The original documents are located in Box 31, folder "Revenue Sharing - Votes in 1972" of the James M. Cannon Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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

Digitized from Box 31 of the James M. Cannon Files
at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.

House passage of Revenue Sharing. H.R. 14370. Vote Number 147.

CQ vote 146 is Motion to recommit

- KEY -

- Y Record vote for (yea).
- ✓ Paired for.
- † Announced for.
- # CQ poll for.
- N Record vote against (nay).
- X Paired against.
- \- Announced against.
- • CQ poll against.
- ? Not voting, voted "present," did not announce or answer poll.
- T Recorded teller vote.

	146	147	148T	149T	150T	151T	152
ALABAMA							
1 Edwards	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
2 Dickinson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Andrews, E.	✓	X	?	?	?	?	?
4 Nichols	N	Y	N	•	#	N	#
5 Flowers	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
6 Buchanan	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
7 Bevill	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
8 Jones	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
ALASKA							
AL Begich	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
ARIZONA							
1 Rhodes	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 Udall	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Steiger	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
ARKANSAS							
1 Alexander	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
2 Mills	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
3 Hammerschmidt	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
4 Pryor	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
CALIFORNIA							
1 Clausen	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
2 Johnson	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
3 Moss	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Leggett	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
5 Burton	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
6 Mailliard	•	#	•	#	•	•	#
7 Dellums	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
8 Miller	N	Y	•	?	•	•	#
9 Edwards	N	Y	#	N	Y	Y	Y
10 Gubser	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
11 McCloskey	N	Y	?	•	?	?	?
12 Talcott	N	Y	N	Y	N	•	?
13 Teague	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
14 Waldie	X	✓	#	•	#	#	#
15 McFall	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
16 Sisk	Y	N	?	N	N	N	Y
17 Anderson	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
18 Mathias	N	Y	N	N	•	N	Y
19 Holifield	Y	N	#	N	N	N	Y
20 Smith	Y	N	•	•	•	•	#
21 Hawkins	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
22 Corman	Y	N	?	•	#	#	#
23 Clawson	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
24 Rousselot	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
25 Wiggins	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
26 Rees	Y	N	Y	N	N	•	#
27 Goldwater	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
28 Bell	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
29 Danielson	N	Y	†	-	†	†	†
30 Roybal	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
31 Wilson	N	Y	•	•	#	•	#
32 Hosmer	#	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
33 Pettis	•	†	#	†	•	#	†
34 Hanna	Y	Y	•	•	•	•	#
35 Schmitz	✓	X	?	?	?	?	?
36 Wilson	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
37 Van Deerlin	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
38 Veysey	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
COLORADO							
1 McKevitt	N	Y	N	•	N	N	Y
2 Brotzman	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
3 Evans	✓	X	?	?	?	?	?
4 Aspinall	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
CONNECTICUT							
1 Cotter	N	Y	Y	N	#	#	#
2 Steele	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
3 Giaimo	N	X	Y	N	Y	N	Y
4 McKinney	N	#	N	N	N	N	Y
5 Monagan	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
6 Grasso	N	Y	Y	Y	•	#	#
DELAWARE							
AL DuPont	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
FLORIDA							
1 Sikes	Y	N	•	•	N	N	Y
2 Fuqua	✓	X	#	•	•	•	#
3 Bennett	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
4 Chappell	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
5 Frey	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
6 Gibbons	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Haley	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Young	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
9 Rogers	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
10 Burke	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
11 Pepper	N	Y	•	•	•	•	?
12 Fascell	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
GEORGIA							
1 Hagan	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
2 Mathis	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Brinkley	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Blackburn	Y	N	N	N	N	#	Y
5 Thompson	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
6 Flynt	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
7 Davis	N	Y	Y	?	Y	N	Y
8 Stuckey	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	?	Y
9 Landrum	N	Y	?	?	N	?	Y
10 Stephens	N	Y	?	?	N	?	Y
HAWAII							
1 Matsunaga	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
2 Mink	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
IDAHO							
1 McClure	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
2 Hansen	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
ILLINOIS							
1 Metcalfe	X	✓	?	?	?	?	?
2 Mikva	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
3 Murphy, M.	N	Y	Y	?	?	?	?
4 Derwinski	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
5 Kluczynski	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
6 Collins	N	Y	Y	N	?	?	?
7 Annunzio	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
8 Rostenkowski	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
9 Yates	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
10 Collier	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
11 Pucinski	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
12 McClory	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
13 Crane	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
14 Erlenborn	#	✓	•	•	•	•	#
15 Carlson	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
16 Anderson	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
17 Arends	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
18 Michel	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
19 Railsback	N	Y	N	N	•	N	Y
20 Findley	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
21 Gray	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
22 Springer	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
23 Shipley	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
24 Price	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
INDIANA							
1 Madden	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Landgrebe	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
3 Brademas	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Roush	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Hillis	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
6 Bray	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
7 Myers	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
8 Zion	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
9 Hamilton	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
10 Dennis	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
11 Jacobs	Y	N	[illegible]	Y	Y	Y	Y
IOWA							
1 Schwengel	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
2 Culver	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
3 Gross	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 Kyl	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
5 Smith	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
6 Mayne	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
7 Scherle	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
KANSAS							
1 Sebelius	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N
2 Roy	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y
3 Winn	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
4 Shriver	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
5 Skubitz	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y
KENTUCKY							
1 Stubblefield	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 Natcher	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
3 Mazzoli	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Snyder	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Carter	N	Y	N	N	?	N	Y
6 Curlin	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
7 Perkins	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
LOUISIANA							
1 Hebert	N	Y	?	?	?	?	[illegible]
2 Boggs	N	Y	N	N	N	N	[illegible]
3 Caffery	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	[illegible]
4 Waggonner	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	[illegible]
5 Passman	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	[illegible]
6 Rarick	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Vacancy							
8 Long	Y	N	Y	?	?	?	[illegible]
MAINE							
1 Kyros	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	[illegible]
2 Hathaway	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	[illegible]
MARYLAND							
1 Mills	N	Y	N	N	N	N	[illegible]
2 Long	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	[illegible]
3 Garmatz	N	Y	?	N	N	N	[illegible]
4 Sarbanes	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	[illegible]
5 Hogan	N	Y	N	•	N	N	[illegible]
6 Byron	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	[illegible]
7 Mitchell	X	✓	#	•	#	#	[illegible]
8 Gude	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	[illegible]
MASSACHUSETTS							
1 Conte	N	Y	N	N	N	N	[illegible]
2 Boland	N	Y	•	•	•	•	[illegible]
3 Drinan	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	[illegible]
4 Donohue	N	Y	Y	N	•	Y	[illegible]
5 Vacancy							
6 Harrington	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	[illegible]
7 Macdonald	N	Y	Y	N	#	#	[illegible]
8 O'Neill	N	✓	Y	N	Y	N	Y
9 Hicks	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
10 Heckler	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
11 Burke	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
12 Keith	N	?	?	?	?	?	?
MICHIGAN							
1 Conyers	N	Y	Y	N	Y	?	?
2 Esch	•	#	•	•	•	•	#
3 Brown	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
4 Hutchinson	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
5 Ford	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
6 Chamberlain	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
7 Riegle	N	Y	?	?	?	?	Y
8 Harvey	Y	Y	N	?	N	Y	Y
9 Vander Jagt	N	Y	N	N	N	N	#
10 Cederberg	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	[illegible]
11 Ruppe	N	Y	N	Y	N	[illegible]	[illegible]
12 O'Hara	N	Y	?	?	?	[illegible]	[illegible]
13 Diggs	•	Y	•	•	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
14 Nedzi	N	Y	Y	N	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
15 Ford	N	Y	Y	N	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
16 Dingell	N	Y	Y	N	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
17 Griffiths	N	Y	?	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18 Broomfield	N	Y	•	•	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
19 McDonald	N	Y	N	N	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
MINNESOTA							
1 Quie	N	Y	N	Y	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
2 Nelsen	N	Y	•	#	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
3 Frenzel	N	Y	•	#	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
4 Karth	N	Y	Y	N	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
5 Fraser	N	Y	#	#	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
6 Zwach	N	Y	?	?	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
7 Bergland	N	Y	Y	N	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
8 Blatnik	X	✓	?	?	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
MISSISSIPPI							
1 Abernethy	✓	X	#	•	[illegible]	[illegible]	#
2 Whitten	Y	N	N	N	N	[illegible]	[illegible]
3 Griffin	Y	N	N	Y	N	[illegible]	[illegible]
4 Montgomery	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
5 Colmer	Y	N	Y	?	?	[illegible]	?
MISSOURI							
1 Clay	N	Y	?	?	[illegible]	?	?
2 Symington	N	Y	Y	N	[illegible]	#	Y

Democrats — *Republicans*

146. HR 14370. Revenue Sharing With the States Byrnes (R Wis.) motion to recommit the bill *(vote 147, below)* to the Ways and Means Committee with instructions to report it back after deleting retroactive payment of $2.65-billion for fiscal year 1972. Rejected 157-241: R 61-104; D 96-137 (ND 43-113; SD 53-24), June 22, 1972. A "nay" was a vote supporting the President's position.

147. HR 14370. Revenue Sharing With the States. Passage of the bill providing assistance payments totaling $29.6-billion over five years to states and to local governments for high-priority expenditures, encouraging states to broaden their tax systems and authorizing federal collection of state personal income taxes. Passed 275-122: R 122-42; D 153-80 (ND 124-32; SD 29-48), June 22, 1972. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

148(T). HR 15585. Treasury Department-Postal Service Appropriations, Fiscal 1973. Macdonald (D Mass.) amendment decreasing by $2-million, to $1-million from $3-million, funds for salaries and expenses of the Office of Telecommunications Policy. Rejected by recorded teller vote 148-188: R 7-140; D 141-48 (ND 112-15; SD 29-33), June 22, 1972.

149(T). HR 15585. Treasury Department-Postal Service Appropriations, Fiscal 1973. Gross (R Iowa) amendment deleting all funds in the bill ($100,000) for the salaries and expenses of the Commission on Executive, Legislative and

	146	147	148T	149T	150T	151T	152
3 Sullivan	N	Y	#	#	#	#	#
4 Randall	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
5 Bolling	Y	N	•	•	•	•	#
6 Hull	Y	N	N	N	N	N	#
7 *Hall*	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
8 Ichord	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	?	?
9 Hungate	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Burlison	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
MONTANA							
1 *Shoup*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 Melcher	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
NEBRASKA							
1 *Thone*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 *McCollister*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
3 *Martin*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
NEVADA							
AL Baring	Y	N	N	Y	[illegible]	Y	Y
NEW HAMPSHIRE							
1 *Wyman*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 *Cleveland*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
NEW JERSEY							
1 *Hunt*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 *Sandman*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
3 Howard	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Thompson	X	✓	#	•	#	#	#
5 *Frelinghuysen*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
6 *Forsythe*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
7 *Widnall*	N	Y	•	•	N	N	Y
8 Roe	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Helstoski	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
10 Rodino	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
11 Minish	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
12 *Dwyer*	N	Y	•	•	•	•	#
13 Gallagher	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
14 Daniels	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
15 Patten	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
NEW MEXICO							
1 *Lujan*	?	X	?	?	?	?	?
2 Runnels	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEW YORK							
1 Pike	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
2 *Grover*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
3 Wolff	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 *Wydler*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
5 *Lent*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
6 *Halpern*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
7 Addabbo	N	Y	N	N	N	•	#
8 Rosenthal	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Delaney	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
10 Celler	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
11 Brasco	N	Y	N	•	#	#	#
12 Chisholm	N	Y	#	•	?	#	#
13 Podell	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
14 Rooney	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
15 Carey	N	Y	?	N	Y	Y	Y
16 Murphy	N	Y	•	N	N	Y	Y
17 Koch	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
18 Rangel	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
19 Abzug	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
20 Ryan	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
21 Badillo	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
22 Scheuer	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
23 Bingham	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
24 Biaggi	N	Y	Y	N	Y	?	#
25 *Peyser*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
26 Reid	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
27 Dow	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
28 *Fish*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
29 Stratton	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
30 *King*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
31 *McEwen*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
32 *Pirnie*	N	Y	?	?	?	?	Y
33 *Robison*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
34 *Terry*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
35 Hanley	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
36 *Horton*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
37 *Conable*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
38 *Hastings*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
39 *Kemp*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
40 *Smith*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
41 Dulski	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
NORTH CAROLINA							
1 Jones	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Fountain	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
3 Henderson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Galifianakis	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 *Mizell*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
6 Preyer	N	Y	#	•	Y	N	Y
7 Lennon	Y	N	#	#	#	#	#
8 *Ruth*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
9 *Jonas*	Y	N	?	?	?	?	?
10 *Broyhill*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
11 Taylor	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NORTH DAKOTA							
1 *Andrews*	X	✓	•	?	•	•	?
2 Link	N	Y	?	•	?	?	?
OHIO							
1 *Keating*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 *Clancy*	Y	N	N	Y	?	N	Y
3 *Whalen*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
4 *McCulloch*	Y	Y	N	Y	?	N	Y
5 *Latta*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
6 *Harsha*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
7 *Brown*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
8 *Betts*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
9 Ashley	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
10 *Miller*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
11 *Stanton*	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
12 *Devine*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
13 *Mosher*	•	?	•	•	•	?	?
14 Seiberling	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 *Wylie*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
16 *Bow*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
17 *Ashbrook*	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
18 Hays	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
19 Carney	N	Y	•	Y	•	?	Y
20 Stanton	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
21 Stokes	N	Y	•	•	•	[illegible]	Y
22 Vanik	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	[illegible]	Y
23 *Minshall*	N	Y	#	#	#	[illegible]	Y
24 *Powell*	Y	N	N	Y	N	[illegible]	Y
OKLAHOMA							
1 *Belcher*	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
2 Edmondson	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
3 Albert			?	N	N	?	
4 Steed	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
5 Jarman	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
6 *Camp*	Y	N	N	N	N	[illegible]	Y
OREGON							
1 *Wyatt*	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
2 Ullman	N	Y	Y	N	Y	#	Y
3 Green	Y	N	Y	Y	N	#	#
4 *Dellenback*	Y	Y	?	?	?	?	?
PENNSYLVANIA							
1 Barrett	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
2 Nix	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
3 Byrne	?	✓	?	?	?	?	?
4 Eilberg	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Green	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
6 Yatron	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
7 *Williams*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
8 *Biester*	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
9 *Ware*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
10 *McDade*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
11 Flood	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
12 *Whalley*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
13 *Coughlin*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
14 Moorhead	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
15 Rooney	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
16 *Eshleman*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
17 *Schneebeli*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
18 *Heinz*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
19 *Goodling*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
20 Gaydos	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
21 Dent	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
22 *Saylor*	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
23 *Johnson*	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
24 Vigorito	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
25 Clark	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
26 Morgan	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
27 *Conover*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
RHODE ISLAND							
1 St Germain	X	Y	?	?	?	?	?
2 Tiernan	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
SOUTH CAROLINA							
1 Davis	✓	X	?	?	?	?	?
2 *Spence*	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
3 Dorn	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
4 Mann	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Gettys	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
6 McMillan	✓	X	?	?	?	?	?
SOUTH DAKOTA							
1 Denholm	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Abourezk	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
TENNESSEE							
1 *Quillen*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 *Duncan*	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y
3 *Baker*	Y	N	•	?	•	?	?
4 Evins	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	#	#
5 Fulton	N	Y	•	•	•	•	#
6 Anderson	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
7 Blanton	?	?	?	?	?	?	#
8 Jones	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
9 *Kuykendall*	N	Y	N	•	•	•	#
TEXAS							
1 Patman	N	N	?	?	?	?	?
2 Dowdy	✓	X	?	?	?	?	?
3 *Collins*	Y	Y	N	Y	N	?	#
4 Roberts	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
5 Cabell	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
6 Teague	Y	N	?	?	?	?	?
7 *Archer*	Y	N	?	?	N	Y	Y
8 Eckhardt	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Brooks	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
10 Pickle	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
11 Poage	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
12 Wright	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
13 Purcell	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
14 Young	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
15 de la Garza	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
16 White	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
17 Burleson	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
18 *Price*	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
19 Mahon	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
20 Gonzalez	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
21 Fisher	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
22 Casey	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y
23 Kazen	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
UTAH							
1 McKay	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
2 *Lloyd*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
VERMONT							
AL *Mallary*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
VIRGINIA							
1 Downing	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
2 *Whitehurst*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
3 Satterfield	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
4 Abbitt	Y	N	?	?	?	?	?
5 Daniel	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
6 *Poff*	N	Y	•	•	•	•	#
7 *Robinson*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
8 *Scott*	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
9 *Wampler*	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
10 *Broyhill*	Y	N	N	•	N	N	Y
WASHINGTON							
1 *Pelly*	•	#	•	#	•	•	#
2 Meeds	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
3 Hansen	N	Y	#	•	•	#	Y
4 McCormack	X	✓	#	•	#	•	#
5 Foley	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	?
6 Hicks	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
7 Adams	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
WEST VIRGINIA							
1 Mollohan	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
2 Staggers	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Slack	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
4 Hechler	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Kee	N	Y	?	?	?	?	Y
WISCONSIN							
1 Aspin	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Kastenmeier	N	Y	?	?	?	?	?
3 *Thomson*	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
4 Zablocki	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
5 Reuss	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
6 *Steiger*	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
7 Obey	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 *Byrnes*	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y
9 *Davis*	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
10 *O'Konski*	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N
WYOMING							
AL Roncalio	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Judicial Salaries. Rejected by recorded teller vote 135-196: R 92-49; D 43-147 (ND 20-111; SD 23-36), June 22, 1972.

