to the 94th Congress with the highest opposition scores of the previous year, but the opposition alliance was not included in the 93rd Congress, so the leading opposition was on 28 percent of the votes in Congress, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The leading supporters of the coalition in the House were Virginia Reps. Robert W. Davis (R) and W. C. Dutch (D), who voted with the conservative coalition. The coalition appeared on 28 percent of the votes in Congress, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The highest coalition opposition score in the Senate was New York Democrat Edward Kennedy's 96 percent of the time compared with 77 percent in 1974. The 93rd Congress was the last Congress in which the conservative coalition had a majority in the Senate, after which Democrats gained control of the chamber in 1975, the coalition's victory percentage dropped sharply. The coalition won only 48 percent of the 186 Senate votes on which it appeared, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

In the House, the coalition performed slightly better, winning 59 percent of the 179 votes on which it appeared. But this was still 15 percentage points below the 67 percent winning 52 percent of the time, the first year since 1966 that it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The drastic decline in coalition success in the House was due largely to the drop in the number of Republicans serving in that chamber. There were only 148 House Republicans during the first session of the 94th Congress, compared with the more than 190 who had served for most of 1974.

They supported the coalition 75 percent of the time in 1975, compared with 66 percent in 1974. House Republican opposition dropped 3 percent, from 28 to 25.

Changes among House Republicans were smaller. Support levels among northern and southern Democrats stayed almost the same in 1974, but the opposition level rose slightly from 26 percent, from 24, among Southerners and to 29 percent, from 22.

The opposition level rose from 24, among Southerners and to 29 percent, from 22, among Northerners.

The conservative coalition was the most successful group of the 93rd Congress, winning 52 percent of the time, with Pennsylvania Senator Harris Wofford and New Jersey Senator Paul Sarbanes tied for the leading opposition votes against the conservative coalition. Opponents were elected to the 94th Congress with the highest opposition scores of the previous year, but the opposition alliance was not included in the 93rd Congress, so the leading opposition was on 28 percent of the votes in Congress, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The leading supporters of the coalition in the House were Virginia Reps. Robert W. Davis (R) and W. C. Dutch (D), who voted with the conservative coalition. The coalition appeared on 28 percent of the votes in Congress, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The highest coalition opposition score in the Senate was New York Democrat Edward Kennedy's 96 percent of the time compared with 77 percent in 1974. The 93rd Congress was the last Congress in which the conservative coalition had a majority in the Senate, after which Democrats gained control of the chamber in 1975, the coalition's victory percentage dropped sharply. The coalition won only 48 percent of the 186 Senate votes on which it appeared, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

In the House, the coalition performed slightly better, winning 59 percent of the 179 votes on which it appeared. But this was still 15 percentage points below the 67 percent winning 52 percent of the time, the first year since 1966 that it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The drastic decline in coalition success in the House was due largely to the drop in the number of Republicans serving in that chamber. There were only 148 House Republicans during the first session of the 94th Congress, compared with the more than 190 who had served for most of 1974.

They supported the coalition 75 percent of the time in 1975, compared with 66 percent in 1974. House Republican opposition dropped 3 percent, from 28 to 25.

Changes among House Republicans were smaller. Support levels among northern and southern Democrats stayed almost the same in 1974, but the opposition level rose slightly from 26 percent, from 24, among Southerners and to 29 percent, from 22, among Northerners.

The coalition's opposition score in the Senate was also varied little from 1974. But a cleavage among Senate Republicans was visible when their scores were broken down by region. Coalition support rose and opposition decreased among Senate Republicans everywhere but in the East, where support dropped and opposition increased sharply. Eastern Republican support dropped to 21 percent, from 40, and opposition rose to 61 percent, from 45, over 1974 levels.

The conservative coalition was the most successful group of the 93rd Congress, winning 52 percent of the time, with Pennsylvania Senator Harris Wofford and New Jersey Senator Paul Sarbanes tied for the leading opposition votes against the conservative coalition. Opponents were elected to the 94th Congress with the highest opposition scores of the previous year, but the opposition alliance was not included in the 93rd Congress, so the leading opposition was on 28 percent of the votes in Congress, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The coalition had a majority in the Senate in the 93rd Congress, after which Democrats gained control of the chamber in 1975, the coalition's victory percentage dropped sharply. The coalition won only 48 percent of the 186 Senate votes on which it appeared, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

In the House, the coalition performed slightly better, winning 59 percent of the 179 votes on which it appeared. But this was still 15 percentage points below the 67 percent winning 52 percent of the time, the first year since 1966 that it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The drastic decline in coalition success in the House was due largely to the drop in the number of Republicans serving in that chamber. There were only 148 House Republicans during the first session of the 94th Congress, compared with the more than 190 who had served for most of 1974.

They supported the coalition 75 percent of the time in 1975, compared with 66 percent in 1974. House Republican opposition dropped 3 percent, from 28 to 25.

Changes among House Republicans were smaller. Support levels among northern and southern Democrats stayed almost the same in 1974, but the opposition level rose slightly from 26 percent, from 24, among Southerners and to 29 percent, from 22, among Northerners.

The coalition's opposition score in the Senate was also varied little from 1974. But a cleavage among Senate Republicans was visible when their scores were broken down by region. Coalition support rose and opposition decreased among Senate Republicans everywhere but in the East, where support dropped and opposition increased sharply. Eastern Republican support dropped to 21 percent, from 40, and opposition rose to 61 percent, from 45, over 1974 levels.

The conservative coalition was the most successful group of the 93rd Congress, winning 52 percent of the time, with Pennsylvania Senator Harris Wofford and New Jersey Senator Paul Sarbanes tied for the leading opposition votes against the conservative coalition. Opponents were elected to the 94th Congress with the highest opposition scores of the previous year, but the opposition alliance was not included in the 93rd Congress, so the leading opposition was on 28 percent of the votes in Congress, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The coalition had a majority in the Senate in the 93rd Congress, after which Democrats gained control of the chamber in 1975, the coalition's victory percentage dropped sharply. The coalition won only 48 percent of the 186 Senate votes on which it appeared, down from 54 percent in 1974. This was its worst showing there since 1965, when it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

In the House, the coalition performed slightly better, winning 59 percent of the 179 votes on which it appeared. But this was still 15 percentage points below the 67 percent winning 52 percent of the time, the first year since 1966 that it was successful only 39 percent of the time.

The drastic decline in coalition success in the House was due largely to the drop in the number of Republicans serving in that chamber. There were only 148 House Republicans during the first session of the 94th Congress, compared with the more than 190 who had served for most of 1974.

They supported the coalition 75 percent of the time in 1975, compared with 66 percent in 1974. House Republican opposition dropped 3 percent, from 28 to 25.