150(T). HR 15585. Treasury Department-Postal Service Appropriations, Fiscal 1973. Udall (D Ariz.) amendment limiting salary expenses for employees of the Executive Office of the President to $29,737,760 and setting a personnel ceiling of 1,647 employees. Rejected by recorded teller vote 122-210: R 11-133; D 111-77 (ND 84-40; SD 27-37), June 22, 1972.

151(T). HR 15585. Treasury Department-Postal Service Appropriations, Fiscal 1973. Jacobs (D Ind.) amendment prohibiting the use of funds for the purchase or lease of chauffeurs or limousines for the use of any person other than the President, cabinet members and employees of the Executive Office of the President. Rejected by recorded teller vote 121-205: R 30-116; D 91-89 (ND 71-49; SD 20-40), June 22, 1972.

152. HR 15585. Treasury Department-Postal Service Appropriations, Fiscal 1973. Passage of the bill appropriating $5,057,145,000 for the Treasury Department ($1,675,977,000), the U.S. Postal Service ($1,410,000,000), the Executive Office of the President ($179,446,000) and other independent agencies ($1,791,722,000) for fiscal year 1973. Passed 322-11: R 143-6; D 179-5 (ND 120-2; SD 59-3), June 22, 1972.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.

JIM:

Enclosed are CQ votes on Revenue Sharing. House and Senate votes on final passage and House Rule...

maggie

(don't you remember - final passage -- Agnes struck and we all had dinner at Sans Souci)

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.

House vote on Conference
Report on Revenue Sharing
CQ vote 308.

House recedes from disagreements
to Senate amendments
CQ vote 309

- KEY -

- Y Record vote for (yea).
- ✓ Paired for.
- † Announced for.
- # CQ poll for.
- N Record vote against (nay).
- X Paired against.
- \- Announced against.
- • CQ poll against.
- ? Not voting, voted "present," did not announce or answer poll.
- T Recorded teller vote.

	303	304	305	306	307	308	309
ALABAMA							
1 Edwards	#	#	#	#	Y	Y	Y
2 Dickinson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Andrews E.	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Nichols	#	#	#	#	#	✓	#
5 Flowers	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Buchanan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Bevill	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Jones	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N	Y
ALASKA							
AL Begich	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
ARIZONA							
1 Rhodes	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Udall	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
3 Steiger	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
ARKANSAS							
1 Alexander	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Mills	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Hammerschmidt	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Pryor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
CALIFORNIA							
1 Clausen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Johnson	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Moss	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
4 Leggett	Y	Y	Y	?	#	Y	Y
5 Burton	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
6 Mailliard	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Dellums	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
8 Miller	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
9 Edwards	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
10 Gubser	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 McCloskey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 Talcott	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Teague	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Waldie	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
15 McFall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
16 Sisk	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
17 Anderson	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
18 Mathias	Y	Y	Y	?	?	Y	Y
19 Holifield	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
20 Smith	Y	N	N	?	?	N	Y
21 Hawkins	Y	?	?	?	?	✓	N
22 Corman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
23 Clawson	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
24 Rousselot	Y	N	N	Y	Y	X	Y
25 Wiggins	Y	Y	Y	Y	#	Y	Y
26 Rees	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
27 Goldwater	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
28 Bell	?	?	?	?	?	✓	?
29 Danielson	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
30 Roybal	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
31 Wilson	#	#	Y	N	Y	Y	N
32 Hosmer	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
33 Pettis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
34 Hanna	Y	Y	Y	?	?	✓	?
35 Schmitz	?	?	?	?	?	X	?
36 Wilson	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
37 Van Deerlin	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
38 Veysey	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
COLORADO							
1 McKevitt	Y	N	Y	Y	#	✓	#
2 Brotzman	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Evans	?	?	?	?	?	X	?
4 Aspinall	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
CONNECTICUT							
1 Cotter	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Steele	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Giaimo	Y	Y	Y	?	?	X	?
4 McKinney	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
5 Monagan	Y	Y	#	#	#	X	#
6 Grasso	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
DELAWARE							
AL DuPont	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
FLORIDA							
1 Sikes	Y	Y	#	#	Y	N	Y
2 Fuqua	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Bennett	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
4 Chappell	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Frey	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Gibbons	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N	Y
7 Haley	?	?	?	?	?	X	?
8 Young	Y	N	Y	?	Y	N	Y
9 Rogers	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Burke	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
11 Pepper	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 Fascell	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
GEORGIA							
1 Hagan	Y	?	N	N	?	N	Y
2 Mathis	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
3 Brinkley	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
4 Blackburn	Y	Y	#	•	#	X	#
5 Thompson	Y	N	Y	?	?	?	?
6 Flynt	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
7 Davis	Y	?	?	?	?	N	Y
8 Stuckey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
9 Landrum	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Stephens	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y
HAWAII							
1 Matsunaga	#	#	#	#	#	✓	#
2 Mink	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
IDAHO							
1 McClure	?	?	?	?	Y	?	?
2 Hansen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
ILLINOIS							
1 Metcalfe	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Mikva	N	?	?	?	Y	Y	Y
3 Murphy, M.	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	Y
4 Derwinski	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Kluczynski	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Collins	?	?	?	?	?	Y	N
7 Annunzio	#	#	#	#	Y	Y	Y
8 Rostenkowski	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Yates	?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
10 Collier	Y	Y	#	Y	Y	N	Y
11 Pucinski	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	?
12 McClory	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
13 Crane	?	?	?	?	?	X	?
14 Erlenborn	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 Carlson	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
16 Anderson	Y	?	✓	?	Y	Y	Y
17 Arends	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
18 Michel	Y	N	Y	#	Y	N	Y
19 Railsback	Y	N	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
20 Findley	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
21 Gray	?	Y	?	?	?	Y	Y
22 Springer	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
23 Shipley	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
24 Price	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
INDIANA							
1 Madden	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	N
2 Landgrebe	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Brademas	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
4 Roush	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Hillis	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Bray	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Myers	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Zion	Y	?	✓	?	Y	Y	Y
9 Hamilton	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
10 Dennis	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
11 Jacobs	N	Y	Y	Y	#	N	Y
IOWA							
1 Schwengel	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Culver	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Gross	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
4 Kyl	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Smith	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
6 Mayne	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Scherle	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
KANSAS							
1 Sebelius	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Roy	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Winn	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Shriver	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Skubitz	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
KENTUCKY							
1 Stubblefield	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Natcher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Mazzoli	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Snyder	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Carter	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
6 Curlin	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
7 Perkins	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
LOUISIANA							
1 Hebert	Y	N	N	?	#	✓	?
2 Boggs	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Caffery	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
4 Waggonner	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Passman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
6 Rarick	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
7 Breaux *					Y	Y	Y
8 Long	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
MAINE							
1 Kyros	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
2 Hathaway	#	#	#	#	Y	Y	N
MARYLAND							
1 Mills	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Long	N	N	Y	?	Y	N	Y
3 Garmatz	Y	Y	N	?	Y	Y	Y
4 Sarbanes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Hogan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Byron	Y	N	N	?	Y	N	Y
7 Mitchell	Y	Y	Y	N	?	Y	N
8 Gude	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
MASSACHUSETTS							
1 Conte	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Boland	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Drinan	Y	Y	#	-	Y	Y–Y	
4 Donohue	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Vacancy							
6 Harrington	Y	?	?	?	Y	Y	N
7 Macdonald	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
8 O'Neill	Y	?	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
9 Hicks	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Heckler	Y	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N
11 Burke	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 Keith	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MICHIGAN							
1 Conyers	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
2 Esch	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Brown	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Hutchinson	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Ford	Y	#	#	#	Y	Y	Y
6 Chamberlain	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Riegle	Y	N	Y	Y	?	Y	N
8 Harvey	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	?
9 Vander Jagt	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	#
10 Cederberg	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Ruppe	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	#
12 O'Hara	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Diggs	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	N
14 Nedzi	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
15 Ford	Y	N	#	•	#	Y	Y
16 Dingell	?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
17 Griffiths	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
18 Broomfield	Y	N	Y	#	Y	Y	Y
19 McDonald	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	?
MINNESOTA							
1 Quie	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Nelsen	Y	Y	Y	#	Y	Y	Y
3 Frenzel	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
4 Karth	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Fraser	Y	#	Y	N	Y	Y	N
6 Zwach	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Bergland	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
8 Blatnik	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MISSISSIPPI							
1 Abernethy	Y	Y	N	#	Y	N	Y
2 Whitten	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Griffin	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
4 Montgomery	Y	N	N	#	Y	N	N
5 Colmer	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
MISSOURI							
1 Clay	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
2 Symington	Y	#	#	#	Y	Y	#

Democrats — Republicans (italic)

* John B. Breaux (D) sworn in Oct. 12

FORD

303. HR 16924. Military Pay. Passage of the bill authorizing additional incentive pay and additional enlistment and re-enlistment bonuses for certain specialized military personnel ranging from doctors and dentists to persons qualified in the nuclear submarine service. Passed 337-35: R 157-1; D 180-34 (ND 109-28; SD 71-6), Oct. 11, 1972. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

304. HR 16724. D. C. Bus Acquisition. Cabell (D Texas) motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority to acquire four private bus lines in the metropolitan area. Failed 226-129: R 71-80; D 155-49 (ND 105-25; SD 50-24), Oct. 11, 1972. A two-thirds majority vote (237 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules. (The House subsequently voted to suspend the rules and adopt a similar bill already passed by the Senate.

305. HR 6482. Strip Mining. Edmondson (D Okla.) motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill providing for federal regulation of strip coal mining and requiring reclamation of strip mined lands. Agreed to 265-75: R 108-36; D 157-39 (ND 113-13; SD 44-26), Oct. 11, 1972. A two-thirds majority vote (227 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

306. S J Res 247. Copyright Protection. Celler (D N.Y.) motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill extending for three years, through Dec. 31, 1974, the expiration date for all copy-

	303	304	305	306	307	308	309
3 Sullivan	#	#	•	?	#	✓	#
4 Randall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Bolling	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
6 Hull	Y	#	#	#	Y	N	Y
7 Hall	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
8 Ichord	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Hungate	Y	Y	?	?	?	?	?
10 Burlison	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MONTANA							
1 Shoup	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Melcher	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
NEBRASKA							
1 Thone	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 McCollister	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Martin	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
NEVADA							
AL Baring	#	#	•	#	#	•	•
NEW HAMPSHIRE							
1 Wyman	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Cleveland	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEW JERSEY							
1 Hunt	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Sandman	Y	?	?	?	Y	N	Y
3 Howard	Y	Y	Y	#	Y	Y	N
4 Thompson	#	#	#	#	#	✓	•
5 Frelinghuysen	Y	Y	Y	?	?	Y	Y
6 Forsythe	Y	Y	Y	Y	#	Y	Y
7 Widnall	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	#
8 Roe	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Helstoski	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
10 Rodino	Y	Y	#	Y	Y	Y	N
11 Minish	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
12 Dwyer	?	?	?	?	?	Y	?
13 Gallagher	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
14 Daniels	Y	N	#	?	Y	Y	N
15 Patten	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
NEW MEXICO							
1 Lujan	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Runnels	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
NEW YORK							
1 Pike	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
2 Grover	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Wolff	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Wydler	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Lent	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Halpern	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
7 Addabbo	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
8 Rosenthal	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9 Delaney	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Celler	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Brasco	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
12 Chisholm	?	?	?	?	?	Y	N
13 Podell	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
14 Rooney	?	?	?	?	?	Y	N
15 Carey	N	Y	Y	Y	#	Y	Y
16 Murphy	Y	?	?	?	?	✓	?
17 Koch	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
18 Rangel	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
19 Abzug	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
20 Vacancy							
21 Badillo	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	N
22 Scheuer	N	Y	Y	N	#	Y	N
23 Bingham	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
24 Biaggi	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
25 Peyser	#	#	#	?	Y	Y	N
26 Reid	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	N
27 Dow	?	?	?	?	?	✓	?
28 Fish	Y	#	#	#	#	✓	•
29 Stratton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
30 King	Y	N	Y	Y	?	✓	?
31 McEwen	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	Y
32 Pirnie	Y	N	#	#	Y	Y	Y
33 Robison	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
34 Terry	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	Y
35 Hanley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
36 Horton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
37 Conable	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
38 Hastings	Y	N	Y	#	Y	Y	Y
39 Kemp	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
40 Smith	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
41 Dulski	Y	N	N	•	Y	Y	Y
NORTH CAROLINA							
1 Jones	Y	N	Y	?	#	X	?
2 Fountain	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
3 Henderson	Y	Y	?	?	Y	N	Y
4 Galifianakis	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
5 Mizell	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Preyer	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Lennon	Y	Y	#	#	#	N	Y
8 Ruth	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Jonas	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Broyhill	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Taylor	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NORTH DAKOTA							
1 Andrews	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Link	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
OHIO							
1 Keating	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Clancy	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
3 Whalen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
4 McCulloch	Y	?	?	?	?	Y	Y
5 Latta	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Harsha	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
7 Brown	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
8 Betts	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
9 Ashley	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
10 Miller	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
11 Stanton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
12 Devine	Y	N	Y	Y	#	X	•
13 Mosher	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
14 Seiberling	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
15 Wylie	?	?	?	?	Y	Y	Y
16 Bow	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
17 Ashbrook	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
18 Hays	Y	Y	Y	#	#	N	Y
19 Carney	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
20 Stanton	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
21 Stokes	#	#	#	#	#	Y	N
22 Vanik	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
23 Minshall	Y	N	?	#	Y	Y	Y
24 Powell	?	N	N	?	Y	N	Y
OKLAHOMA							
1 Belcher	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Edmondson	Y	N	Y	Y	?	X	?
3 Albert							
4 Steed	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Jarman	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Camp	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
OREGON							
1 Wyatt	Y	Y	N	?	Y	Y	?
2 Ullman	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Green	#	#	#	?	#	X	?
4 Dellenback	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
PENNSYLVANIA							
1 Barrett	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	N
2 Nix	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	N
3 Byrne	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
4 Eilberg	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y	N
5 Green	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
6 Yatron	Y	Y	•	#	#	#	#
7 Williams	Y	Y	?	?	Y	Y	Y
8 Biester	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
9 Ware	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 McDade	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
11 Flood	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
12 Whalley	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
13 Coughlin	Y	Y	Y	#	Y	Y	Y
14 Moorhead	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
15 Rooney	#	#	#	#	Y	Y	N
16 Eshleman	Y	●	#	#	Y	Y	#
17 Schneebeli	Y	N	Y	?	Y	N	Y
18 Heinz	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
19 Goodling	Y	•	N	Y	Y	N	Y
20 Gaydos	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
21 Dent	Y	Y	?	N	Y	Y	N
22 Saylor	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
23 Johnson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
24 Vigorito	#	#	#	#	Y	Y	Y
25 Clark	Y	?	Y	?	Y	?	?
26 Morgan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
27 Conover	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
RHODE ISLAND							
1 St Germain	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Tiernan	Y	?	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
SOUTH CAROLINA							
1 Davis	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
2 Spence	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Dorn	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Mann	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Gettys	Y	N	N	Y	#	X	#
6 McMillan	Y	Y	?	?	?	X	?
SOUTH DAKOTA							
1 Denholm	N	N	Y	Y	?	?	?
2 Abourezk	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	?
TENNESSEE							
1 Quillen	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
2 Duncan	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Baker	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Evins	Y	Y	Y	#	Y	Y	Y
5 Fulton	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Anderson	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	?	?
7 Blanton	#	?	?	?	Y	N	Y
8 Jones	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
9 Kuykendall	#	•	#	#	#	#	#
TEXAS							
1 Patman	Y	?	?	?	Y	N	Y
2 Dowdy	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
3 Collins	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Roberts	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
5 Cabell	Y	Y	?	?	?	?	?
6 Teague	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
7 Archer	Y	N	N	Y	?	X	?
8 Eckhardt	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
9 Brooks	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
10 Pickle	#	#	#	#	Y	N	Y
11 Poage	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
12 Wright	Y	Y	N	?	Y	N	Y
13 Purcell	#	#	#	#	Y	X	#
14 Young	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
15 de la Garza	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
16 White	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
17 Burleson	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
18 Price	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
19 Mahon	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
20 Gonzalez	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
21 Fisher	Y	N	Y	N	#	N	Y
22 Casey	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
23 Kazen	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
UTAH							
1 McKay	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Lloyd	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
VERMONT							
AL Mallary	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
VIRGINIA							
1 Downing	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
2 Whitehurst	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Satterfield	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
4 Abbitt	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
5 Daniel	X	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
6 Vacancy							
7 Robinson	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
8 Scott	?	?	?	?	?	N	Y
9 Wampler	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
10 Broyhill	Y	Y	#	#	Y	N	Y
WASHINGTON							
1 Pelly	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
2 Meeds	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
3 Hansen	#	#	#	#	#	✓	#
4 McCormack	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
5 Foley	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
6 Hicks	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Adams	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
WEST VIRGINIA							
1 Mollohan	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y
2 Staggers	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
3 Slack	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
4 Hechler	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
5 Kee	Y	Y	N	?	?	?	?
WISCONSIN							
1 Aspin	N	Y	Y	?	Y	Y	Y
2 Kastenmeier	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
3 Thomson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
4 Zablocki	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
5 Reuss	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
6 Steiger	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
7 Obey	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
8 Byrnes	Y	Y	•	#	Y	N	Y
9 Davis	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
10 O'Konski	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WYOMING							
AL Roncalio	?	?	?	?	?	✓	?

• *Answered "present" to avoid possible conflict-of-interest.*

rights which would have expired before that date. Agreed to 208-92: R 110-20, D 98-72 (ND 57-53; SD 41-19), Oct. 11, 1972. A two-thirds majority of members present and voting (200 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules.

307. HR 16987. Maritime Authorization. Garmatz (D Md.) motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill authorizing $175-million in supplemental appropriations for ship-building programs in fiscal 1973. Passed 351-3: R 151-0; D 200-3 (ND 130-3; SD 70-0), Oct. 12, 1972. A two-thirds majority voted (235 in this case) is required for passage under suspension of the rules. A "yea" was a vote supporting the President's position.

308. HR 14370. General Revenue Sharing. Adoption of the conference report on the bill establishing a five-year program to share $30,236,400,000 in federal revenues with state and local governments. Adopted 266-110: R 126-33; D 140-77 (ND 114-30; SD 26-47), Oct. 12, 1972. A "yea" was a vote in support of the President's position.

309. HR 14370. General Revenue Sharing. Mills (D Ark.) motion that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments placing a $1.6-billion ceiling on annual federal contributions to state and local social services programs and concur in a conference substitute placing a $2.5-billion ceiling on federal matching grants for social services by state and local governments. Adopted 281-86: R 142-10; D 139-76 (ND 75-67; SD 64-9), Oct. 12, 1972.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Senate vote on Conference

Report on Revenue Sharing.

CQ vote 516

CQ Senate Votes 514-520

Corresponding to Congressional Record roll-call votes 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559

	514	515	516	517	518	519	520
ALABAMA							
Allen	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N
Sparkman	Y	Y	#	•	#	•	•
ALASKA							
Gravel	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
Stevens	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
ARIZONA							
Fannin	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Goldwater	X	Y	?	?	?	?	?
ARKANSAS							
Fulbright	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
McClellan	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
CALIFORNIA							
Cranston	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Tunney	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
COLORADO							
Allott	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Dominick	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
CONNECTICUT							
Ribicoff	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Weicker	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
DELAWARE							
Boggs	Y	Y	Y	?	?	N	N
Roth	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
FLORIDA							
Chiles	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
Gurney	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
GEORGIA							
Gambrell	Y	Y	N	N	N	-	-
Talmadge	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
HAWAII							
Inouye	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Fong	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
IDAHO							
Church	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Jordan	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
ILLINOIS							
Stevenson	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Percy	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
INDIANA							
Bayh	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Hartke	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
IOWA							
Hughes	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Miller	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
KANSAS							
Dole	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
Pearson	Y	Y	Y	?	?	?	?
KENTUCKY							
Cook	#	†	†	✓	#	•	#
Cooper	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
LOUISIANA							
Edwards	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Long	N	Y	Y	?	?	?	N
MAINE							
Muskie	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Smith	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
MARYLAND							
Beall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Mathias	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
MASSACHUSETTS							
Kennedy	#	#	#	•	#	•	#
Brooke	Y	Y	Y	?	Y	N	Y
MICHIGAN							
Hart	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Griffin	Y	Y	Y	?	?	?	?
MINNESOTA							
Humphrey	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Mondale	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
MISSISSIPPI							
Eastland	N	Y	Y	N	N	?	?
Stennis	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
MISSOURI							
Eagleton	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Symington	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
MONTANA							
Mansfield	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Metcalf	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
NEBRASKA							
Curtis	✓	†	†	•	-	-	†
Hruska	#	#	#	N	N	N	N
NEVADA							
Bible	#	#	•	•	#	•	•
Cannon	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
NEW HAMPSHIRE							
McIntyre	#	†	†	-	†	-	†
Cotton	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
NEW JERSEY							
Williams	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Case	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
NEW MEXICO							
Anderson	Y	N	Y	N	Y	?	?
Montoya	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
NEW YORK							
*Buckley**	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Javits	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
NORTH CAROLINA							
Ervin	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Jordan	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
NORTH DAKOTA							
Burdick	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Young	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
OHIO							
Saxbe	N	Y	N	?	?	?	?
Taft	N	Y	Y	Y	N	-	✓
OKLAHOMA							
Harris	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Bellmon	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
OREGON							
Hatfield	†	†	X	?	?	?	?
Packwood	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
PENNSYLVANIA							
Schweiker	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
Scott	#	†	†	N	N	N	Y
RHODE ISLAND							
Pastore	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Pell	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
SOUTH CAROLINA							
Hollings	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Thurmond	Y	Y	Y	X	X	-	†
SOUTH DAKOTA							
McGovern	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Mundt	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
TENNESSEE							
Baker	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Brock	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
TEXAS							
Bentsen	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Tower	?	†	✓	-	-	-	X
UTAH							
Moss	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Bennett	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
VERMONT							
Aiken	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Stafford	#	†	†	•	✓	•	•
VIRGINIA							
Byrd, Jr.**	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Spong	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
WASHINGTON							
Jackson	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
Magnuson	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
WEST VIRGINIA							
Byrd	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Randolph	†	†	†	-	†	-	-
WISCONSIN							
Nelson	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Proxmire	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N
WYOMING							
McGee	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
Hansen	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N

- KEY -

- Y Record vote for (yea).
- ✓ Paired for.
- † Announced for.
- # CQ poll for.
- N Record vote against (nay).
- X Paired against.
- \- Announced against.
- • CQ poll against.
- ? Not voting, voted "present," did not announce or answer poll.

Democrats *Republicans*

* Buckley elected as Conservative

** Byrd elected as independent

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

514. HR 11021. Noise Pollution. Cranston (D Calif.) amendment prohibiting supersonic civilian aircraft from landing at places under U.S. jurisdiction unless they complied with Federal Aviation Administration noise level standards for subsonic aircraft. Adopted 62-17: R 25-9; D 37-8 (ND 25-4; SD 12-4), Oct. 13, 1972.

515. HR 11021. Noise Pollution. Passage of the Environmental Noise Control Act of 1972, a bill establishing federal noise emission standards for newly manufactured products, authorizing federal grants for state and local noise control programs and requiring noise standards for aircraft. Passed 75-5: R 33-2; D 42-3 (ND 28-1; SD 14-2), Oct. 13, 1972.

516. HR 14370. General Revenue Sharing. Adoption of the conference report on the bill establishing a five-year program to share $30,236,400,000 in federal revenues with state and local governments. Adopted 59-19: R 29-5; D 30-14 (ND 21-8; SD 9-6), Oct. 13, 1972. A "yea" was a vote in support of the President's position.

517. HR 16810. Debt Ceiling. Taft (R Ohio) amendment to adopted Jordan (R Idaho) amendment *(below)* as modified by Charles McC. Mathias Jr. (R Md.) amendment exempting administrative expenses of the judiciary from the programs authorized to be cut by the President—Permit the President to reserve from spending more than 10 percent of any single budget account and empower Congress to override any such spending cutback within 30 days of notification of the President's intention. Rejected 7-66: R 5-25; D 2-41 (ND 2-27; SD 0-14), Oct. 13, 1972.

518. HR 16810. Debt Ceiling. Jordan (R Idaho) amendment in the nature of a substitute for Vance Hartke (D Ind.) amendment limiting exemptions to veterans' services and later adopted by voice vote—Require the President, when making cuts in spending to limit federal outlays to $250-billion in fiscal 1973, to reduce all appropriations by a uniform percentage, not to exceed 10 percent for any activity or program, and exempt from spending cutbacks payments for Social Security benefits, Medicaid, veterans' benefits, public assistance, food stamps, social services grants, military retirement pay, judicial salaries and interest on the national debt. Adopted 46-28: R 11-20; D 35-8 (ND 26-3; SD 9-5), Oct. 13, 1972. A "nay" was a vote in support of the President's position.

519. HR 16810. Debt Ceiling. Bellmon (R Okla.) amendment requiring Congress to set an annual ceiling on federal spending and authorizing the President to cut proposed expenditures in certain categories to hold outlays within the limit adopted. Rejected 9-62: R 5-26; D 4-36 (ND 4-24; SD 0-12), Oct. 13, 1972.

520. HR 16810. Debt Ceiling. Packwood (R Ore.) amendment deleting Title II of the bill which imposed a $250-billion ceiling on federal outlays in fiscal 1973. Rejected 24-48: R 12-19; D 12-29 (ND 11-17; SD 1-12), Oct. 13, 1972.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Senate vote on Revenue

Sharing.

CQ vote 391

Corresponding to Congressional Record roll-call votes 417, 418, 419, 421, 422, 423

	389	390	391	392	393	394
ALABAMA						
Allen	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Sparkman	-	†	†	#	•	#
ALASKA						
Gravel	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stevens	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
ARIZONA						
Fannin	N	Y	?	Y	N	Y
Goldwater	N	Y	X	Y	N	N
ARKANSAS						
Fulbright	N	?	Y	?	N	Y
McClellan	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
CALIFORNIA						
Cranston	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tunney	Y	Y	Y	#	#	#
COLORADO						
Allott	-	†	✓	?	?	?
Dominick	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
CONNECTICUT						
Ribicoff	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Weicker	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
DELAWARE						
Boggs	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N
Roth	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
FLORIDA						
Chiles	N	Y	N	Y	?	?
Gurney	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
GEORGIA						
Gambrell	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Talmadge	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
HAWAII						
Inouye	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fong	Y	Y	Y	Y	•	#
IDAHO						
Church	N	Y	X	Y	N	N
Jordan	N	Y	X	Y	N	N
ILLINOIS						
Stevenson	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y
Percy	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
INDIANA						
Bayh	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hartke	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
IOWA						
Hughes	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Miller	-	†	✓	Y	N	N
KANSAS						
Dole	N	?	Y	Y	N	Y
Pearson	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
KENTUCKY						
Cook	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Cooper	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
LOUISIANA						
Edwards	N	Y	Y	?	?	?
Long	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MAINE						
Muskie	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Smith	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
MARYLAND						
Beall	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mathias	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	?
MASSACHUSETTS						
Kennedy	#	•	#	#	#	#
Brooke	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
MICHIGAN						
Hart	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Griffin	Y	N	Y	?	?	?
MINNESOTA						
Humphrey	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mondale	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
MISSISSIPPI						
Eastland	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Stennis	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
MISSOURI						
Eagleton	Y	N	N	?	Y	Y
Symington	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
MONTANA						
Mansfield	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Metcalf	N	Y	Y	Y	#	Y
NEBRASKA						
Curtis	N	Y	X	Y	N	N
Hruska	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
NEVADA						
Bible	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Cannon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
McIntyre	-	†	†	?	?	?
Cotton	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
NEW JERSEY						
Williams	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Case	Y	N	Y	Y	N	•
NEW MEXICO						
Anderson	N	Y	?	Y	N	Y
Montoya	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
NEW YORK						
*Buckley**	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Javits	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
NORTH CAROLINA						
Ervin	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Jordan	N	Y	Y	Y	?	Y
NORTH DAKOTA						
Burdick	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Young	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
OHIO						
Saxbe	Y	N	N	?	?	?
Taft	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
OKLAHOMA						
Harris	?	?	?	?	?	?
Bellmon	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
OREGON						
Hatfield	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Packwood	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
PENNSYLVANIA						
Schweiker	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Scott	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
RHODE ISLAND						
Pastore	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pell	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
SOUTH CAROLINA						
Hollings	N	Y	Y	#	#	#
Thurmond	-	†	✓	Y	N	Y
SOUTH DAKOTA						
McGovern	?	?	✓	?	?	?
Mundt	?	?	?	?	?	?
TENNESSEE						
Baker	N	Y	Y	?	?	?
Brock	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TEXAS						
Bentsen	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Tower	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y
UTAH						
Moss	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bennett	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
VERMONT						
Aiken	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Stafford	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
VIRGINIA						
Byrd, Jr.**	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Spong	N	Y	Y	?	?	N
WASHINGTON						
Jackson	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Magnuson	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WEST VIRGINIA						
Byrd	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Randolph	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
WISCONSIN						
Nelson	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Proxmire	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
WYOMING						
McGee	N	?	†	?	?	?
Hansen	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y

Democrats *Republicans*

* Buckley elected as Conservative

** Byrd elected as independent

- KEY -

- Y Record vote for (yea).
- ✓ Paired for.
- † Announced for.
- # CQ poll for.
- N Record vote against (nay).
- X Paired against.
- - Announced against.
- • CQ poll against.
- ? Not voting, voted "present," did not announce or answer poll.

389. HR 14370. General Revenue Sharing. Taft (R Ohio) amendment revising formula for allocating revenue-sharing funds among the states to distribute one-third of each year's total amount by population, one-third by tax effort and one-third by relative income (instead of computing the three factors together to determine each state's share). Rejected 32-59: R 17-24; D 15-35 (ND 15-19; SD 0-16), Sept. 12, 1972.

390. HR 14370. General Revenue Sharing. Long (D La.) motion to table, and thus kill, Taft (R Ohio) amendment replacing formula for allocating revenue-sharing funds among the states with a provision determining each state's share solely by population. Motion to table adopted 60-28: R 22-18; D 38-10 (ND 23-10; SD 15-0), Sept. 12, 1972.

391. HR 14370. General Revenue Sharing. Passage of the bill establishing a five-year program to share $29,583,560,000 in federal revenues with state and local governments and appropriating $1-billion a year for four years for supplementary social services grants. Passed 64-20: R 32-5; D 32-15 (ND 22-9; SD 10-6), Sept. 12, 1972. The President supported revenue-sharing but did not take a position on the version approved by the Senate.

392. S 3917. Senate Office Building Expansion. Cooper (R Ky.) amendment granting jurisdiction over construction of the office building extension to the Public Works Committee and imposing a $53.5-million spending ceiling on building costs. Adopted 83-0: R 40-0; D 43-0 (ND 31-0; SD 12-0), Sept. 13, 1972.

393. S 3917. Senate Office Building Expansion. Gravel (D Alaska) amendment directing the Architect of the Capitol to inquire whether the owners of certain property north of the New Senate Office Building were willing to sell it. Rejected 28-53: R 5-34; D 23-19 (ND 21-10; SD 2-9), Sept. 13, 1972.