Changes among House Republicans were smaller. Support levels among northern and southern Democrats stayed almost the same in 1974, but the opposition level rose slightly from 26 percent, from 24, among Southerners and to 29 percent, from 22, among Northerners.

The coalition's opposition score in the Senate was also varied little from 1974. But a cleavage among Senate Republicans was visible when their scores were broken down by region. Coalition support rose and opposition decreased among Senate Republicans everywhere but in the East, where support dropped and opposition increased sharply. Eastern Republican support dropped to 21 percent, from 40, and opposition rose to 61 percent, from 45, over 1974 levels.
### Conservative Coalition - 2

**State Rankings**

Here are the 10 states whose delegations supported the conservative coalition most frequently in 1975 and those whose delegations supported it least frequently, based on statistics from both chambers (figures in parentheses indicate 1974 rank).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Averages Scores**

Following are the composite conservative coalition support and opposition scores for 1975; scores for 1974 are in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>73 (%)</td>
<td>61 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>93 (%)</td>
<td>84 (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Regional Scores**

The parties' coalition support scores, by region, for 1975; scores for 1974 are in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>50 (%)</td>
<td>40 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>40 (%)</td>
<td>30 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>30 (%)</td>
<td>20 (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPPOSITION**

The parties' coalition opposition scores, by region, for 1975; scores for 1974 are in parentheses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>93 (%)</td>
<td>84 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>93 (%)</td>
<td>84 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>93 (%)</td>
<td>84 (%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1975 Coalition Votes

**House**


**Senate**


### Coalition Appearances, 1961-75

Following is the appearance of the recorded votes for both houses of Congress on which the coalition appeared:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coalition Victories, 1961-75

#### Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individual Scores

**Support**

Highest Coalition Support Scores. Those who voted with the conservative coalition most consistently in 1975:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Opposition**

Highest Coalition Opposition Scores. Those who voted against the conservative coalition most consistently in 1975:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democrats</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. All references to 1975 are in parentheses.

---

1. All references to 1975 are in parentheses.
## Conservative Coalition

### Support and Opposition: House

1. **Conservative Coalition Support, 1975.** Percentage of 170 conservative coalition recorded votes in 1975 on which representatives voted "yes" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

2. **Conservative Coalition Opposition, 1975.** Percentage of 170 conservative coalition recorded votes in 1975 on which representatives voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

3. **Conservative Coalition Support, 3rd Congress.** Percentage of 235 conservative coalition recorded votes in 1973 and 1974 on which representatives voted "yes" or "nay" in agreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

4. **Conservative Coalition Opposition, 3rd Congress.** Percentage of 235 conservative coalition recorded votes in 1973 and 1974 on which representatives voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with the position of the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1975.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1973 Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a member of 3rd Congress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State-by-State Analysis

#### KANSAS
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 87
  - 1973 Score: 87
  - 1974 Score: 87

#### MONTANA
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 72
  - 1973 Score: 72
  - 1974 Score: 72

#### NUEVA HAMPSHIRE
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 69
  - 1973 Score: 69
  - 1974 Score: 69

#### NEW JERSEY
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 61
  - 1973 Score: 61
  - 1974 Score: 61

#### NEW MEXICO
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 72
  - 1973 Score: 72
  - 1974 Score: 72

#### RHODE ISLAND
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 70
  - 1973 Score: 70
  - 1974 Score: 70

#### PENNSYLVANIA
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 110
  - 1973 Score: 110
  - 1974 Score: 110

#### SOUTH CAROLINA
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 78
  - 1973 Score: 78
  - 1974 Score: 78

#### WASHINGTON
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 86
  - 1973 Score: 86
  - 1974 Score: 86

#### WEST VIRGINIA
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 60
  - 1973 Score: 60
  - 1974 Score: 60

#### WISCONSIN
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 75
  - 1973 Score: 75
  - 1974 Score: 75

#### WYOMING
- **1st District**
  - 1975 Score: 59
  - 1973 Score: 59
  - 1974 Score: 59

### Additional Information

3. Rep. Edward F. C. Blair (D-Wash.) died Jan. 19, 1975. He opposed the coalition on the one issue for which he was eligible.
Southern Democrats split from their northern party brethren on 34 per cent of 1975 House and Senate votes, only rarely without Republican support.

A study of voting in the 1975 Senate, based on a review of the 434 recorded votes, revealed that 39 per cent of the southern Democrats opposed 166 out of 225 in the Senate and 170 out of 259 in the House. And the Southerners' position usually was successful only when they had Republican support.

The southern Democrats went their own way against both Republican and northern Democratic majorities on only 70 of 1,214 House and Senate recorded votes during the first session of the 94th Congress. Those issues for the most part dealt with strong regional, economic or emotional interests.

Without Republican support, southern Democrats won their point on only three of those 70 votes, united in a regional stance while Republicans and northern Democrats were dividing.

With Republican support on 336 other votes, by contrast, southern Democrats prevailed over northern Democrats 169 times, a 90 per cent success rate for the traditional congressional conservative coalition. (Conservative coalition study, p. 169.) House Democrats split along North-South lines on 189 recorded votes, 41 per cent of the 412 recorded votes taken in 1975. That was a marked increase in North-South splits from the 22 per cent record of 1974.

On all but 19 of those party-split votes, however, southern Democrats were joined by a majority of House Republicans. In 1974, southern Democrats had stood alone in only 14 House recorded votes.

In the Senate, southern Democrats backed northern Democrats on 37 per cent of 632 recorded votes in 1975. In 1974, the Senate North-South split rate was 29 per cent.

Splitting with northern Democrats on 220 Senate votes in 1975, southern Democrats were up against a Republican northern majority 34 times. In 1974, Senate southern Democrats went against Republican and northern Democratic majorities in 46 votes.

House

House Republicans, generally closely attuned to southern conservatism on economic and foreign policy issues, opposed southern Democrats by themselves in 19 North-South splits on regional issues during 1975.

Southern Democrats were only one of those 19 issues, turning back a northern-Republi­can-led attempt to drop a $3 million federal subsidy for a private cotton industry organization. That proposal lost by a three-vote margin, 196-199, as southern Democrats voted 6-79, northern Democrats 103-89 and Republicans 88-89. (Vote 885, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 1586.)