394. S 3917. Senate Office Building Expansion. Passage of the bill authorizing construction of additional office space in the New Senate Office Building and the purchase of land for an additional parking garage for senators and their staffs. Passed 65-17: R 29-8; D 36-9 (ND 27-5; SD 9-4), Sept. 13,1972.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

CONGRESS CLEARS NIXON'S REVENUE-SHARING PLAN

Congress Oct. 13 completed action on a bill (HR 14370—PL 92-512) establishing a five-year program to share $30,236,400,000 in federal revenues with state and local governments.

Final action came when the Senate, by a 59-19 roll-call vote, adopted a conference report (S Rept 92-1229) on the bill. The House had approved the report Oct. 12 by a 265-110 roll call. *(Votes 516, 308, p. 79-S, 92-H)*

As cleared, the bill appropriated $30,236,400,000 to a special trust fund for distribution among state and local governments. The program, retroactive to Jan. 1, 1972, at an initial annual level of $5.3-billion, would run until Dec. 31, 1976.

The conference agreement represented a unique compromise between conflicting House and Senate provisions for allocating revenue-sharing funds. The conference agreement gave states the greater of two amounts available under the different formulas approved by the House and the Senate.

The compromise averted a possible stalemate in choosing between the House formula, which generally favored more populous and industrial states, and the Senate formula, which favored less populous states.

To distribute each state's revenue-sharing funds among state and local governments, however, the conference agreement generally followed the Senate bill. By stressing relative income and the extent of government taxing efforts as well as population—and dropping the House bill's emphasis on urbanization—the conference compromise favored poor central city and rural areas at the expense of more affluent suburbs.

In another key compromise, the conferees dropped a Senate provision setting a $1.6-billion annual limit on grants to state and local governments for social services.

Reporting the Senate limit in technical disagreement, conferees recommended a substitute amendment setting a $2.5-billion limit on social services expenditures under existing matching grant programs. Under the substitute, each state could receive only a proportion of $2.5-billion based on its population.

In a further attempt to restrain state requests for matching grants, the substitute required that no more than 10 percent of a state's matching grant funds be spent on programs for persons not on welfare. Exceptions were made, however, for programs for child care, family planning, the mentally retarded, alcoholics and drug addicts and for foster homes for children.

The House approved the substitute separately by a 281-86 roll call Oct. 12; the Senate routinely accepted the substitute in adopting the conference report. *(Vote 516, p. 79-S)*

Accepting a principle included in the House-passed version of HR 14370, the conference agreement included a list of spending priorities for revenue-sharing funds turned over to local governments. The conference version, less restrictive than the House bill, allowed local governments to use federal revenues for capital expenditures authorized by law and for ordinary operating and maintenance expenditures on public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor and aged and for financial administration.

Following the Senate version, the conference agreement subjected state as well as local governments to certain requirements for handling revenue-sharing funds and provisions barring discrimination and applying federal wage standards to jobs and projects financed in large part by revenue-sharing money.

Final Provisions

As cleared by Congress, HR 14370:

- Created a State and Local Government Fiscal Assistance Trust Fund, to remain available without fiscal year limitation.
- Appropriated $30,212,500,000 to the trust fund from federal income tax revenues in the following amounts:
  1) $2,650,000,000 for the period Jan. 1-June 30, 1972.
  2) $2,650,000,000 for July 1—Dec. 31, 1972.
  3) $2,987,500,000 for Jan. 1-June 30, 1973.
  4) $6,050,000,000 for fiscal 1974.
  5) $6,200,000,000 for fiscal 1975.
  6) $6,350,000,000 for fiscal 1976.
  7) $3,325,000,000 for the period July 1-Dec. 31, 1976.
- Appropriated to the trust fund $23,900,000 from income tax collections for adjustments in allocations to non-contiguous states (Alaska and Hawaii) in the following amounts:
  1) $2,390,000 for Jan. 1-June 30, 1972
  2) $2,390,000 for July 1-Dec. 31, 1972.
  3) $2,390,000 for Jan. 1-June 30, 1973.
  4) $4,780,000 for fiscal 1974.
  5) $4,780,000 for fiscal 1975.
  6) $4,780,000 for fiscal 1976.
  7) $2,390,000 for July 1-Dec. 31, 1976.
- Allocated to each state for each entitlement period the greater of two amounts computed by the following methods:
  1) A three-factor fomula allocating to each state an amount in the same ratio to $5.3-billion (the initial annual rate) as the figure produced by the state's population multiplied by its state and local government tax effort multiplied by its relative income was to the figure produced by the same factors for the nation as a whole.
  2) A five-factor formula allocating (at an initial annual level of $5.3-billion) $3.5-billion among the states according to population (one-third), urbanized population (one-third) and population weighted by per capita income (one-third) and the remaining $1.8-billion according to individual income tax collections by state governments (one-half) and the general tax effort of state and local governments (one-half).
- Allocated one-third of each state's entitlement to the state government and the remaining two-thirds to local governments within the state. The local governments' two-thirds would be divided as follows:
  1) Allocated to each county within a state an amount computed on the basis of population, tax effort and relative income.
  2) Allocated to each county government an amount determined by the ratio of its tax collections to total tax collections by all governments in the county.
  3) Allocated among all township governments within a county a total amount determined by their combined

(Continued on p. 638)

Revenue Sharing: Conference Bill's Figures by Key Cities for 1972

City	Amount
Alabama	
Birmingham	$ 7,099,587
Mobile	5,668,861
Huntsville	2,872,185
Alaska (Plus cost-of-living payment)	
Anchorage	786,641
Fairbanks	300,033
Arizona	
Phoenix	9,280,443
Scottsdale	601,577
Tempe	572,833
Arkansas	
Little Rock	2,392,164
North Little Rock	407,567
Fort Smith	787,284
California	
Los Angeles	35,442,819
San Francisco	19,276,751
San Diego	6,527,384
Colorado	
Denver	12,189,871
Colorado Springs	1,162,761
Pueblo	1,473,606
Connecticut	
Hartford	3,334,147
Bridgeport	2,619,799
New Haven	2,905,607
Delaware	
Wilmington	2,238,762
Dover	374,585
District of Columbia	23,647,564
Florida	
Jacksonville	3,972,067
Miami	6,959,236
Tampa	5,640,879
Georgia	
Atlanta	4,583,171
Savannah	2,089,189
Macon	1,965,134
Hawaii (Plus cost-of-living payment)	
Honolulu	12,542,903
Idaho	
Boise	1,089,716
Pocatello	583,710
Idaho Falls	372,848
Illinois	
Chicago	69,477,799
Rockford	2,023,772
Springfield	897,115
Indiana	
Indianapolis	6,983,136
Fort Wayne	2,137,708
Gary	3,069,017
Iowa	
Des Moines	2,201,662
Sioux City	1,227,154
Council Bluffs	518,661
Kansas	
Wichita	2,139,061
Topeka	1,239,629
Kansas City	1,646,379
Kentucky	
Louisville	9,480,686
Lexington	2,836,217
Frankfort	472,705
Louisiana	
New Orleans	14,744,411
Baton Rouge	5,149,671
Lake Charles	1,767,060
Maine	
Portland	1,769,263
Augusta	443,343
Bangor	898,961
Maryland	
Baltimore	23,881,944
Hagerstown	566,837
Annapolis	409,813
Massachusetts	
Boston	17,753,054
Cambridge	2,078,601
Springfield	4,443,226
Michigan	
Detroit	36,530,556
Grand Rapids	2,682,599
Ann Arbor	697,571
Minnesota	
St. Paul	4,450,117
Duluth	1,212,570
Minnetonka	130,248
Mississippi	
Jackson	4,346,704
Biloxi	929,557
Columbus	762,500
Missouri	
St. Louis	12,702,004
Kansas City	10,222,093
Jefferson City	390,432
Springfield	1,537,329
Independence	1,084,433
Montana	
Helena	196,712
Billings	637,296
Butte	316,961
Great Falls	626,748
Nebraska	
Lincoln	1,763,525
Omaha	3,640,464
Scottsbluff	195,219
Nevada	
Las Vegas	1,045,413
Carson City	61,960
Reno	762,202
New Hampshire	
Manchester	1,749,749
Portsmouth	512,778
Concord	508,879
New Jersey	
Newark	8,437,328
Trenton	1,930,287
Camden	2,070,137
New Mexico	
Albuquerque	6,431,471
Santa Fe	968,982
Clovis	306,019
New York	
Albany	1,300,747
Buffalo	7,328,071
New York	247,524,126
Syracuse	3,279,903
Rochester	2,293,973
North Carolina	
Charlotte	4,462,898
Greensboro	2,761,068
Raleigh	1,714,054
North Dakota	
Bismarck	389,813
Minot	419,431
Grand Forks	440,854
Ohio	
Cleveland	14,107,681
Columbus	5,697,361
Cincinnati	8,501,849
Toledo	4,467,549
Oklahoma	
Midwest City	456,901
Oklahoma City	6,783,125
Tulsa	3,013,250
Oregon	
Eugene	1,561,628
Portland	8,579,738
Salem	1,568,703
Pennsylvania	
Harrisburg	1,149,316
Philadelphia	43,758,115
Pittsburgh	11,679,788
Scranton	1,883,909
Rhode Island	
Cranston	983,329
Providence	4,304,042
Warwick	852,365
South Carolina	
Columbia	2,251,500
Charleston	2,036,353
Greenville	1,861,843
South Dakota	
Pierre	66,924
Rapid City	525,926
Sioux Falls	989,343
Tennessee	
Chattanooga	2,389,735
Knoxville	3,742,137
Memphis	9,826,564
Nashville	6,378,838
Texas	
Austin	2,121,831
Houston	14,029,925
San Antonio	7,785,895
Utah	
Salt Lake City	3,881,774
Ogden	944,978
Vermont	
Montpelier	272,374
Burlington	995,345
Virginia	
Richmond	5,463,373
Norfolk	6,740,023
Alexandria	1,680,122
Washington	
Olympia	295,694
Spokane	3,316,084
Seattle	9,863,462
West Virginia	
Charleston	2,072,376
Huntington	1,872,000
Martinsburg	154,000
Wheeling	1,089,161
Wisconsin	
Green Bay	1,267,219
Kenosha	1,433,901
Madison	1,935,498
Milwaukee	11,221,768
Wyoming	
Cheyenne	396,713
Casper	359,240
Laramie	215,845

(Continued from p. 636)
share of tax collections, with each township's amount determined by population, tax effort and relative income.

4) Allocated the remainder of the county's share among municipal governments according to population, tax effort and relative income.

5) Allocated part of a county area's allotment to the governing bodies of local Indian tribes or Alaskan native villages on the basis of population.

• Permitted states to legislate optional formulas for distributing local government funds by population and tax effort or by population and relative income, or by both.

• Increased revenue-sharing entitlements for Alaska and Hawaii by the same percentage as cost-of-living adjustments given federal employees in those non-contiguous states.

• Required that a state government's revenue-sharing entitlement be reduced if it reduced transfers of state funds to local governments. (The penalty could be reduced or offset if the state had assumed responsibility for expenditures previously made by local governments or had conferred new taxing authority on local governments to provide the funds.)

• Required each government receiving revenue-sharing funds to submit to the secretary of the treasury and publish in local newspapers reports on the planned and actual uses of shared revenues.

• Prohibited discrimination by race, color, national origin or sex in any activity or program funded in whole or in part with revenue-sharing money.

• Required state and local governments receiving federal revenues to meet certain requirements in handling revenue-sharing funds.

• Required that a state or local government employee be paid at the prevailing local wage, state or local minimum wage or federal minimum wage (whichever was highest) in cases where revenue-sharing funds made up 25 percent or more of the employee's compensation.

• Applied the 1931 Davis-Bacon Act requirement that workers on federally funded construction projects receive prevailing local construction wages to projects for which 25 percent or more of the financing came from revenue-sharing funds.

• Required local governments to use revenue-sharing funds only for "priority expenditures": capital expenditures authorized by law or maintenance and operating expenditures on public safety (including law enforcement, fire protection and building code enforcement), environmental protection (including sewage disposal, sanitation and pollution abatement), public transportation (including transit systems and streets and roads), health, recreation, libraries, social services for the poor and aged, and financial administration.

• Provided for collection by the federal government's Internal Revenue Service of state income taxes starting in the year after at least two states, whose residents together filed at least 5 percent of all federal income tax returns, requested such a service.

• Placed a $2.5-billion ceiling on annual federal 75-percent matching grants to state and local governments for social services, with each state limited to the same percentage of $2.5-billion as the percentage of its population to total U.S. population.

• Required that not more than 10 percent of each state's federal matching grants be used for assistance to persons not receiving welfare. Programs for child care, family planning, the mentally retarded, drug addicts and alcoholics and foster homes for children would be exempted from the 10-percent limit.

References. *President's revenue sharing proposals and 1971 House hearings, 1971 Almanac p. 698.*

Background

The revenue-sharing concept was developed by Johnson administration officials but never accepted publicly by President Johnson, who faced budget deficits brought on by U.S. involvement in the Vietnam war.

President Nixon in 1969 proposed a revenue-sharing plan that would have made $500-million in federal revenues available to state and local governments in fiscal 1971, with the total rising to $5-billion by fiscal 1976. Congress did not act on that proposal.

In his 1971 State of the Union address, the President unveiled a second revenue-sharing plan that exceeded the scope of previous proposals, including his own.

The administration's second and current proposal included two elements:

• $5-billion starting in fiscal 1972 for allocation to the states, counties, municipalities and the District of Columbia.

• $11-billion for "special revenue-sharing" programs created by consolidating about 105 existing federal aid programs into six broad purposes with fewer federal specifications.

Under the general revenue-sharing proposal, 90 percent of the $5-billion would be allocated to the states by percentage of total U.S. population, with adjustments reflecting a state's tax effort.

The remaining 10 percent would be available to states that had negotiated a formula for sharing federal funds with local governments.

Of the total share of each state, about 50 percent would be passed on to local governments, with school districts and other special purpose government units excluded. The local shares would be distributed according to the ratio of local revenues to state revenues—at least until a negotiated local sharing formula had been adopted.

House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D Ark.), supported by the panel's ranking Republican, John W. Byrnes (R Wis.), fought the general revenue-sharing plan. Because it involved sharing a proportion of federal tax revenues, the bill was referred to Mills' committee. The special revenue-sharing proposals were referred to the various committees with jurisdiction over the six areas of activity involved.

The Ways and Means Committee held extensive hearings in June 1971 on the administration's bill. But Mills announced that their purpose was to expose the dangers and weaknesses of the revenue-sharing concept and to kill the bill.

But midway through the hearings Mills announced that he favored a revenue-sharing plan that would give most of its benefits to urban areas.

On Nov. 30, 1971, Mills and nine other members of the Ways and Means Committee introduced HR 11950, a $5.3-billion revenue-sharing bill which provided two-

thirds of its funds for local governments and one-third for states.

House Committee Action

The House Ways and Means Committee April 26 reported a clean bill, the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (HR 14370—H Rept 92-1018), establishing general revenue sharing with state and local governments at a first-year rate of $5.3-billion.

The committee April 17 voted 18-7 to report the bill. HR 14370 was written by the committee based on Chairman Mills' earlier bill, HR 11950.

Committee Views. The committee bill provided for revenue sharing initially at an annual rate of $3.5-billion for local governments and $1.8-billion for state governments. The committee justified this allocation as follows:

"In considering the financial problems of local governments, your committee came to the conclusion that many localities face most severe financial crises. In part, this stems from the increasing demand for public services resulting from the substantial increase in urbanization occurring in recent years.

"Closely related to this is the problem arising from the limited jurisdictions of many local governments: they often are called upon to provide many services for persons who do not live in their taxing jurisdictions. At the same time, those within their taxing jurisdictions often are poor and unable to pay for their share of the services demanded. This financial problem for local governments has been significantly worsened by the twin problems of rising costs resulting from inflation and the lower than normal increase in revenues because of the stagnant condition of the economy.

"Your committee concluded that states also have financial problems but that their problems are less severe than those of the localities and also of a different nature....The difficulty in obtaining adequate financing... has presented the states with problems not only in meeting their own financing needs but also in their increasing role in assisting local governments. Your committee concluded that, in the case of states, the primary emphasis should be on encouraging them to help themselves—by making more extensive use of their own tax resources."

The committee noted that state and local expenditures rose from $33.7-billion in fiscal year 1955 to $131.3-billion in fiscal 1970. In the period 1946-70 (fiscal years), state and local revenues, excluding federal aid, rose at an average rate of almost 10 percent per year.

The committee found that many states did not make effective use of their revenue sources, either by not using certain taxes (individual and corporate income taxes and general sales taxes) or by keeping rates too low.

The heavy reliance of state and local governments on property and sales taxes, the committee said, made it harder for them to increase their revenues because those taxes did not respond rapidly to increases in income.

In aggregate, the committee said, local governments accounted for about two-thirds of total state-local expenditures and states the remaining one-third. This was the approximate division of revenue sharing incorporated in the bill.

Federal Finances. The committee noted a deficit of almost $39-billion was forecast for fiscal year 1972 and a deficit of $25.5-billion in fiscal 1973. The cost of revenue sharing was included in calculating the deficits.

To postpone revenue sharing in order to cut the deficit, the report said, would be to assign a lower priority to state and local financial problems than to other needs.

Although federal aid to state and local governments rose from $6.7-billion in fiscal 1959 to $36.8-billion in fiscal 1972 and an estimated $38.5-billion in fiscal 1973, the committee found the total inadequate to the need. Since most federal aid was "categorical"—dispensed for specific purposes—it often could not be used for the most pressing state and local needs, the committee said.

Major Provisions

The bill appropriated $3.5-billion per year for local governments for five years, beginning with calendar 1972. It appropriated funds for state governments at an initial annual rate of $1.8-billion and increased that rate by $150-million for the following year and $300-million for each succeeding year for the rest of the five-year period.

Since the government operates on a fiscal year, the bill appropriated half of the initial allocation for the period Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972, the remainder of fiscal year 1972. It appropriated funds for the four succeeding fiscal years and a final half-year allocation. The appropriations were (in billions of dollars):

Year	State	Local	Total
FY 1972 *(half-year)*	.9	1.75	2.65
FY 1973	1.95	3.5	5.45
FY 1974	2.25	3.5	5.75
FY 1975	2.55	3.5	6.05
FY 1976	2.85	3.5	6.35
FY 1977 *(half-year)*	1.575	1.75	3.325
TOTALS	12.075	17.5	29.575

The appropriation for the final half-year was at an annual rate of $6.65-billion.

The increase of $300-million per year for the states was essentially a "hold-harmless" increment to ensure that no state received less in any year than it had in previous years of the program. Funds would be distributed to the states based on their tax efforts; consequently, states increasing their tax efforts could increase their shares. If the total remained constant, some other states would then receive reduced shares unless the total was increased each year.

The bill created three trust funds: for state shares, for local shares and for the hold-harmless funds.

Payments were to be made from the trust funds quarterly or more often. When lack of current data would delay payments, allocations were to be made on the basis of estimates.

Distribution. The bill created a complex distribution system.

State funds were to be distributed equally according to total tax effort and income-tax collections. Tax effort was to be measured by a formula relating the total tax collections of a state and its local governments, including special-purpose units such as school districts and sewer districts, to total personal income in the state. The state allocation would then be calculated by establishing the proportion of its tax efforts to the total U.S. state and local tax effort.

The state's share based on income tax would be 7.5 percent of each state's income-tax collections. The bill set both a floor and a ceiling for the income-tax share. For states with no income tax, and particularly states like Tennessee and Florida, which had constitutional prohibitions against income taxes that would take time to repeal, a minimum amount was guaranteed equal to .5 percent of federal income-tax liabilities attributable to the state. The ceiling limited each state's allocation based on its income tax to 3 percent of federal income-tax liabilities arising from the state.

For local governments the distribution was far more complicated. The total available was to be divided into three equal parts, to be allocated among the states on the basis of three factors: total state population, urban population and population weighted by per capita income. The last factor would be determined by establishing an inverse population-per capita income ratio that gave the greatest weight to the lowest per capita income and comparing the result with the ratio for the entire nation.

Each state's local funds then were to be distributed among its counties according to the same three factors.

Next, within each county's share, that which went to the county government was to be determined according to the proportion of total local taxes raised in the county and levied by the county government, as compared with those levied by the city, village or township.

As in the Nixon revenue-sharing plan, allocations to local governments were limited to general-purpose governments, excluding school and other special-purpose districts. Consequently, in establishing the county government shares, education taxes were to be excluded.

Finally, the remaining funds were to be distributed among the municipal and town governments according to three factors:

- The allocation based on population was to be distributed according to the relative population of the municipalities and towns.
- Funds allocated according to the inverse population-per capita income ratio were to be distributed on that basis among the municipalities and towns.
- Funds allocated according to urban population were to be distributed in proportion to the totals distributed under the other two factors.

After the first 18 months of operation, states were authorized to alter the formula for distribution to counties and other local governments by substituting a factor weighting population with per capita tax revenue for the population factor.

States also were authorized to increase the proportion of available funds to be allocated according to any of the three factors by as much as 40 percent and to decrease proportions by as much as 25 percent.

States also were authorized to withhold up to 10 percent of local funds for regional projects, provided that the state matched the local funds equally with state funds.

The bill denied funds to any locality if its total allocation was less than $200. It placed a ceiling on the total allocation to any locality of 50 percent of a unit's relevant taxes and transferred funds. In states choosing to use the alternative population-per capita tax revenue factor, a ceiling was provided to limit amounts allocated to high-income suburbs with high tax rates.

Conditions. The bill tied more "strings" to the revenues shared with local governments than did the administration's proposal.

Funds allocated to local governments were limited in use to "generally recognized...national high-priority objectives," which the committee defined as operational and maintenance expenses for public safety, environmental protection and public transportation.

The committee justified exclusion of such major local expenses as education and welfare on various grounds. It noted the great diversity of state and local responsibilities in those areas. It also noted that the House had passed a welfare reform bill (HR 1), which, among other purposes, was designed to provide greater federal welfare assistance, and that the federal government operated a number of major programs of aid for education. *(HR 1, p. 833; 1971 Almanac p. 519)*

The bill required states to maintain at least the level of aid to their local governments prevailing before revenue sharing. It prohibited use of revenue-sharing funds for matching federal funds for other purposes.

A state which regularly spent more for any of the allowed purposes than all its local governments combined was authorized to exclude that function from the uses of the funds allowed to local governments.

The bill authorized the treasury secretary to require a local government to repay 110 percent of any expenditure for an unauthorized purpose and to cut off funds to any locality for violations of the bill's provisions.

Federal Tax Collection. The bill required the Internal Revenue Service to administer and collect "piggyback" state income taxes where certain conditions were met.

The purpose was to enable states to use the income tax as a greater source of revenue with minimum administrative effort, reduce duplication of effort and simplify tax matters.

The eligible state taxes for federal collection were those based on taxable income as federally defined and those levied as a percentage of federal tax liability.

The bill established basic requirements in order for a state to participate.

The bill provided for establishment of combined withholding rates, so that employers would be required to keep only one set of tax records and make combined deposits of withheld taxes. The Treasury was to be given full responsibility for enforcement and legal proceedings.

The system was to take effect Jan. 1, 1974, if at least five states had agreed and qualified and if the residents of the five states had filed at least 5 percent of total federal individual income-tax returns in 1972. If the conditions had not been met by the beginning of 1974, the system was to start at the beginning of the calendar year after the first five states met the conditions.

Other Provisions. As reported, HR 14370 also:

- Prohibited discrimination in distribution of or participation in benefits of the program.
- Provided for review by federal courts on appeals from decisions by the treasury secretary to withhold funds for failure to comply with requirements.

Dissenting Views

Seven committee members, after voting against reporting the bill, filed dissenting views. They were Omar

Burleson (D Texas), James C. Corman (D Calif.), Sam M. Gibbons (D Fla.), Joe D. Waggonner Jr. (D La.), John W. Byrnes (R Wis.), Herman T. Schneebeli (R Pa.) and Joel T. Broyhill (R Va.).

The dissenters first objected to the fact that states were to be unrestricted in their use of funds while local governments were restricted to uses given high priority by the committee majority. "The 'priorities' were plucked out of thin air," they said, "for the sole purpose of distinguishing the committee bill from the administration's 'no-strings-attached' revenue sharing proposal which had been consistently denounced by some members of the committee."

The dissent incorporated a long list of provisions and effects which the seven found objectionable, including:

- Divorce of tax-raising responsibility from spending authority.
- Restructuring of federal-state-local relationships.
- Lack of surplus revenues to share.
- Failure of the bill to deal with the existing weaknesses of state and local government.
- Lack of any rationale for the amounts of money or relationship of the amounts to state or local needs.
- Lack of a rationale for the various formulas.
- Failure of the bill to take account of federal aid programs or state aids to local governments.
- Lack of effective accountability requirements.

The dissenters said the bill would transfer more power to Washington instead of strengthening state and local governments.

Formulas were developed by trial and error, they said, and "the committee's bill is nothing more than the final error, reached as a result of exhaustion and despair, rather than a feeling that the committee had finally stumbled on a workable formula." Further, they said, distribution was based on constantly changing data. The bill was potentially the biggest giveaway program ever enacted, they said.

Mahon Comments

By far the most vigorous House opponent of the revenue-sharing bill was House Appropriations Committee Chairman George Mahon (D Texas) who charged the measure would actually appropriate the funds without further congressional review, and thus subvert the legislative-appropriations process.

On June 7, Mahon printed his objections in the *Congressional Record*:

"Next week there is also scheduled to be before the House a $30-billion appropriation bill out of the Ways and Means Committee.

"Mr. Speaker, this Ways and Means Committee bill does not raise one penny of revenue. It is an authorization bill and it is an appropriation bill for 5 years. It bypasses the established authorization process involving a number of major legislative committees, and it bypasses the established appropriations process which we have known for the last 52 years.

"Not in the history of Congress that I can find has an appropriation bill come to the floor under a closed rule, which is now proposed for this Ways and Means Committee bill. (The House Rules Committee May 23 approved a closed rule, allowing eight hours of general debate but prohibiting amendments from the floor. The House must approve the rule before the bill itself can be considered.)

"I say it is indefensible that the appropriation bill of $30-billion should come before the House next week under a closed rule. Members should have the right to make points of order and offer amendments. I propose to do what I can to open up the rule so the House can work its will on that appropriation bill, just as it does on other appropriation bills."

Mahon's opposition resulted in two postponements of floor consideration of the bill—a ploy by the measure's proponents to gain more time in which to mobilize a lobby campaign of state and local officials and other groups in behalf of HR 14370. In effect, Mahon lost the battle June 21 when the House, by a 223-185 roll-call vote, agreed to a procedural motion that paved the way for consideration of the measure under a procedure barring floor amendments.

House Floor Action

The House June 22, by a 275-122 roll-call vote, passed HR 14370 without amendment. *(Vote 147, p. 46-H)*

Passage of the bill was virtually assured June 21, the first of two days of debate on HR 14370, when proponents of the revenue-sharing plan prevailed in a key procedural vote. By a roll-call vote of 223-185, the House called for the previous question (closing off debate and precluding the opportunity of offering amendments) on a controversial closed rule (H Res 996) under which the bill was taken up. *(Vote 145, p. 44-H)*

Republicans supported the rule by 113-57; Democrats opposed it, 110-128 (northern Democrats, 89-69, southern Democrats, 21-59). The rule then was approved by voice vote.

Closed Rule

The closed rule provided for eight hours of debate on HR 14370 but prohibited floor amendments and waived points of order against the bill. The rule permitted amendments offered by the Ways and Means Committee, which reported the bill April 26, but the committee offered none.

Thus the rule limited action on the House floor to the alternatives of passing the bill, killing it or returning it to the Ways and Means Committee. With governors, mayors and their organizations and other state and local officials lobbying vigorously for the bill with strong support from taxpayers, the bill commanded an impressive majority when it came to a vote.

Opponents had little hope of defeating the new aid program for hard-pressed state and local governments on a direct vote, but they hoped to make changes in the bill by raising a point of order against it or by amending it if they could defeat the rule. Ways and Means Committee revenue bills cutomarily were granted closed rules on grounds that they were too complicated to amend on the floor and that open rules would open the entire Internal Revenue Code to amendment. The privilege had been

granted to other Ways and Means non-revenue-raising legislation on grounds of complexity; thus welfare reform (HR 1) was passed by the House under a modified closed rule permitting only one amendment.

Appropriation

The bill pitted two leaders of the House, Chairman Wilbur D. Mills (D Ark.) of Ways and Means and Chairman George Mahon (D Texas) of the Appropriations Committee. *(box, p. 641)* Mills, originally a vociferous critic of revenue sharing, changed his mind in 1971 and drafted the bill on which his committee's bill was based. Mahon fought the bill on two grounds: that it spent money the government did not have (the latest official estimate of the federal deficit for fiscal year 1972 was $26-billion and for fiscal 1973, $27-billion), and that it appropriated funds in a legislative bill.

The bill established the revenue-sharing program and also appropriated the necessary funds, though it was never referred to Mahon's committee. (House rules prohibit appropriations in a legislative bill, hence the waiver of points of order in the rule.) Customarily a program is established and funds authorized in one bill handled by the committee responsible for the particular area of activity; funds are appropriated in a separate bill handled by the Appropriations Committee.

Mahon hoped to delete the bill's provisions appropriating funds and to require funding of the program with annual appropriations as in the case of most other aid programs. But proponents objected strenuously to subjecting revenue sharing to the appropriations process.

Had the bill been opened to amendment, attempts were contemplated to change the complicated formula for distribution of the funds, to add tax reform to the bill and to make other changes in tax statutes. As with other legislation in similar circumstances, Mills announced before the bill was taken up that he was under instructions from his committee to withdraw the bill from floor consideration if it was opened to amendment. The Rules Committee on May 23 had voted 8-7 to approve the closed rule. Following committee adoption of the rule, floor action was postponed twice while the bill's proponents sought to build up the lobbying muscle necessary to push the measure through.

The bill provided initially for aid at rates of $1.8-billion a year to states and $3.5-billion to local governments. Annual increases of up to $300-million were provided for states. Grants for the five-year term provided in the bill were (in billions of dollars):

Year	State	Local	Total
FY 1972 (half-year)	$ .9	$ 1.75	$ 2.65
FY 1973	1.95	3.5	5.45
FY 1974	2.25	3.5	5.75
FY 1975	2.55	3.5	6.05
FY 1976	2.85	3.5	6.35
FY 1977 (half-year)	1.575	1.75	3.325
TOTALS	$12.075	$17.50	$29.575

State funds were to be distributed according to formulas that increased state shares as their individual income taxes increased. The funds were unrestricted as to use. Local funds were limited to operation and maintenance expenses for public safety, environmental protection and public transportation and capital expenditures for sewage collection and treatment facilities, waste disposal systems and public transportation.

Debate, June 21

Majority Whip Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. (D Mass.), supporting the rule, argued that its defeat would send the bill back to committee and that it might not come to the floor again. O'Neill led the debate for the rule because Chairman William M. Colmer (D Miss.) of the Rules Committee opposed the bill.

Majority Leader Hale Boggs (D La.) said the need of state and local governments constituted an emergency. "I say it is too bad that the Appropriations Committee is bypassed, but in an emergency you take emergency action." Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford (R Mich.) said both parties were committed to revenue sharing and the bill provided the opportunity to carry out their commitments.

Mahon said the bill was essentially an appropriation. "The bill represents an indefensible abrogation...of the power of the House for a five-year period. Think of it—writing ourselves out of the action for a five-year period."

John W. Byrnes (R Wis.), the ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee, challenged Mills' interpretation of his instructions. "The chairman will no doubt say (if the rule was defeated) that he would have to go back to the committee for further instructions. That is a bunch of malarkey." Byrnes said the committee's request for a closed rule did not require withdrawal of the bill if the rule was opened.

H. Allen Smith (R Calif.) of the Rules Committee urged defeat of the rule so that he could offer a substitute which would have allowed points of order and amendments to the bill except to those provisions amending the Internal Revenue Code.

Mills did not speak on the rule but defended the bill against charges that its distribution of funds would grant larger amounts per capita to wealthy than to poor states and cities. Wealthy states pay a larger share of the federal income tax, he said. "In evaluating the distributive effects, it is important to take into consideration not only the grants themselves but also the federal income taxes that are collected to pay for these grants. When both the grants and federal income taxes are taken into consideration, the net effect is to aid the poorer states."

The bill, Byrnes said, "takes us into a dark tunnel of fiscal chaos with no light at the end." He quoted extensively from two of Mills' 1971 speeches attacking revenue sharing. Mahon said state and local demands for greater aid would make the bill a "tiger by the tail." "A vote for revenue sharing...will be a vote for a tax increase," he said.

June 22

Barber B. Conable Jr. (R N.Y.) asserted that the bill would strengthen state and local governments by giving them funds to spend according to their own priorities rather than those of the federal government. Revenue sharing is a better way to help states and localities than the existing system of categorical aid programs for specific purposes, he said. State and local governments, he contended, would be held to at least as close accountability for the funds as was the federal government.