Southern Democrats were less unified on other issues, however, and Republicans and northern Democrats were less evenly divided. Southern Democrats therefore lost on 18 votes, including issues on which they:

- Opposed reconciliation of $12.9 million in appropriations for the Texas-built F-111 fighter-bomber and supported a $38.3 million appropriation to develop the F-15 fighter that the Navy had selected over the Texas-built F-16. (Vote 11, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 154; Votes 143 and 485, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 1388.)
- Backed government support for private efforts to develop oil shale and other non-commercial fuels and opposed federal support for mining curbs. (Vote 123, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 494; Votes 573 and 578, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 876.)
- Opposed additional federal aid for Northeast and Midwest railroads. (Vote 7, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 114.)
- Opposed U.S. contributions to the Inter-American Development Bank.

In the Senate, southern Democrats more frequently found themselves without majority Republican support, winning only two of 54 votes in which they lined up against both Republican and northern Democratic blocs.

In one of those votes, southern Democrats held off an effort to kill provisions to raise 1975 tobacco price supports. Southern Democrats voted 6-17 on that amendment, with northern Democrats dividing 19-16 and Republicans 16-16. (Vote 116, 1975 Weekly Report, p. 478.)

On another issue, southern Democrats voted 16-1 to table an amendment to emergency tax cut legislation (HR

Conservative Coalition Support and Opposition: Senate

1. Conservative Coalition Support, 1975. Percentage of 166 conservative coalition votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yes" or "nay" in agreement with the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

2. Conservative Coalition Opposition, 1975. Percentage of 166 conservative coalition votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

3. Conservative Coalition Support, 94th Congress. Percentage of 385 conservative coalition roll calls in 1974 and 1975 on which senator voted "yes" or "nay" in agreement with the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

4. Conservative Coalition Opposition, 94th Congress. Percentage of 385 conservative coalition roll calls in 1974 and 1975 on which senator voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with the conservative coalition. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

### Key

- "nay" not eligible for all recorded votes in 1975.
- "nay" not eligible for all recorded votes in 94th Congress.

Democrats Repub­licans

- Bold elected as Conservative.
- Italic elected as Independent.
2166) to discount a 10 per cent earned income credit for taxpayers with children in income determining to obtain their eligibility for federal benefit programs. Northern Democrats divided 18-23 and Republicans 16-16, so the proposal was defeated.

The 92 votes that the southern Democrats lost to combined Republican and northern Democratic majorities included:

- A series of 10 recorded votes during a week of maneuvering in which opponents failed to block and delay action on a measure (HR 6219) extending the 1965 voting rights act. (Votes 906, 910, 911, 918, 923, 928, 1975 Weekly Report pp. 1728-29; votes 811, 886-885, 1975 Weekly Report pp. 1728-29)
- Three preliminary votes and final passage of a measure (HR 6219) extending the 1965 voting rights act. (Votes 906, 910, 911, 918, 923, 928, 1975 Weekly Report pp. 1728-29)
- Scattered votes on Northeast railroad reorganization, common-site polling, foreign aid and defense spending, executive pay, Senate cloture rules and various other issues.

Individual Differences

To some extent, of course, North-South splits reflected differences between rural and urban areas, both within northern and southern states.

In the House, for instance, two Virginians were among the seven southern members who voted most consistently with the southern Democratic bloc on party-splitting votes. But two freshman Virginia members, elected by districts including the Washington, D.C., suburbs, were among the five southern Democrats who most frequently bolted to vote with the northern democratic majority.

In the Senate, the first-time southern Democrats voted least frequently with their region's party majority.

1975 Splits

The table below shows 1975 North-South splits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOTH CHAMBERS</th>
<th>Total Recorded Votes</th>
<th>North-South Percentage of Splits</th>
<th>Vote with the Northern Majority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

North-South Split History

The table below compares the number and percentage of 1975 splits in both chambers with figures for previous years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOTH CHAMBERS</th>
<th>Total Recorded Votes</th>
<th>North-South Percentage of Splits</th>
<th>Vote with the Northern Majority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Scores

The list below shows senators and representatives who supported the southern position most often and least often in 1975:

**SENAATE**

- Most 'Southern' Southerners: The southern Democratic senators who voted most frequently with the majority of voting southern Democrats in 1975 were: Sam Nunn (Ga.), 90 per cent; John L. McClellan (Ark.), 88; James B. Allen (Ala.), 85; Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. (Va.), an independent, led all senators with 92 per cent.
- Least 'Southern' Southerners: The southern Democratic senators who voted least frequently with the majority of voting southern Democrats in 1975 were: Dale Bumpers (Ark.), 34 per cent; Walter (Del) Huddleston (Ky.), 38; Wendell H. Ford (Ky.), 40; Lloyd Bentsen (Tex.), 50.
- Most 'Southern' Northerners: The northern Democratic senators who voted most frequently with the majority of voting northern Democrats in 1975 were: William J. Fulbright (Ark.), 86; James B. Allen (Ala.), 85; Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. (Va.), an independent, led all senators with 92 per cent.
- Least 'Southern' Northerners: The northern Democratic senators who voted least frequently with the majority of voting northern Democrats in 1975 were: W.C. (Dan) Daniel (S.C.), 86; James B. Allen (Ala.), 85; Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. (Va.), an independent, led all senators with 92 per cent.

**HOUSE**

- Most 'Southern' Southerners: The southern Democratic representatives who voted most frequently with the majority of voting southern Democrats on the 1975 party-splitting issues were: Sam Nunn (Ga.), 90 per cent; W.R. Poage (Texas), 90; Olin E. Teague (Okl.), 90; Joe D. Waggonner Jr. (La.), 90; G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery (Miss.), 90; Larry McDonald (Ga.), 90; David E. Satterfield III (Va.), 90.
- Least 'Southern' Southerners: The southern Democratic representatives who voted least frequently with the majority of voting southern Democrats in 1975 were: Hosea Anderson (Ga.), 10; Charles W. O'Rear (Ga.), 10; B. B. (Jack) Bpegg (Ala.), 10; James Oberstar (Minn.), 10.

The chart below and on the following page show how often individual Democrats voted with the southern and northern positions on party-splitting issues. The first two columns are based on 1970 Senate roll calls and the 189 House roll votes on which the majority of voting southern Democrats opposed the stand taken by the majority of voting northern Democrats in 1975. The last two columns show the votes of Democratic representatives on Senate roll calls and 273 House recorded votes in the 93rd Congress.

**COLUMN 1** gives the percentage of recorded votes on which the member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the majority of voting northern Democrats in 1975.

**COLUMN 2** gives the percentage of recorded votes on which the member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the majority of voting southern Democrats in the 93rd Congress.

**COLUMN 3** gives the percentage of recorded votes on which the member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the majority of voting northern Democrats in the 93rd Congress.