Al Ullman (D Ore.) said the bill would in no way circumscribe the states in their activities and would help local governments meet the fiscal crisis they faced. The flight of higher-income families to the suburbs left low-income families to finance the problems concentrated in core cities, he said. The bill restricted local governments in their use of the funds, he said, but still gave them considerable flexibility.

James C. Corman (D Calif.), a member of Ways and Means who voted against reporting the bill, criticized the bill's distribution formulas. He said the committee had considered and rejected a number of formulas: "We finally quit, not because we hit on a rational formula, but because we were exhausted. And finally we got one that almost none of us could understand at the moment. We were told the statistics were not available to run the print on it. So we adopted it, and it is here for you today."

Corman said further that the bill did nothing to reduce the fragmentation of local government. Rather than encouraging more efficient local government, he said, the bill appeared to invite further fragmentation and greater waste.

Sam Gibbons (D Fla.) said that, despite reports of fiscal crises in the states, only four governors asked their legislatures for new taxes in 1972. A number of representatives objected that their states would be penalized in the distribution of funds because they did not have an individual income tax.

Richard W. Mallary (R Vt.) listed wealthy suburban cities which, as urbanized areas, would receive funds supposedly allocated for central cities, including Beverly Hills, Calif., McLean, Va., Shaker Heights, Ohio, Grosse Pointe, Mich., Greenwich, Conn., Lake Forest, Ill., and Palm Beach, Fla. "There is in this bill," he said, "the false assumption that the rural areas do not have extremely pressing revenue problems.... We must recognize the extreme tax problems of rural, sparsely populated areas where poverty is a way of life...."

Recommittal Motion. Byrnes lost in a final effort to cut the cost of the bill. He moved to recommit the bill to the Ways and Means Committee (a routine parliamentary procedures) with instructions to report it back immediately without the retroactive distribution of funds for the last six months of fiscal year 1972. This would save $2.65-billion, he said. His motion was defeated on a 157-241 roll-call vote. *(Vote 146, p. 46-H)* The House then passed the bill by a 275-122 roll-call vote. *(Vote 147, p. 46-H)*

Senate Committee Action

HEARINGS. The Senate Finance Committee held a hearing June 29 on the House-passed State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 (HR 14370).

Testimony June 29

Treasury Secretary George P. Shultz endorsed the bill in general but asked consideration of certain changes:

Revenue sharing will help state and local governments avert their recurrent financial crises. It will partially redress the imbalance in revenue sources available to state and local governments. It offers hope for revitalization of state and local government within the federal system.

"While we prefer determining the amount to be shared each year as a percentage of the federal tax base, we also respect the desire of the Congress to limit the duration of the program so that it can be evaluated and changed if necessary. We feel certain that a five-year trial period is sufficient to see if this redirection in our federal system is as effective as we anticipate.

"In the distribution of funds among state governments, the House bill places great emphasis on state income taxes. It has been the position of the administration not to favor particular state tax instruments, but rather to reward over-all state and local tax effort. Accordingly, we would prefer to replace the income tax incentive with a provision closer to the President's original proposal.

"Another difference involved the restrictions placed on local uses of these revenue-sharing funds. The President's proposal required only that the funds be used for legitimate governmental purposes and in a nondiscriminatory fashion. The House bill provides for a series of high-priority categories. We would recommend that your committee consider removing these restrictions on local spending contained in the House bill.

"A third aspect of the House bill which deserves comment is the use of urbanized population as a factor to distribute the $3.5-billion among the states to the localities. This factor discriminates rather severely against three states (Alaska, Vermont and Wyoming) without urbanized population. Consequently, we recommend that the committee explore ways of removing this discrimination."

Howard H. Baker Jr. (R Tenn.), who introduced the bill in the Senate (S 3651), urged passage of a revenue-sharing bill in 1972.

HR 14370 is a bill "that I could easily support and vote for without any change in it at all.... There is one significant change that I would like to urge strongly before this committee." One provision would encourage (if not virtually force) states to enact personal income taxes. The constitutional obstacles to an income tax are formidable in Tennessee.

Several ways have been proposed to eliminate the income tax problem from the bill. "I introduced an amendment" under which "the entire appropriation...would be apportioned among the states on the basis of population modified by tax effort." The amendment would double the apportionment to the Tennessee state government, from $14.3-million to $29.5-million.

Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.), a cosponsor of S 3651 and author of an earlier revenue-sharing bill, urged passage but also recommended certain changes and warned that "this Congress and the Executive Branch of our federal government must not—indeed cannot—fall into the trap of thinking that problems of the cities, suburbs and townships disappear with the passage of revenue sharing."

July 26

Lee Metcalf (D Mont.) urged the committee to make Indian tribes eligible to share in the funds allocated to local governments:

James L. Buckley (Cons-R N.Y.) suggested an alternative to the bill under which the federal government would shift part of its personal income tax base to the states temporarily and share its tax-collecting facilities to the extent that a total of $5-billion or more would be collected annually for state and local governments.

Roland M. Bixler, president of J-B-T Instruments, Inc., New Haven, Conn., speaking for the National Association of Manufacturers, opposed HR 14370 but urged the committee to add to it minimum standards for state taxation of multi-state businesses and relief for business from differing state and local tax requirements.

Eugene F. Rinta, executive director of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, opposed HR 14370:

"Even if HR 14370 were acceptable on principle, the seriously adverse present and prospective federal fiscal position would not warrant embarking at this time on a new program

providing $5- to $6-billion annual handouts to state and local governments in the years ahead."

Paul Parks, administrator of the model cities program in Boston, speaking for Americans for Democratic Action, supported the revenue-sharing concept for local governments but opposed sharing with states.

July 27

George Lehr, county executive, Jackson County, Mo., speaking for the National Association of Counties, supported the bill:

"These crises (faced by counties) do not exist because of increases in what are thought to be 'traditional' county functions. They exist because of the rapid increases in new functions that counties have willingly assumed during the last two decades.

"This is the overriding reason why we need fiscal assistance now—to solve the fiscal problems arising from our willingness to assume the responsibilities accorded us (and sometimes mandated upon us) by federal and state governments and to meet the demands of our local citizens."

Andrew J. Biemiller, director, department of legislation, AFL-CIO, restated the organization's opposition to the bill:

"It is our judgment that the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act...in its present form will be a cruel disappointment to its advocates. It will fall far short of its intended goals and set a dangerous precedent."

BILL REPORTED. The Senate Finance Committee Aug. 16 reported an amended bill, the Revenue Sharing Act of 1972 (HR 14370—S Rept 92-1050).

The revenue-sharing bill which was passed by the House June 22 was substantially revised by the Senate committee.

The amended bill provided the same total amount for revenue sharing as the House bill but, in addition, authorized supplementary social service grants at a level of $1-billion per calendar years 1973-1976. It reduced the revenue shares for more urbanized states but increased shares for urbanized areas as well as less urban states.

The bill provided trust fund financing for revenue sharing to avoid the congressional appropriations process. It eliminated the limits on local use of funds provided by the House bill.

Initial Action, Revision. The Senate bill initially was ordered reported Aug. 9 as a thoroughly amended version of the House bill. However, when the Senate Appropriations Committee tried to assert jurisdiction over the bill, the Finance Committee reconsidered its action Aug. 11. (The Appropriations panel had voted Aug. 10 to demand an opportunity to consider the bill before it went to the floor.) To keep the program out of the normal appropriations process, within which it could have been subject to annual appropriations, the committee revised the bill's financing provisions to provide a "permanent" appropriation of 7 percent of personal income tax receipts to a special revenue-sharing trust fund for the five-year life of the legislation. From the trust fund the secretary of the treasury was directed to pay out to the state and local governments the amounts to which they were entitled under the aid formulas adopted by the committees. The trust fund was expected to provide substantially more than the amounts mandated by the bill, which began retroactively at an annual level of $5.3-billion for the latter half of fiscal 1972 (Jan. 1 to June 30, 1972).

The Treasury was authorized to pay the supplementary social service grants out of sums remaining from revenue sharing in the trust fund. Any remaining amounts were to be added to the general funds of the Treasury.

The committee noted that other trust-funded programs, such as Social Security, were financed under permanent appropriations and did not require annual or periodic action by the appropriations bodies of the two houses. If the Appropriations Committee was successful in asserting jurisdiction, it could require annual appropriations which would be subject to pressures both from recipients and from conflicting claims of other federal programs.

The decision to order the bill reported again came after unsuccessful efforts to reach an accommodation with the Appropriations Committee The action appeared to reflect the confidence of Chairman Russell B. Long (D La.) of the Finance Committee that, as amended, the bill had sufficient support to reject any effort by the Appropriations Committee on the floor to take control of it.

Many observers regarded the Appropriations Committee's effort as an initial assertion of authority by John L. McClellan (D Ark.), who succeeded to the committee chairmanship on the death of Allen J. Ellender (D La.) July 27. The move scuttled the chance for Senate passage before the Aug. 18 recess for the Republican national convention. A move similar to McClellan's by Chairman George Mahon (D Texas) of the House Appropriations Committee failed when the bill was considered in the House.

Amounts allocated to individual states and to their local governments differed substantially from the House bill's distribution. By fiscal years, the amounts provided were, in billions of dollars:

Fiscal Year	Revenue Sharing	Supplementary Grants	Total
1972	$ 2.650 (half-year)	$ 0.000	$ 2.650
1973	5.450	.500 (half-year)	5.950
1974	5.750	1.000	6.750
1975	6.050	1.000	7.050
1976	6.350	1.000	7.350
1977	3.325 (half-year)	.500 (half-year)	3.825
TOTALS	$29.575	$4.000	$33.575

The annual rates for fiscal year 1977, for the first half of which funds were provided, were $6.650-billion for revenue sharing, $1-billion for supplementary grants and $7.650-billion in total.

The committee voted 12-4 to report the bill. The dissenters were Fred R. Harris (D Okla.), Harry F. Byrd Jr. (Ind. Va.), Carl T. Curtis (R Neb.) and Len B. Jordan (R Idaho).

Abraham Ribicoff (D Conn.) submitted additional views on the legislation, while Byrd submitted a minority view. Ribicoff objected to the committee's deletion of factors in the House bill allocation formulas which granted greater benefits in total to the local governments of urbanized states and to the committee's refusal to relate state shares to federal income tax collections in each state. Byrd dissented on grounds that the federal government was in deficit and had no surplus revenues to share, that the bill divided public accountability by giving state and local governments funds which they had no responsibility for raising and that the legislation involved federal dictation to state and local governments.

Provisions. As reported by the Finance Committee, HR 14370:

- Authorized revenue sharing with state and local governments for five calendar years, effective retroactively to Jan. 1, 1972, at an initial fiscal year level of $5.3-billion (actually half that amount to be paid out retroactively for the latter half of fiscal year 1972—Jan. 1, 1972, to June 30, 1972), with annual increases of $150-million in fiscal 1973 and $300-million each fiscal year afterward, making a total of $29.575-billion over the five calendar years.
- Authorized supplementary social service grants to state and local governments for four calendar years, beginning Jan. 1, 1973, at an initial fiscal year level of $1-billion (half that amount to be paid out in the latter half of fiscal 1973), making a total of $4-billion and a grand total of $33.575-billion; stipulated that the grants were to replace existing 75-percent federal matching grants for all social services except child care and family planning (for which the matching grants would continue to be available).
- Created a trust fund consisting of 7 percent of individual income tax receipts (3.5 percent for the half-years of fiscal 1972 and 1977) for revenue sharing and authorized appropriation of a sum sufficient to make supplementary grants; required the treasury secretary to pay state and local governments in quarterly increments the sums to which the bill entitled them and authorized use of leftover sums in the revenue-sharing trust fund for supplementary grants.

REVENUE SHARING

- Distributed funds for each fiscal year among the states according to population, total tax effort of the state and local governments and, inversely, per capita income relative to each of those factors for the entire country.
- Allocated each state's share, including the annual increase, one-third to the state government and two-thirds to local governments.
- Required each state government to continue to share its own revenues with local governments to at least the extent it did during fiscal 1972 and authorized reduction of a state government's share to the extent by which a state failed to comply.
- Allocated the local government share for each state among the state's counties according to relative population, inverse per capita income and total tax effort (total county and local taxes less education taxes, to eliminate the effect of variations in types of school districts and in financial responsibility for education).
- Allocated each county's share between the county government and the municipal governments according to their relative tax effort, excluding education taxes.
- Allocated local governments' shares within each county—according to relative population, tax effort and inverse per capita income—among the municipalities (and towns, where they performed municipal services).
- Established a floor and ceiling such that no county or municipality would receive less than 20 percent of the average per capita allocation of all local governments in a state or more than 145 percent; limited each county's and municipality's share to 50 percent of its taxes (less education taxes) and intergovernmental transfers for the previous fiscal year.
- Authorized each state government to change the formula for distribution of local government funds once during the five calendar years to increase, reduce or eliminate the effect of either total tax effort or inverse per capita income.
- Limited local government revenue sharing to general purpose government units, excluding school districts and other special purpose districts.
- Provided that, where a city crossed county lines, the part within each county was to be treated separately in calculation of the city's share (but the total share was to be paid to the city government).
- Disallowed allocation of a share to any locality entitled to less than $200.
- Required each state and local government to submit an annual report to the Treasury Department setting out the purposes for which revenue-sharing funds were used during the previous fiscal year and the purposes for which the funds were to be used in the current or forthcoming fiscal year.
- Prohibited denial of benefits under the program by any state or local government on the basis of race, sex or national origin.
- Prohibited use of funds as state or local funds to match federal funds under requirements of other federal aid programs.
- Required each state and local government to establish a trust fund for revenue-sharing funds received; required each state and local government to spend revenue-sharing funds within the same strictures applying to their own funds; required fiscal accounting and audit procedures conforming to guidelines to be established by the treasury secretary after consultation with the comptroller general.
- Required that persons in local government jobs financed by revenue-sharing funds be paid at rates prevailing for similar jobs financed with local funds but eliminated the House bill's application of the Davis-Bacon Act (requiring payment of prevailing—union—wage scales under federally financed construction contracts) to local government construction contracts financed with revenue-sharing funds.

SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS

- Limited 75-percent federal matching funds for social service programs for welfare recipients, under the existing Social Security program, to matching for child care and family planning.
- Allocated supplementary grant funds among states on the basis of their urbanized population, as defined by the Census Bureau, but provided a floor under which no less than 30 percent of the population of any state was regarded as urbanized.
- Allocated supplementary grant funds, one-third to state governments and two-thirds to local governments; distributed funds to local governments in the same proportions as revenue-sharing funds.
- Limited 75-percent matching for social services for the remainder of calendar 1972 to existing programs at current levels.
- Provided for judicial review of questions involving federal withholding of state or local revenue-sharing allocations or supplementary grants.
- Required information about place of residence on income tax returns, for allocation purposes.

INCOME TAX COLLECTION

- Required the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to collect state individual income taxes when the state had met requirements of the bill and regulations to be issued by the Treasury and had entered into an agreement for that purpose with the Treasury.
- Made the "piggyback" collection provision effective Jan. 1, 1974, if a state or states with residents who had filed at least 5 percent of federal income tax returns in 1972 had entered a collection agreement by that date.
- Generally applied IRS regulations to collection of state taxes and gave the treasury secretary authority to prescribe withholding rates and establish conditions for entry into an agreement and withdrawal.
- Established requirements to be met in their tax systems by states to qualify for federal collection.
- Provided that the federal government would represent state interests in dealings with taxpayers, including legal proceedings, except in limited circumstances.
- Required participating states to adopt all future changes in federal individual income tax laws; prescribed timing for changes in state tax laws; prescribed additional types of income taxes participating states could impose; required conformity in taxable years, joint returns, penalties and treatment of income.

Senate Floor Action

The Senate Sept. 12, by a 64-20 roll-call vote, passed HR 14370 establishing a five-year program to share $29,583,560,000 in federal revenues with state and local governments and $4-billion over four years for social services. *(Vote 391, p. 61-S)*

During floor action on HR 14370, the Senate upheld the major revisions in the House-passed bill recommended by the Senate Finance Committee. The Senate version increased the amounts provided the smaller states, at the expense of the more populous urban states.

As passed, HR 14370 reflected the greater representation in the Senate of states with smaller populations and fewer cities. The votes against passage of HR 14370 were cast by fiscal conservatives opposed to the extent of the appropriations in the bill and by large-state senators opposed to the reduced shares it gave their states.

Although the allocations among states varied, House and Senate versions provided nearly identical total amounts for state and local governments, starting at an annual level of about $5.3-billion.

In an effort to offset reductions in shared revenues to urban states, the Senate added $1-billion for each of 1973-76, not provided by the House, for a separate program of grants for social services based on each state's urban population. At the same time, however, the Senate limited total federal spending on such programs to $1.6-billion: $1-billion for programs funded by the bill and $600-million for child-care and family-planning services to be funded under existing matching grant programs.

Under existing programs, in which the federal government furnishes 75 percent of the cost of social services (including child care and family planning) administered by state and local governments, federal payments had been expected to reach $4.7-billion in fiscal 1973.

At the Finance Committee's recommendation, the Senate abandoned complex provisions in the House bill for dividing $1.8-billion a year among state governments and $3.5-billion a year among local governments within the states. Under the House bill, each state government's share would be determined by its state income tax collections and by the general tax effort of all governments within the state. Funds for local government would be allocated among the states on the basis of over-all population, urban population and the average income of the state's population.

The Senate bill, on the other hand, allocated a single lump sum to each state on the basis of three factors: population, tax effort by state and local governments and the income level of the population. One-third of that amount would go to the state government; the other two-thirds would be distributed among the local government units according to the same factors used to determine the state's allocation from the federal government.

By dropping the House bill's use of state income tax collections to compute state government shares and the urban population figure to compute each state's local government shares, the Senate gave greater weight to the income level of the population, thus favoring smaller states where incomes are lower.

The result was reduced shares of revenue-sharing funds for 16 states and the District of Columbia and greater shares for the other 34 states. The Senate's overall redistribution formula reflected less weight given income taxes, a higher proportion of which are collected by larger states, and the populations of the major metropolitan areas; this resulted in smaller shares for those state governments and for local governments in populous suburban areas. On the other hand, the greater weight given low-income levels and tax effort by the Senate bill favored local governments in poor central cities and rural areas.

In terms of funds provided by HR 14370, the Senate's reduction of revenue-sharing allocations to the larger states was partially offset by the addition of $1-billion a year for supplementary social services grants. The supplementary funds, distributed on the basis of a state's urban population, primarily would benefit the larger states whose revenue-sharing funds were cut back in the Senate bill.

Approval of the supplementary funds reduced to four the number of states that would lose total funding under the Senate version. In terms of total federal money available, however, the larger states still might lose money, since HR 14370 placed a ceiling of $1.6-billion on federal grants for social services.

In all, the Senate adopted 11 amendments to the committee-approved bill, most of which made only minor changes in the committee's revenue-sharing formula. It rejected 19 amendments, some of which would have shifted the whole emphasis in the distribution of revenue-sharing funds.

By substantial margins, the Senate rejected seven amendments to provide a greater proportion of revenue-sharing funds for the larger states. The alternative formulas—proposed by senators from Ohio, New York and Connecticut—favored larger states by giving greater weight to population or to the population living in urban areas.

In the only change affecting total funds available under HR 14370, the Senate Sept. 12 adopted an amendment by Daniel K. Inouye (D Hawaii) increasing alloca-

tions to Alaska and Hawaii to offset higher living costs in the states outside the continental United States.

Inouye's amendment added $4,780,000 a year to the committee-approved totals to Hawaii ($3,405,000 a year) and Alaska ($1,375,000 a year), leaving other states' shares unaffected.

In actions modifying the committee-approved provision for supplementary social services grants, the Senate Sept. 12 adopted:

- By a 60-28 roll call, an amendment by Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D La.) limiting federal matching grants for child-care and family-planning services to $600-million a year, allocated among the states according to population. *(Vote 387, p. 60-S)*
- By voice vote, an amendment by Abraham Ribicoff (D Conn.) appropriating $1-billion a year to a separate trust fund for the supplemental social services grants.

Long's amendment was offered as a compromise substitute for an amendment by William V. Roth Jr. (R Del.) that would have replaced the committee's $1-billion social services grants authorization with authority for $3.15-billion a year in matching funds for such programs—including child-care and family-planning.

The committee bill, while limiting federal contributions for state and local social services to $1-billion, had excluded family planning and child care from the ceiling. Roth's amendment brought child care and family planning under the ceiling but provided substantially more than the committee bill for the other programs.

By limiting child care and family planning to $600-million, Long's amendment placed a total ceiling of $1.6-billion on federal assistance to social services programs. Family planning and child care still would be funded separately by existing programs.

Ribicoff's amendment, which was endorsed by Long, provided permanent appropriations for the supplementary grant funds; enactment would assure state and local governments of receiving the funds without the fear of congressional appropriations cutbacks in later years.

Other amendments approved by the Senate made Indian tribes and groups that performed government functions eligible for revenue sharing and attached existing federal wage standards to projects for which revenue-sharing funds were used.

The Senate rejected amendments that would have limited the revenue-sharing program to two years and required annual congressional appropriations of funds before they could be distributed to state and local governments.

Also rejected were amendments by Democratic senators dealing with tax reform. One, offered by Edward M. Kennedy (D Mass.), would have required President Nixon to submit tax reform proposals to Congress before the November presidential election. Amendments by Frank Church (D Idaho) and Gaylord Nelson (D Wis.) would have repealed existing tax preferences on personal income.

Debate

Opening debate on HR 14370 Aug. 18, Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D La.) explained the committee-approved changes in the House-passed revenue-sharing bill.

"The committee bill is more effective than the House bill in putting the money where the needs are," Long contended. The committee version's single formula for distributing funds to states and to political divisions within states "has the advantage of providing consistent treatment in allocating funds to state and local governments," he added.

"The House bill distributed funds to the states only on an incentive basis—that is, on the basis of general tax effort and income tax collections. This ignored the 'need' factor in distributing funds and meant that the lower income states received less than their fair share."

By basing distributions to states in part on their income tax collections, Long argued, the House bill "discriminates markedly against states with either no income tax or low income taxes."

The House formula for distributions to local governments "would distribute relatively large amounts of aid to well-to-do suburbs, reducing the amounts available for distribution to the cities and low-income rural areas."

"The committee bill, by emphasizing both low-income levels and tax effort, channels more of the revenue-sharing funds both to the cities and to the poorer rural areas," Long added.

Conceding that the Senate committee had reduced revenue-sharing allocations to the most populous states, Long argued that the committee's bill provided offsetting aid to urban states through the $1-billion supplemental grant program for social services.

The committee deleted House provisions restricting local governments' use of federal revenue funds to specified purposes because "we are convinced that local governments know better than we do in the Senate as to what their needs are," Long said.

John V. Tunney (D Calif.) objected that the $1-billion supplemental grant program would disrupt California's social services financing system. In California, he said, counties and states share responsibility for social services; but the committee bill would require that federal funds for such programs go to cities as well.

Ribicoff Amendment. The Senate Sept. 5 resumed debate on HR 14370 with Ribicoff introducing his amendment revising the distribution formula to provide more money to the larger states.

"The rejuvenation of our deteriorating cities was one of the prime considerations in the development of the revenue-sharing concept," he said. "Yet the Senate Finance Committee has approved a bill which is only partly responsive to our urban problems. The committee's formula...is a conscious attempt to penalize those areas with the most explosive and expensive problems."

The committee bill's greater share for cities "does not compensate for the fact that in the total distribution of the $5.3-billion, urban states and their state governments get far less than their fair share," Ribicoff added. "...we must also recognize that many urban-oriented services are provided by state governments."

Long opposed Ribicoff's amendment during debate Sept. 6, arguing that the committee version offered help to poorer states not provided by the House bill or by Ribicoff's formula.

By allocating more funds to urban areas "where perhaps sanitary services are not everything that is desired," Long reasoned, "in some respects you would be taking funds away from rural people who cannot afford even a flush toilet."

Ribicoff: "Whenever a formula comes up before the Committee on Finance, the state of Louisiana never comes out second best.... Those from urban states are so outvoted in the committee...that urban problems are overlooked and bypassed."

Long: Under the committee bill "...cities in New York and California, like cities in Illinois and Michigan, which needed help the most would get lots of help...at the expense of the very wealthy suburbs, which really did not need any assistance at all."

By a 24-61 roll-call vote Sept. 6, the Senate defeated Ribicoff's amendment. *(Vote 367, p. 57-S)*

The amendment substituted a formula in which each state's share would have been determined on the basis of urbanized population as well as by total population, tax revenue and income level as under the committee bill.

The Ribicoff formula would have allocated 40 percent of the federal revenues shared each year among the states according to their shares of the total population and the percentage of the urban population. The remaining 60 percent would be allocated in ratio to each state's state and local tax effort weighted by their per capita income levels.

The result would have been larger shares of federal revenues for the most populous and industrialized states and, correspondingly, reduced shares for the smaller, less urbanized states. All 24 votes for Ribicoff's amendment were cast by senators from states whose shares would have been enlarged by the revised formula.

McClellan Amendment. By a 34-49 roll call Sept. 7, the Senate rejected an amendment by Appropriations Committee Chairman John L. McClellan (D Ark.) eliminating from the committee version authority to appropriate revenue-sharing funds for the last three years (fiscal 1974-76) covered under the bill. *(Vote 347, p. 54-S)*

McClellan's amendment, an attempt to assert Appropriations Committee jurisdiction over revenue-sharing funds, would have required the committee's approval of amounts distributed to the states during those fiscal years. The Finance Committee bill provided a permanent annual appropriation of 7 percent of personal income tax revenue to a special revenue-sharing trust fund and authorized the secretary of the Treasury to distribute the money in fiscal 1972-76 according to amounts authorized by the bill.

McClellan's amendment would have appropriated $2,650,000,000 retroactively from the trust fund for fiscal 1972 and $5,450,000,000 for fiscal 1973. For subsequent fiscal years, the bill allowed revenue-sharing appropriations to be included in the previous year's appropriations measures to give state and local governments advance notice of how much money they could expect to receive.

The Appropriations Committee Aug. 10 had voted to demand that it be given an opportunity to consider HR 14370 before it went to the floor. The Finance Committee, which had ordered the bill reported Aug. 9, then revised the measure's financing provisions to head off the Appropriations Committee's claim of jurisdiction over the bill.

Of 34 votes for McClellan's amendment, 21 were cast by members of the Appropriations Committee.

Hartke Amendments. The Senate Sept. 6 adopted one of three amendments offered by Vance Hartke (D Ind.) applying existing federal labor standards to projects and government positions financed with revenue-sharing funds. The amendments were supported by organized labor and by the Nixon administration.

By a 58-26 roll call, the Senate approved Hartke's amendment applying existing federal wage standards to workers on construction projects and to government positions financed with federal revenues to be shared with state and local governments. The amendment required persons compensated from revenue-sharing funds to be paid at the prevailing wage, the state or local minimum wage or the federal minimum wage. It also applied to revenue-sharing funds the 1931 Davis-Bacon Act requirement that workers on federally financed construction projects receive wages equivalent to local prevailing construction wages. *(Vote 370, p. 58-S)*

Before approving Hartke's amendment, the Senate by voice vote adopted a modifying amendment by Finance Committee Chairman Russell B. Long (D La.) restricting the wage requirements to projects or job positions for which more than 25 percent of the funding came from revenue-sharing money.

Two other Hartke proposals were rejected Sept. 6 by the Senate:

- By a 26-56 roll call, an amendment prohibiting use of revenue-sharing funds to induce a business or industry to move a factory or other facility from one area to another. *(Vote 371, p. 58-S)*
- By a 27-54 roll call, an amendment applying the 1964 Urban Mass Transportation Act labor requirements to urban mass transportation systems acquired by local government units with federal revenue-sharing funds. *(Vote 372, p. 58-S)*

Debate on Hartke's amendments centered on whether Congress should attach any conditions or qualifications to the revenue it shared with state and local governments.

Long and other senators argued that any restrictive amendments would be inconsistent with the purpose of revenue sharing and that Hartke's amendments would apply federal labor standards to projects financed with only small percentages of federal funds.

Taft Formula. Introducing an amendment revising the distribution formula so that the larger states would receive more of the total amount, Robert Taft Jr. (R Ohio) Sept. 8 said the Finance Committee bill "resulted in a very serious net loss to a great many states and, particularly, to many of our larger cities.

"Many of the states are shortchanged," he added, and many of them are among the larger states where the problems and expenses are the greatest."

Citing his own state's $40-million loss under the committee version, Taft argued that "Ohio should not be victimized by a formula which rewards high taxes and governmental inefficiency." The amendment was killed when Long's motion to table it was adopted on a 52-24 roll-call vote. *(Vote 380, p. 59-S)*

Long said Taft's formula left out tax effort, "one factor that the administration found to be a compelling factor" in determining revenue-sharing allocations. Under Secretary of the Treasury Charls E. Walker had endorsed the Finance Committee formula, Long added.

Tax Amendments. Church and Nelson Sept. 11 presented their amendments to eliminate tax preferences. The resulting increase in tax money would pay the cost of revenue-sharing, they said. Both amendments were

killed by adoption of motions by Long to table them. *(Votes 382, 383, p. 60-S)*

"The Senate is on the verge of passing a $35-billion revenue-sharing measure without raising a dime to pay for it," Church said. "Just because the administration has abandoned all sense of fiscal responsibility, the Senate is not absolved of its duty to keep the federal government solvent."

Adoption of both amendments would advance two objectives: revenue sharing and tax reform, Church said.

Herman E. Talmadge (D Ga.), third-ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee, said adoption of tax reform amendments would be a "futile gesture" because House conferees would not accept tax provisions which originated as a non-germane Senate amendment.

Social Services. Offering an amendment that would have deleted the provision for supplementary social services grants, Lawton Chiles (D Fla.) said the Finance Committee should make a thorough study of social services funding before Congress acted.

Although many states "have abused the program and some of the funding," he said, "many of the services are certainly valuable to the concept that Congress set up when it provided for matching funds...in an attempt to keep many of our citizens off welfare...."

Long defended the committee provision, arguing that the existing "open-ended three-for-one federal matching for so-called social services takes the cake as being the most irresponsible, wide-open federal expenditure to do things no one in Congress ever intended...." The amendment was rejected on an 18-67 roll-call vote. *(Vote 385, p. 60-S)*

Child Care, Family Planning. In proposing a $600-million limit on matching funds for child-care and family-planning programs, Long Sept. 12 insisted that Congress should enact a meaningful ceiling on federal contributions to social services programs.

Combined with the $1-billion ceiling on contributions to other social programs in the committee bill, he said, the $600-million limit would place annual federal contributions for social services at $1.6-billion—an amount certain to be increased in conference with the House.

With a total $1.6-billion ceiling in the Senate bill, Long added, "we might have to settle for $3-billion. However, if we go to conference with the $3.1-billion (allowed by Roth's amendment), we might have to settle for $4.5-billion or $5-billion." Long's substitute was adopted on a 60-28 roll-call vote. *(Vote 387, p. 60-S)*

Backing Roth's amendment, Robert Dole (R Kan.) said its provisions would establish "a fair and financially responsible formula for continued funding of the state social services programs at a reasonable level."

Amendments Accepted—Sept. 6—Russell B. Long (D La.)—Amendment to first Hartke amendment *(below)*—Apply 1931 Davis-Bacon Act requirement, that workers on federally financed construction projects receive prevailing local construction wages, to projects financed with revenue-sharing funds. Roll-call vote, 86-0.

Long—Amendment to first Hartke amendment *(below)*—Restrict wage requirements under Davis-Bacon Act and Hartke amendment to construction projects or government positions for which more than 25 percent of the financing came from revenue-sharing funds. Voice vote.

Vance Hartke (D Ind.)—As modified by Long amendments *(above)*—Require that a state or local government employee be paid at the prevailing local wage, state or local minimum wage or federal minimum wage (whichever was highest) in cases where revenue-sharing funds made up 25 percent or more of the employees' compensation, and apply the 1931 Davis-Bacon Act requirement that workers on federally financed construction projects receive prevailing local construction wages on projects for which more than 25 percent of the financing came from revenue-sharing funds. Roll call, 58-26.

Sept. 7—Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.)—Direct the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to prepare by June 30, 1973, a report on real estate and property tax administration. Voice.

James L. Buckley (Cons-R N.Y.)—Permit states to transfer taxing authority to local governments and reduce corresponding state fund transfers to local governments without losing revenue-sharing funds. Voice.

Sept. 8—John V. Tunney (D Calif.)—Amendment to Metcalf amendment *(below)*—Make Indian bands, groups, pueblos and communities, as well as tribes and Alaskan native villages, eligible for federal revenue-sharing funds. Voice.