**COLUMN 4** gives the percentage of recorded votes on which the member voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the majority of voting southern Democrats in the 93rd Congress.
### Party Unity

**PARTY VOTING ROSE SHARPLY IN 1975**

**Definitions**

- **Party Unity Votes.** Recorded votes in the Senate and House that split the parties, a majority of voting Democrats opposing a majority of voting Republicans. Votes on which either party divides evenly are excluded.

- **Party Unity Scores.** Percentage of party unity votes on which a member votes "yes" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. Failure to vote even if a member announced his stand, lowers his score.

**Opposition-to-Party Scores.** Percentage of party unity votes on which a member votes "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. Failure to vote even if a member announced his stand, lowers his score.

### Northern Democratic Representatives' Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Northern Democrats</th>
<th>Montana</th>
<th>South Dakota</th>
<th>Nebraska</th>
<th>Nevada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scores**

- Party Unity Scores range from 0 to 100.
- Higher scores indicate greater party unity.

### Party Unity Voting Rose Sharply in 1975

Partisan voting in Congress increased sharply during 1975 over previous years. Almost half the votes taken in 1975 reflected partisan divisions—those where a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans. Of the 2,141 recorded votes, 984 or 46 per cent, were partisan.

The 1975 figure of 46 per cent compared with 37 per cent in 1974, the last session of the 93rd Congress. Partisan voting occurred on 41 per cent of the votes in 1973, 38 per cent in 1972 and 40 per cent in 1971. Those figures follow a pattern that has shown up in almost every Congress in the past two decades—a higher level of partisan voting in the first session of a Congress, followed by a drop in partisan divisions and an increase in bipartisan voting during congressional election years.

This variance is due to the House, whose members are up for re-election every other year. The percentage of partisan voting in the House appears to see-saw from the first session of a Congress to the second session, with the first session being more partisan. The Senate, on the other hand, has shown a consistent increase in partisan voting since 1972. The percentage of partisan votes there has increased by four percentage points a year from 1972 to 1975—from 36 per cent to 42 per cent to 48 per cent in 1975. In the House, the percentage has fluctuated, going from 27 per cent in 1972 to 42 per cent in 1973, 29 per cent in 1974 and 48 per cent in 1975.

The Democrats in both chambers won more of the partisan votes than the Republicans, as had been the case most of the time since the 83rd Congress (1953-54), when the Republicans last had majorities in either chamber. House Republicans, however, won more partisan votes than their Democratic rivals in the 92nd Congress (1971-72). On average, Democrats voted with their party on partisan votes slightly less than Republicans in 1975—69 per cent of the time compared with 70 per cent in 1974. That was the reverse of 1974, when Democrats voted with their party slightly more than Republicans—62 per cent to 57 per cent.

The significant change in 1975 was the sharp increase in party voting in both chambers among members of both parties. The House Republicans voted with his party on 69 per cent of partisan votes in 1975, up from 62 per cent in 1974. The average House Republican voted with his party on 72 per cent of partisan votes in 1975, compared with 63 per cent in 1974.

The average Senate Democrat voted with his party on 68 per cent of partisan votes in 1975, compared with 63 per cent in 1974. The average Senate Republican voted with his party on 64 per cent of partisan votes in 1975, up from 59 per cent in 1974.

Southern Democrats voted with their party on only 43 per cent of partisan votes in the Senate and 48 per cent in the House, indicating somewhat greater southern Democratic support of the party's position than in 1974.

### Northern Democratic Representatives' Scores Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Party Unity Score</th>
<th>Party Unity Score</th>
<th>Party Unity Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Totals

- **Total Recorded Votes:** 2,141
- **Party Unity Recorded Votes:** 984 (46%)
- **Per Cent of Total:** 46%
Party Unity - 2

| Total Record | Party Unity | Per Cent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Chambers</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parties won, Republicans lost
Democrats won, Republicans lost
Democrats voted unanimously
Republicans voted unanimously

Highest opposition-to-party scores—those who in 1975 most consistently voted against their party majority.

| Party Unity | Percentage of 478 Senate Party Unity votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. (Party Unity roll calls are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans. Failures to vote lowering both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.)
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Party Unity, 1975. Percentage of 478 Senate Party Unity votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party.
| 2. Party Opposition, 1975. Percentage of 478 Senate Party Unity votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party.

Party Unity and Party Opposition: Senate

| 1. Party Unity, 1975. Percentage of 478 Senate Party Unity votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with a majority of his party. (Party Unity roll calls are those on which a majority of voting Democrats opposed a majority of voting Republicans. Failures to vote lowering both Party Unity and Party Opposition scores.)
| 2. Party Opposition, 1975. Percentage of 478 Senate Party Unity votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yes" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party.
recorded votes in 1975 on which representative voted "yea" or "nay," and recorded votes in 1975 on which representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party.

Party Unity, 3rd Congress. Percentage of 364 House Party Unity recorded votes in 1975 and 1974 on which representative voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with the majority of his party.

Party Unity, 1975. Percentage of 266 House Party Unity recorded votes in 1975 on which representative voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with a majority of his party. (Party unity roll calls are those on which a majority of the party's representatives voted "yea" or "nay." Party unity scores do not indicate whether the votes were cast by party or as individuals.)

Party Unity and Party Opposition: House

- Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1975.
- Not eligible for all recorded votes in 3rd Congress.
- Not a member of 3rd Congress.

**Key**

- *Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1975.*
- *Not eligible for all recorded votes in 3rd Congress.*
- *Not a member of 3rd Congress.*
BIPARTISAN VOTING SHOWED DECLINE IN 1975

Members of Congress were not bound by party differences on about half of their recorded votes in 1975. According to Congressional Quarterly's annual study of bipartisan voting, majorities of Democrats and Republicans voted together on 52 per cent of the year's recorded votes. Bipartisan voting was somewhat more common in the years immediately preceding 1975. Majorities of both parties agreed on 53 per cent of recorded votes in 1974. In 1973, the total was 59 per cent. The 1975 figure of 52 per cent was the lowest recorded since 1964, when bipartisan voting showed up on 50 per cent of recorded votes.

Last year was the first season of the 94th Congress and, if past patterns hold, bipartisan voting will increase in 1976 even though it is a presidential election year. Congress as a whole usually has more bipartisan voting during the second session, largely because the House tends to be less bipartisan during years when its members are up for reelection.

In 1975, 630 of the 1,214 recorded votes Congress took showed bipartisan majorities. The votes were divided almost equally between the House and Senate, with each chamber recording scores of 52 per cent. In 1974, the House led in bipartisanship with 51 per cent, compared with 56 per cent in the Senate.

Democrats had a slight edge over Republicans in 1975 in supporting the bipartisan majority. The average Senate Democrat was with the majority on bipartisan votes 78 per cent of the time, compared with 68 per cent for the average Senate Republican. In the House, the average Democrat agreed with bipartisan majorities 86 per cent of the time, while the Republicans agreed on 76 per cent of the votes.