Lee Metcalf (D Mont.)—As modified by Tunney amendment *(above)*—Set aside 0.25 percent of federal revenue-sharing funds for allocation to Alaskan native villages and Indian tribes, bands, groups, pueblos and communities that perform government services. Voice.

Hartke—Provide that any state income tax collected by the federal government under the mechanism established by the bill could be levied on a transportation worker only if 50 percent or more of the worker's wages were earned within the state. Voice.

Sept. 12—Long—Substitute amendment for Roth amendment *(below)* to delete a provision in the bill authorizing $1-billion annually in supplementary grants for social services other than child care and family planning and substitute an authorization of $3.15-billion a year in federal matching funds for social services including child care and family planning—Limit child-care and family-planning matching grants to $600-million a fiscal year, allocated among the states according to their urban populations. Roll call, 60-28.

William V. Roth Jr. (R Del.)—As amended by Long amendment *(above)*. Voice.

Abraham Ribicoff (D Conn.)—Appropriate to a Social Service Trust Fund out of Treasury funds $500-million in fiscal 1973, $1-billion in each of fiscal 1974-76 and $500-million in fiscal 1977 for payments to state and local governments as supplementary grants for social services. Voice.

Daniel K. Inouye (D Hawaii)—Increase amounts available from the revenue-sharing funds for payments to state and local governments by $2,390,000 in fiscal 1972, by $4,780,000 in each of fiscal 1973-76 and by $2,390,000 in fiscal 1977, and increase the revenue-sharing funds allocated each year to those states where federal government employees received cost-of-living allowances by the same percentage as the increase in those employees' basic compensation provided by such allowances (15 percent in Hawaii and 25 percent in Alaska, increasing Hawaii's annual allocation by $3,405,000 and Alaska's by $1,375,000). Voice.

Amendments Rejected—Sept. 6—Abraham Ribicoff (D Conn.)—Revise formula for distribution of federal revenues among states, allocating 40 percent of re-

venue-sharing funds according to each state's share of total U.S. population and percentage of U.S. urban population, and allocating the remaining 60 percent in ratio to each state's local and state tax effort weighted by per capita income levels. Roll-call vote, 24-61.

Vance Hartke (D Ind.)—Prohibit use of revenue-sharing funds to induce a business or industry to move a factory or other facility from one area to another. Roll call, 26-56.

Hartke—Apply the 1964 Urban Mass Transportation Act labor requirements to urban mass transportation systems that would be acquired by local government units with federal revenue-sharing funds. Roll call, 27-54.

Sept. 7—John L. McClellan (D Ark.)—Delete provisions for permanent appropriation of 7 percent of federal personal income tax revenue in fiscal 1972-76 to a revenue-sharing trust fund for payments to state and local governments, and substitute a provision appropriating $2,650,000,000 retroactively in fiscal 1972 and $5,450,-000 in fiscal 1973 from the trust fund for payments to state and local governments (thus requiring separate congressional appropriation of funds for revenue-sharing in fiscal years 1974-76). Roll call, 34-49.

Hubert H. Humphrey (D Minn.)—Require the President to report to Congress and the comptroller general of the General Accounting Office whenever he impounded funds appropriated by Congress, giving the amounts impounded and his reasons for doing so. Rejected by adoption of Long motion to table. Roll call, 46-39.

Sept. 8—James L. Buckley (Cons-R N.Y.)—Limit federal revenue-sharing to two years (July 1, 1972-June 30, 1974) instead of the five years (Jan. 1, 1972-Dec. 31, 1976) provided by the bill. Roll call, 14-62.

Buckley—Delete provisions requiring reports by local and state governments on their use of revenue-sharing funds, barring discrimination in programs financed with revenue-sharing funds, barring use of revenue-sharing funds as state or local contributions for obtaining federal matching funds under other programs and setting conditions for administration of revenue-sharing funds by state and local governments. Roll call, 6-70.

Edward M. Kennedy (D Mass.)—Require the President to submit to Congress preliminary proposals for tax reform by Oct. 31, 1972, and final proposals by March 31, 1973. Rejected by adoption of Long motion to table. Roll call, 52-24.

Kennedy—Establish a Voter Registration Administration within the Bureau of the Census to administer a voluntary voter registration program for state and local government with federal assistance. Rejected by adoption of Talmadge motion to table. Roll call, 48-28.

Robert Taft Jr. (R Ohio)—Increase to 7.33 percent from 7 percent the percentage of annual federal income taxes available for revenue sharing (thus increasing the total amount provided for each year by $374,500,000), and revise the formula for allocation of the funds among states to give each state the greater of two amounts: an amount based on its share of total U.S. population or an amount based on its relative per capita income. Rejected by adoption of Long motion to table. Roll call, 52-24.

Buckley—Replace provision for sharing federal revenues with the states with a provision directing the Internal Revenue Service to return to each state 7 percent of the federal income tax collected from each taxpayer in the state. Roll call, 6-55.

Sept. 11—Frank Church (D Idaho)—Repeal the asset depreciation range (ADR) system of accelerated depreciation allowances on business plant and equipment put into effect in 1971 by the Nixon administration. Rejected by adoption of Long motion to table. Roll call, 56-21.

Gaylord Nelson (D Wis.)—Modify existing minimum tax on personal income given preferential tax treatment by reducing to $12,000 from $30,000 the exemption on preference income through stock options, bad debt reserves, depletion allowances and capital gains and increasing the tax rate on such income. Rejected by adoption of Long motion to table. Roll call, 60-23.

Edward J. Gurney (R Fla.)—Require the secretary of the treasury to withhold revenue-sharing payments to local government units that failed to revise property tax assessments after the secretary had determined that the ratios of their assessments to property market values varied by more than 15 percent from the statewide average ratio of assessments to property market value. Roll call, 8-75.

Lawton Chiles (D Fla.)—Delete provision authorizing supplementary social services grants to state and local governments of $1-billion a year, limiting existing matching fund grants for social services to child-care and family-planning programs and limiting 1972 social services matching grants to existing programs. Roll call, 18-67.

Jacob K. Javits (R N.Y.)—Create a Urban Dividend Trust Fund providing an additional $1.5-billion over five fiscal years for distribution among the states according to the size of their urban populations. Roll call, 27-57.

Sept. 12—Taft—Increase revenue-sharing funds for each year covered by the bill by $360.7-million and allocate for each of these years to the states the greater of the following amounts: an amount in ratio to a state's population weighted by tax effort and average income level (as under the committee bill), or an amount in ratio to its population alone. Rejected by adoption of Long motion to table. Roll call, 60-30.

Taft—Revise formula for allocating revenue-sharing funds among the states to distribute one-third of the total amount in the bill by population, one-third by tax effort and one-third by relative income (rather than determining each state's share by computing the amount for each state on these factors together). Roll call, 32-49.

Taft—Delete the formula for allocating revenue-sharing finds among the states and determine each state's share solely by its population. Rejected by adoption of Long motion to table. Roll call, 60-28.

Conference Agreement

House and Senate conferees Sept. 25 filed a conference report on HR 14370 (S Rept 92-1229) establishing a five-year program to share $30,236,400,000 in federal revenues with state and local governments.

In an unusual compromise, the conference agreement allowed each state the larger of the revenue-sharing allocations its state and local governments would receive under conflicting House- and Senate-approved distribution formulas.

The House formula, based on five factors, provided larger amounts to more populous, urbanized states. The Senate formula, based on three factors, favored less populous, rural states.

(Continued on p. 652)

Revenue Sharing: State Allocations in 1972 Under Conference Bill

(in millions of dollars)

States	House bill	Senate bill[1]	CONFERENCE AGREEMENT: Before scaling to $5.3 billion	After scaling to $5.3 billion	States' share[4]	Local share[5]
United States, total	$5,300.0	$5,300.0	$5,821.1	$5,303.9	$1,767.8	$3,536.1
Alabama	80.2	127.6	127.6	116.1	38.7	77.4
Alaska	6.6	5.5	5.5[2]	6.3[3]	2.1	4.2
Arizona	46.1	55.1	55.1	50.2	16.7	33.5
Arkansas	38.3	60.4	60.4	55.0	18.3	36.7
California	610.8	510.4	610.8	556.1	185.4	370.7
Colorado	59.4	60.0	60.0	54.6	18.2	36.4
Connecticut	72.6	57.5	72.6	66.2	22.1	44.1
Delaware	17.3	12.9	17.3	15.8	5.3	10.5
District of Columbia	26.0	14.1	26.0	23.6	7.9	15.7
Florida	150.0	160.3	160.3	146.0	48.7	97.3
Georgia	103.4	120.7	120.7	109.9	36.6	73.3
Hawaii	25.9	22.7	22.7[2]	23.8[3]	7.9	15.9
Idaho	15.4	21.8	21.8	19.9	6.7	13.2
Illinois	301.8	250.9	301.8	274.7	91.5	183.2
Indiana	113.8	114.6	114.6	104.3	34.8	69.5
Iowa	67.8	84.6	84.6	77.0	25.6	51.4
Kansas	47.7	58.0	58.0	52.8	17.6	35.2
Kentucky	71.8	95.9	95.9	87.3	29.1	58.2
Louisiana	83.2	124.8	124.8	113.6	37.9	75.7
Maine	19.9	34.2	34.2	31.1	10.3	20.8
Maryland	117.5	94.8	117.5	107.0	35.7	[illegible]
Massachusetts	179.0	143.5	179.0	163.0	44.3	[illegible]
Michigan	243.7	210.9	243.7	221.9	74.0	[illegible]
Minnesota	114.1	108.2	114.1	103.9	34.6	[illegible]
Mississippi	46.0	99.6	99.6	90.7	30.2	60.5
Missouri	107.6	108.5	108.5	98.8	33.0	65.8
Montana	16.7	22.6	22.6	20.6	6.9	13.7
Nebraska	34.5	47.1	47.1	42.9	14.3	28.6
Nevada	12.2	11.9	12.2	11.1	3.7	7.4
New Hampshire	13.5	16.7	16.7	15.2	5.1	10.1
New Jersey	179.7	142.6	179.7	163.6	54.5	109.1
New Mexico	22.5	36.5	36.5	33.2	11.0	22.2
New York	649.6	507.1	649.6	591.4	197.1	394.3
North Carolina	113.0	148.8	148.8	135.5	45.2	90.3
North Dakota	12.0	21.7	21.7	19.7	6.5	13.2
Ohio	227.4	185.4	227.4	207.0	69.0	138.0
Oklahoma	52.9	65.3	65.3	59.4	19.8	39.6
Oregon	60.1	61.8	61.8	56.2	18.7	37.5
Pennsylvania	300.9	290.2	300.9	274.0	91.3	182.7
Rhode Island	25.9	23.1	25.9	23.6	7.9	15.7
South Carolina	57.9	89.5	89.5	81.5	27.2	54.3
South Dakota	13.5	27.6	27.6	25.1	8.4	16.7
Tennessee	79.3	108.1	108.1	98.4	32.8	65.6
Texas	248.3	268.6	268.6	244.5	81.5	163.0
Utah	29.0	34.5	34.5	31.4	10.5	20.9
Vermont	11.0	16.3	16.3	14.8	4.9	9.9
Virginia	115.6	109.7	115.6	105.2	35.0	70.2
Washington	79.1	92.3	92.3	84.1	28.1	56.0
West Virginia	36.4	57.5	57.5	52.3	17.4	34.9
Wisconsin	137.0	147.1	147.1	133.9	44.6	89.3
Wyoming	6.1	10.7	10.7	9.7	3.2	6.5

1 Excludes $1-billion in supplementary grants for social services programs.
2 Before cost-of-living adjustment for states outside continental United States
3 After cost-of-living adjustment.
4 One-third to state governments and two-thirds to local governments.
5 Local share includes amounts to be redistributed to state governments to reduce a local government's share to no more than 50 percent of the local government's tax and intergovernmental transfer receipts.

SOURCE: Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation

(Continued from p. 650)

While allowing a choice between two methods of determining how much federal revenue would go to all governments within a state, the conferees adopted the Senate bill's provisions for determining how the state total would be allocated among the state government and various local government units.

Accepting a principle followed by the House bill, the conference committee agreed to a modified provision placing restrictions on how local governments could use federally shared revenues.

The conferees also agreed to drop a Senate provision providing $4-billion over four years for supplementary social services grants and to propose a substitute limiting existing federal matching grants for state and local social service programs to $2.5-billion a year for specified purposes.

Under the conference agreement, the federal government would distribute $5,303,900,000 to state and local governments in 1972. The effective date of revenue sharing was retroactive to Jan. 1.

In subsequent years, the amount of federal revenues shared with other governments would rise by $150-million a year, reaching $6,350,000,000 for the last full fiscal year (1976) of the program. On a fiscal year basis, the conference agreement provided for sharing federal revenues in the last half of fiscal 1972, fiscal 1973-76 and the first half of fiscal 1977. On a calendar year basis, the program would run from Jan. 1, 1972, to Dec. 31, 1976.

State Allocations. Under the conference compromise, each state would receive the greater of two amounts computed in the following methods:

- The House formula, which at the initial annual level of $5.3-billion would allocate $3.5-billion among the states on the basis of population (one-third), urbanized population (one-third) and population weighted by per capita income (one-third). The remaining $1.8-billion would be allocated among the states on the basis of individual income tax collections by state governments (one-half) and general tax effort by state and local governments (one-half).

Revenue Sharing Conferees

The conferees, all senior members of the Senate Finance and House Ways and Means Committees, reflected the large-state small-state differences between the two versions of the bill.

Of the Senate conferees—Democrats Long, Clinton P. Anderson (N.M.) and Herman E. Talmadge (Ga.) and Republicans Wallace F. Bennett (Utah) and Carl T. Curtis (Neb.)—none was from a large industrial state.

The House conferees—Democrats Wilbur D. Mills (Ark.), chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Al Ullman (Ore.), James A. Burke (Mass.) and Martha W. Griffiths (Mich.) and Republicans Jackson E. Betts (Ohio), Herman T. Schneebeli (Pa.) and Joel T. Broyhill (Va.)—gave greater representation to larger states. Mills, the most influential House conferee, was from a small state that would gain an additional $26.9-million under the Senate version.

- The Senate formula, which would multiply the state's population by its general tax effort and by its relative income, would determine the state's revenue-sharing allocation by comparing the product to the figure produced by the same factors for the nation as a whole.

Under the conference agreement, only 15 states and the District of Columbia would be funded under the House-passed formula. Those states were California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island and Virginia. The remainder would be funded under the Senate formula.

With each state given the higher of two possible shares, total funding under the first-year program in 1972 was increased to $5,821,000,000 from the $5.3-billion planned in both the House and Senate versions. To offset the increase, the conference agreement provided for reducing each state's allocation proportionately to keep the total for 1972 at $5,303,900,000.

Of that total for calendar 1972, $4,780,000 was in the form of cost-of-living adjustments for Alaska and Hawaii, both geographically separate from the rest of the country and both with higher costs of living.

The extra funds for Alaska and Hawaii were provided by a Senate floor amendment accepted by the conferees. The conference agreement appropriated an additional $23.9-million over five years for the adjustments.

Local Governments. The conference agreement, like the Senate bill, allocated one-third of each state's share to the state government and the remaining two-thirds to local government units within the state. At the 1972 level of $5,303,900,000, for instance, $1,767,800,000 would go to state governments and $3,536,100,000 to local governments.

Following the Senate version's method, the conference agreement allocated the local government share of each state's entitlement as follows:

- Each county would receive an amount computed on the basis of population, tax effort and relative income (the three-factor Senate formula for state allocations.)
- Each county government would receive a share determined by the ratio of its tax collections to tax collections by all governments in the county.
- All township governments within a county together would receive a total amount determined by their cumulative share of tax collections, with each township's amount determined by the three-factor formula.
- Municipal governments would share the remainder of each county's allocation according to the three-factor formula.

The conference agreement included a provision allocating part of a county area's allotment to the governing bodies of local Indian tribes or Alaskan native villages that performed substantial governmental functions. A Senate floor amendment to HR 14370 set aside 0.25 percent of total revenue-sharing funds for Indian tribes and Alaskan natives; the conference agreement provided them a share of county allocations on the basis of population.

As did both the House and Senate versions, the conference agreement permitted states to legislate optional formulas for distributing local government funds after the first year of revenue sharing. The conferees approved Senate guidelines for such optional formulas, however, and discarded the House-approved guidelines. ✓