Indvidual Scores

Most of the members with high bipartisan voting scores were moderates from both parties. Those who opposed the bipartisan majority most often were strongly conservative, strongly liberal or, in some cases, "maverick" votes that politicians took unpredictably.

Senate

The Senate member with the highest bipartisan voting score, 90 per cent, was Republican J. Glenn Beall Jr. (Md.). Next in line was presidential hopeful Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) with 88 per cent, while the Republicans agreed on 76 per cent of the votes.

House

In the House, the highest bipartisan scores went to Republican Ralph S. Regula (Ohio) (94 per cent) and Democrat William H. Natcher (Ky.) (80 per cent). House members who voted against the bipartisan majority most often were conservatives Larry F. McDonald (D.Ga.) (50 per cent) and Steven D. Symms (R.Idaho) (44 per cent). Several liberal Democrats also were high on the list, including Elizabeth Holtzman (N.Y.), Bella S. Abzug (N.Y.) and Ronald V. Dellums (Calif.).

Ford's Position

Many of the bipartisan votes came on procedural or noncontroversial matters, such as the Senate's 58-0 approval in February of a resolution calling for a study of the food stamp program. But others occurred on more substantive issues.

President Ford usually was on the side of the majority on bipartisan votes where he took a clear position (96 out of the total 630 bipartisan votes in 1975). Ford was with the majority in 44 out of 54 bipartisan votes in the Senate, and 21 out of 32 House votes.

A bipartisan vote in the Senate, for example, approved the Ford administration's revised proposal to station U.S. forces in the Middle East to monitor a peace settlement. The bipartisan majority backed the President on another foreign policy vote in the Senate, disapproving funds the administration wanted to support a faction in the Angolan civil war.

Ford was on the winning side of one surprise bipartisan House vote in 1975—the 246-72 rejection of a proposal to authorize a gasoline tax of 20 cents a gallon. The Ways and Means Committee had built its congressional energy conservation program around the gas tax increase, but the President opposed the politically unpopular proposal.

Presidential Scoreboard

The following bipartisan support and opposition scores are composite—the percentage of time the average party member voted with or against a bipartisan majority on the Senate and House. Failures to vote lower both support and opposition scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipartisan Scoreboard</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic Support</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republican Support</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic Opposition</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republican Opposition</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual Scores

Highest bipartisan support scores—those who voted with bipartisan majorities most consistently in 1975:

**SENATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jackson (Wash.)</td>
<td>Beall (Md.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ransdell (W.Va.)</td>
<td>Stafford (Va.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leahy (Vt.)</td>
<td>Glenn (N.M.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford (Ky.)</td>
<td>Pearson (Ky.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mondale (Minn.)</td>
<td>Scott (Pa.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highest bipartisan opposition scores—those who voted against bipartisan majorities most consistently in 1975:

**SENATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republicans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natcher (Ky.)</td>
<td>Peake (Okla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall (Okla.)</td>
<td>Johnson (S.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentsen (S.D.)</td>
<td>McClellan (S.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prager (N.C.)</td>
<td>Hatfield (S.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moakley (Mass.)</td>
<td>Wirth (D.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy (D.C.)</td>
<td>Hubert (S.D.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricks (Ind.)</td>
<td>Weicker (S.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shalala (Fla.)</td>
<td>Huddleston (S.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks (Ky.)</td>
<td>Heflin (S.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanes (N.C.)</td>
<td>Bingham (S.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd (Tenn.)</td>
<td>Kefauver (S.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zellweger (Wyo.)</td>
<td>Johnson (S.D.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bipartisan Support - 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bipartisan Support</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1974</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic Support</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republican Support</strong></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Democratic Opposition</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Republican Opposition</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bipartisan Support

#### Bipartisan Support and Opposition: House

1. Bipartisan Support, 1975. Percentage of 216 "bipartisan" recorded votes in 1975 in which both parties' "yea" or "nay" in agreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

2. Bipartisan Opposition, 1975. Percentage of 216 "bipartisan" recorded votes in 1975 in which both parties' "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

3. Bipartisan Support, 93rd Congress. Percentage of 584 "bipartisan" recorded votes in 1973 and 1974 on which both parties' "yea" or "nay" in agreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

4. Bipartisan Opposition, 93rd Congress. Percentage of 584 "bipartisan" recorded votes in 1973 and 1974 on which both parties' "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

#### Key

- **Not eligible for all recorded votes in 1975.**
- **Not eligible for all recorded votes in 93rd Congress.**
- **Not a member of the House.**

#### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALASKA</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLORADO</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWAII</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANSAS</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KENTUCKY</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUISIANA</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARYLAND</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSISSIPPI</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTANA</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVADA</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW MEXICO</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKLAHOMA</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OREGON</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE ISLAND</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH CAROLINA</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH DAKOTA</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TENNESSEE</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTAH</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERMONT</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST VIRGINIA</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISCONSIN</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WYOMING</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IOWA CAUCUSES: AN EARLY TRIUMPH FOR CARTER

Months of spadework and a cool campaign style brought Jimmy Carter a resounding victory in the Iowa caucuses Jan. 24, 1976, pushing him within the reach of the benefits and perils of early front-runner status.

The former Georgia governor won no delegates in Iowa; none will be formally selected there for more than two months. But within hours of the caucuses, he already had the newspaper headlines and television coverage that made George McGovern a credible Democratic contender in 1972.

The caucus results quickly produced arguments that Carter would be unlikely to duplicate his showing in other states. Rival candidates pointed out that Carter held no political office in 1975, giving him an advantage in campaign days that will disappear now that others are running full-time. Other analysts noted that Carter won in Iowa on personal charm and individual contact, and that this will be impractical in larger states.

Nevertheless, the importance of the Iowa result to Carter's national standing was hard to overlook. If nothing else, he opened up a wide margin over Sen. Birch Bayh of Indiana, who drew less than half Carter's vote even though the two were expected to finish about even. Also disappointing were Morris K. Udall of Arizona, who finished fourth despite months of effort, and Brent Scriver, who did not show the strength he had hoped for in the Catholic neighborhoods of the larger cities.

The only candidate other than Carter who seemed pleased was former Sen. Fred R. Harris of Oklahoma, who finished third. "The winnowing-out process has begun," he told supporters, "and we have been winnowed in.

By 89 per cent of the caucus vote counted, Carter had 27.6 per cent of the vote, followed by Muskie 9.9, Udall 6.0, Shriver 4.9, and Sen. Henry M. Jackson of Washington 1.1. All the candidates fell below the 37.1 per cent recorded for an "uncommitted" preference. The heavily uncommitted vote was seen by some as a vote of discontent with all the contenders, but others said it simply reflected tactical decisions based on the political situation in individual precincts.

GOP Results

Iowa Republicans caucused Jan. 19, too, but the GOP rules of operation made the result unclear, and detracted from the excitement. Both McGovern and Muskie did not require caucus participants to state their candidate preference, so it was hard to tell who was winning. The candidates themselves did not give the caucuses much attention; President Ford did not visit at all and Ronald Reagan made only a brief airport appearance.

The only clue to Republican preference was a straw poll conducted at 52 randomly selected caucus sites of 583 participants. It was conducted by the GOP state committee to spur interest in the event. The response was a virtual dead heat: 45.3 per cent for Ford, 42.5 per cent for Reagan, and 10.2 per cent uncommitted. The Reagan campaign claimed the poll showed that Ford was in trouble in the Midwest, arguing that the President should have done better with the support of Iowa's Republican Gov. Robert Ray and much of the state party leadership. A spokesman for the Republican State Committee, however, stressed that the low uncommitted total reflected the satisfaction of party voters with their two options for President.

The Last War

The news coverage of the Democratic-caucus results was unprecedented. Never had a caucus state attracted so much attention, either from candidates or reporters. The political news from Iowa was new as frequently as the news from New Hampshire, scheduled to hold its first primary Feb. 2.

Part of this was due to a rules change. In 1976, all caucus participants are required to state either their candidate preference or their desire to remain uncommitted. This permits an instant hard count of candidate strength, and has made caucus coverage in all states simpler.

Perhaps more important, however, was the success of McGovern in the Iowa caucuses in 1972.

McGovern made an unexpectedly strong showing in Iowa, winning 22.6 per cent of the vote, compared to 35.8 per cent uncommitted and 26.8 per cent for the acknowledging frontrunner, Maine Sen. Edmund S. Muskie. McGovern's percentage, seven months earlier than his standing in the national polls at the time, was a breakthrough in his effort to show that he was more than a fringe candidate.

Viewing the emphasis placed on Iowa by Democratic contenders this year, Bob Skiranski, McGovern's 1972 caucus strategist, commented: "Like the generals fighting the last war, the candidates themselves make Iowa important in 1976." Both McGovern and Muskie campaigned less than a month between them in Iowa, used no broadcast advertising and left the bulk of their work to their staffs.

But this year's crop of contenders, hoping to duplicate McGovern's grass-roots success, gave the state an unprecedented amount of personal attention. The six active

Bipartisan Support and Opposition: Senate

1. Bipartisan Support, 93rd Congress. Percentage of 314 "bipartisan" votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

2. Bipartisan Opposition, 93rd Congress. Percentage of 314 "bipartisan" votes in 1975 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

3. Bipartisan Support, 94th Congress. Percentage of 660 "bipartisan" votes in 1975 and 1976 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in agreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.

4. Bipartisan Opposition, 94th Congress. Percentage of 660 "bipartisan" votes in 1975 and 1976 on which senator voted "yea" or "nay" in disagreement with majorities of voting Democrats and voting Republicans. Failures to vote lower both Support and Opposition scores.
Illinois Filing

Seven presidential candidates were certified by the Illinois Board of Elections for places on the advisory presidential preference ballot at the state convention on June 18 and 19. Thirty of their selections will be ratified and six more delegates will be chosen at the six district conventions. The remaining seven are ratified from the state convention on March 6, 1976.

The Democratic and Republican national conventions are elected separately, from congressional districts, with their presidential preference or uncommitted status identified on the ballot.

The filing deadline for delegate candidates was Jan. 14. Following is an unofficial breakdown of the preferences of delegate candidates. On the Democratic side, 170 are running pledged to Gov. Daniel Walker, 132 to Sen. Adlai E. Stevenson III, 135 to Wallace, 96 to Carter, 90 to Harris, 36 to Sen. Hubert Humphrey (Minn.), 18 to Shriver, 14 to Rep. Michael D. McClellan (Ariz.), 10 to Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (Mass.), seven to Sen. Birch Bayh (Ind.), one each to Sens. Lloyd Bentsen (Texas) and Harry M. Jackson (Wash.), and 107 uncommitted.

On the Republican side, 96 candidates for delegate pledged to Ford, 78 to Reagan and 56 uncommitted. The total number of delegates may be reduced slightly by withdrawals or failure to gain certification due to a lack of enough signature on filing petitions.

Florida Ballot

Fourteen presidential candidates were placed on the ballot Jan. 15 for the March 9 Florida presidential primary. The list of candidates was announced by Secretary of State Bruce Smathers, who headed the seven-member Presidential Candidates Selection Committee. The remaining seven are selected by the state convention. At all levels, a candidate or uncommitted group must have at least 15 percent of the vote to win the nomination.

The results of the precinct caucuses do not dictate the composition of the Iowa national convention delegation. The deregulation of the uncommitted bloc and the withdrawal of candidates before the convention will affect the vote. The candidates who are not on the ballot are not eligible for the state convention.

Utah

Another Senate campaign came into focus Jan. 15 with the announcement by Jack C. Warner, a Republican and a former assistant secretary of the interior, that he will challenge Democratic Sen. Frank E. Moss of Utah.

The Interior Department is something of a stepping stone to Senate politics; another assistant secretary, Jack Horton, is expected to challenge Democrat Sen. George S. McGovern of South Dakota.

Both candidates are expected to be the Republican nominees. They lost narrowly to the Democratic nominees in 1972 and 1974. Their campaigns will take the form of a presidential campaign, with the theme: "Let a businessman put New York back in business."

There are numerous Democratic possibilities for the New York state seat of James L. Buckley, who was elected in 1970 as a Conservative but joined the Republican conference in the Senate.

Governors

Amid the rush of Senate announcements, there were interesting gubernatorial developments. Gerald J. Zelller, New Hampshire's former commissioner of health and welfare, announced a primary challenge to Medford Thomson Jr., the state's incumbent Republican governor. Thomson, a hard-line conservative, turned back moderate opponents to win the nomination in 1972 and 1974. His Republican rivals had been expected to launch a similar effort against him in 1976. Zelller may be their man.

And in Indiana, State Treasurer Jack L. New announced Feb. 15 that he was running for the Democratic nomination. The Democratic primary is attracting a crowded field, though the Republican incumbent, Gov. Otis L. Bowen, appears strong.

Already announced on the Democratic side is the secretary of state, Larry Conrad. Expected to join the field is Senate candidate Steve Mendenhall, a Republican. Conrad is the best-known, but has made enemies within the party during his five years in state government.

In announcing his candidacy, New said that he was "off the record" and could not say how much he would spend.

In the Montana Senate race, with both the incumbent Democratic Sen. Mike Mansfield and Republican Sen. James E. McClure, both of whom are up for re-election, the race is currently a dead heat.
1. HR 7977. Indochinese Refugee Education Aid. Quie (R. Minn.) amendment to reimburse local school districts only for the actual costs incurred in providing education services to Indochinese refugees. Adopted 283-148; R 115-12; D 177-231; ND 65-106; SD 52-22, Jan. 19, 1976. (Shore, p. 198)

2. HR 7977. Indochinese Refugee Education Aid. Passage of the bill to make federal grants to states to reimburse local school districts for the actual costs they incurred in providing education services to Indochinese refugee students. Passed 81-76; R 101-32; D 210-43; ND 182-14; SD 49-20, Jan. 19, 1976. (Shore, p. 199)

3. H.R. 15377. Federal Reclamation Projects. Johnson (D Calif.) motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize $273 million for federal reclamation projects in Wyoming, North Dakota, Oregon and South Dakota. Motion agreed to 430-11; R 192-0; D 238-1; ND 76-2; SD 48-20, Jan. 20, 1976. A two-thirds majority vote (266 in 1976. A two-thirds majority vote of 266 in 386-12: R 116-11; D 109-1; ND 42-1; SD 3-3, Jan. 19, 1976. (Shore, p. 197)

4. HR 2710. 1976 Airborne Memorial. Nedzi (D Mich.) motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill to authorize the 1976 Airborne Division Association to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia or surrounding area. Motion agreed to 450-112; R 182-12; D 268-0; ND 98-20; SD 78-4, Jan. 20, 1976. A two-thirds majority vote (266 in 1976. A two-thirds majority vote of 266 in this case is required for passage under suspension of the rules. (Shore, p. 197)

5. S. 2719. Railroad Revitalization. Staggers (D W Va.) motion to suspend the rules and adopt the resolution of Sen Res 92 (SJR) to rescind House and Senate action of Dec. 19, 1975, in adopting the conference report on the bill and to recommit S 2718 to the conference committee. Motion agreed to 833-10; R 198-4; D 568-71; ND 186-1; SD 47-109, Jan. 20, 1976. A two-thirds majority vote (266 in 1976. A two-thirds majority vote of 266 in this case is required for passage under suspension of the rules. (Shore, p. 197)

6. HR 4731. Coal Leasing Amendments. Adoption of the resolution (H Res 96) providing for House floor consideration of the bill (see vote 19, p. 164). Adopted 366-12; R 156-11; D 209-6; ND 180-5; SD 2-2, Jan. 21, 1976.

7. HR 4731. Coal Leasing Amendments. Heatherly (D W Va.) amendment to prohibit any coal mining operations in the national parks system, the national wildlife refuge system, the national wilderness preservation system, the national system of trails and the wild and scenic river system. Adopted 270-32; R 111-20; D 159-12 (ND 186-2; SD 73-10), Jan. 21, 1976.

8. HR 4731. Coal Leasing Amendments. Ruppe (R Mich.) amendment to delete from the bill language to limit the size of a logical coal mining unit to 25,000 acres. Rejected 97-361; R 78-42; D 19-249 (ND 2-82; SD 17-470), Jan. 21, 1976.
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9. HR 7211, Coal Leasing Amendments. Ruppe (R Mich.) motion to recommit the bill (and thus kill it) to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Rejected 80-319: R 62-69; D 18-250 (ND 3-162; SD 15-88), Jan. 21, 1976.

10. HR 7211, Coal Leasing Amendments. Passage of the bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 to revise procedures governing the leasing and development of coal deposits on federal lands. Passed 344-51: R 92-36; D 252-16 (ND 186-2; SD 66-14), Jan. 21, 1976.

11. HR 10067, Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Amendments. Adoption of the resolution (H Res 967) providing for House floor consideration of the bill to authorize fiscal 1976-77 funds to carry out the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act, and strengthen federal authority to enforce the prohibition against tampering with auto odometers. Adopted 386-18: R 136-8; D 250-0 (ND 186-2; SD 76-4), Jan. 22, 1976.

12. HR 10067, Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Amendments. Passage of the bill to authorize $11.25-million in fiscal 1976-77 for the Department of Transportation to carry out the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act, and to strengthen the department's authority to enforce the prohibition against tampering with auto odometers. Passed 385-18: R 116-12; D 269-4 (ND 186-2; SD 76-4), Jan. 22, 1976.
RAIL MODERNIZATION BILL

House and Senate conferences reached agreement Jan. 22 on legislation to create a new version of the deregulation bill (S 2718) that was acceptable to President Ford.

The bill had been cleared by Congress on Dec. 19, the last day of the first session, but was never sent to the President because of the likelihood that Ford would veto it as an in-fiction. The new compromise reduced the overall authorizations in the bill to $6.37-billion. As originally approved, the estimated authorizations totaled between $7-billion and $7.5-billion. Final action is expected by the week of Jan. 26.

Since the bill had already been cleared, the House and Senate had to take the unusual parliamentary route of passing a separate measure canceling their December action. The House adopted Jan. 20 a resolution (H Con Res 597) formally canceling the earlier congressional approval of S 2718 and returning it to the conference committee. The vote was 288-12. The Senate then adopted H Con Res 597 by voice vote Jan. 21. (House vote 5, p. 189)

Objections

The main objection voiced by the Ford administration was the level of authorizations in the first conference version. One item the administration strenuously objected to, which was modified in the new version, was the $2.4-billion authorization for improved passenger service in the Northeast corridor between Washington, D.C., and Boston. Ford had requested only $1.4-billion for a more modest modernization program. Conferences agreed on $1.86-billion.

Regulations Dropped:

NEW POSTAL SERVICE POLICY

In an effort to improve relations with Congress, the U.S. Postal Service Jan. 12 announced the abolition of two polities that had been adopted in 1971 to protect the service from political pressure. Dropping a regulation that had been the source of considerable irritation to senators and representatives, the Postal Service declared that henceforth members could go directly to any level of the Postal Service with complaints consistent with constitutional complaints about mail service. Previously, members of Congress were required to take problems to Postal Service headquarters in Washington, D.C., even though they might have a district office in the same building as the local postmaster.

The second regulation dropped by the Postal Service had prohibited members from taking part in deliberative conferences for new post offices. That rule had been adopted in 1971 in an effort to divest the political image of the Post Office Department that was reorganized into the Postal Service in 1971. The new policy was a compromise that would permit members to participate in opening day ceremonies, but they may not make speeches.

The policy changes were announced by a Postal Service increasingly nervous about its future. An oversupply of growing debt and deteriorating service, the House assumed postal officials in 1975 by voting to require the Postal Service to come to Congress for annual appropriations, a change that would end the Postal Service's independence. The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee planned to consider that proposal, along with a Postal Service request for increased subsidies, in January or February. (1975 Weekly Report p. 2411)

House Passage:

EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

The House Jan. 20 passed by voice vote under suspension of the rules barring floor amendments a bill (HR 9630) authorizing $35.76-million in new broadcasting facilities and telecommunications demonstration projects for fiscal 1977 and the budget transition period, July-September 1976.

The non-controversial measure was a one-year extension of the public broadcasting matching grants program that was first authorized in a 1962 law (PL 87-447). Designed to stimulate greater use of education programming, the bill would provide a federal share of up to 55 per cent for the purchase and installation of radio and television broadcasting equipment.

The $37.5-million in the bill reserved for the matching funds program would not be used for the purchase of land or for building costs.

Five classes of applicants would be eligible for the authorizations under the program: 1) public schools, 2) state public broadcasting agencies, 3) public colleges and universities, 4) nonprofit public broadcasters and 5) municipalities operating public broadcasting agencies. To promote the growth of public radio, which had lagged behind public television, the bill proposed separate priorities for awards to television and radio stations.

HR 9630 also authorized $1,250,000 in new funds for a demonstration program to promote the development of nonbroadcast telecommunications—satellite, cable, fiber optics and other means of transmission.

Both the facility grants and demonstration programs would be administered by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. HR 9630 was reported (H Rept 94-772) unanimously Jan. 19 by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

TRANSPORTATION NOTES

Highway Bill

Conferees to the bill (HR 8235) amending the Federal-Aid Highway Act were appointed by the Senate Jan. 19 and by the House Jan. 20. Conferees' negotiations on the widely varying House and Senate versions were scheduled to begin Jan. 27 and were expected to take a month or longer. (House passage 1975 Weekly Report p. 2900; Senate action, p. 3785)
HEARINGS BEGIN ON INTELLIGENCE PANEL PROPOSAL

The Senate Government Operations Committee Jan. 21 began eight days of hearings on proposals to create a committee on intelligence oversight. Chairman Abraham Ribicoff (D Conn.) said he hoped to have a bill reported by March 1 for consideration by the Senate Rules Committee.

Testifying in favor of a new Senate panel to monitor the intelligence functions of the CIA, FBI, National Security Council and other intelligence components of the federal government were Sen. Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D Mont.) and Frank Church (D Idaho), chairman of the Senate Select Intelligence Committee. Both called for an oversight panel that would: 1) have a rotating membership to assure the committee did not become too close to the agencies being supervised, 2) consider all budgetary requests of the various intelligence agencies on an annual basis, and 3) receive reports from the executive branch on covert actions being planned before they were implemented.

Mansfield, on the other hand, declared that Congress should "be in on the take-off" of a covert plan. He told the committee that if the intelligence panel was opposed to a covert proposal, it should inform the administration and take the dispute to the Senate floor for a vote within 30 days.

Differing with both Mansfield and Church as well as with others on the Ribicoff committee who favored a new oversight apparatus was John G. Tower (R Texas), vice chairman of the Senate Select Intelligence Committee. Tower said that "too, initially leaned toward the creation of a separate oversight committee," but "I am now of the view that haste and simplicity may be the enemy of a solution." Tower asserted that the legislation being drafted to set up the committee—"which is expected to be released by the select committee by the end of January—began with the "assumption that existing committees are incompetent to pursue implementation of the findings and recommendations" for improved oversight.

Breaking with the bipartisan consensus that had existed previously on the Senate intelligence committee, Tower said he was "not prepared to accept the legislation as drafted...because I believe serious analysis will reveal it to be both a premature and a simplistic solution to an extremely complicated set of problems," Tower added.

Senate Overrides Veto:

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

The Senate Jan. 23 voted to override President Ford's Dec. 31 veto of legislation (S 2500) adding the secretary of the treasury as a member of the National Security Council. The vote was 72-16, 13 more than the two-thirds majority necessary to override a veto.

A date had not yet been announced for an override vote in the House.

The bill had been passed by the Senate Oct. 9 and by the House without amendment Dec. 17. (Final passage, 1977 Weekly Report p. 940; veto message, p. 60).

In his veto message, the President argued that the bill was unnecessary because many channels exist advising the President on the integration of foreign economic policy. "Most issues that come before the council on a regular basis do not have significant economic and monetary implications," he said.

Stuart Symington (D Mo.), the legislation's sponsor, in Senate debate Jan. 22 urged that the veto be overridden: "That this President, or any President, would subscribe to the narrow view that national security is limited to only diplomatic and military problems—and would not automatically include economic considerations—is little short of astounding."

Speaking in favor of the committee version during floor debate Jan. 19, Rep. Edward Labor Committee Chairman Carl D. Perkins (D Ky.) contended that the administration had promised to pay the full costs of educating the estimated 40,000 Indochinese refugee children. "But now," he added, "the administration has backed down on these commitments and is giving grants which average only one-fourth of the costs of providing a regular education."

Most of the children, Perkins added, needed bilingual education and other special services which "wegoing to cost more money than is involved in providing a regular education."

Calling the committee version a "rip-off," Albert H. Quie (R Minn.), ranking Republican on the committee, offered the amendment cutting back funding. "We ought to reimburse school districts for what they actually spend on refugee children rather than make lump sum payments which they can use for almost anything," he declared.

Congress would not be justified in making payments to a school "where they hire no additional teacher, where they do not pay the teacher any more, where they do not buy any more materials of any kind, where they do not have to buy additional school buses," Quie added.

Still others sided with the Ford administration, opposing any additional grants altogether. "We absorbed 80,000 Hungarian refugees without special programs," said R. Lawrence Coughlin (R Pa.). "We absorbed 450,000 displaced persons and 189,000 eastern Europeans without special programs. We annually absorb about 400,000 immigrants without special programs."

Quie's amendment, which also would limit the program to fiscal 1978, passed on a 235-143 vote. (Vote l, p. 198)

As an aide to Quie said a previous estimate could not be made but suggested that Quie's amendment might cut the cost of the program to one-third of what the committee version would have cost.

After passing the bill, the House agreed to substitute its language for that of S 2145, passed by the Senate Oct. 29, 1975. The Senate bill would authorize $125.5-million in fiscal 1976-77 for reimbursements to school districts. (1978 Weekly Report p. 1884).
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