UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 121—PART 2

JANUARY 27, 1975 TO FEBRUARY 5, 1975
(PAGES 1285 TO 2628)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1975

exceptionally good year for cotton farmers and for agriculture in general. Cotton prices rose to unprecedented levels in excess of 80 cents per pound on the world markets, and there was anxiety over whether textile plants could secure sufficient supplies of cotton to meet their needs.

Unfortunately, this past year has been literally disastrous for cotton growers. Prices have continued to decline due to a worldwide recession in the textile industry. At the same time, prices farmers must pay for the goods they buy have vastly increased. Thus, it is no surprise that December 1974 prices for American upland cotton averaged only 57 percent of parity.

An increase in the target price for cotton is urgently needed to partially remedy this unhealthy situation. While a substantial improvement in the economy and in the worldwide demand for cotton remains the best hope for cotton growers in the long run, a higher target price that more accurately reflects real costs of production is necessary for short-term relief.

The target price level which I am proposing will provide a meaningful incentive and reasonable guarantee to cotton growers. It will enable our more efficient cotton producers to survive and will keep American cotton competitive abroad. It should also provide a psychological stimulus to sagging cotton markets.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee for prompt consideration.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended as follows:

Section 103(e)(2) is amended by striking "1974 and 1975 crops, 38 cents" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "1974 crop, 55 cents per pound in the case of the 1975 crop, 55 cents".

By Mr. METCALF (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. INOUYE).

S. 437. A bill to provide for additional Federal financial participation in expenses incurred in providing benefits to Indians, Aleuts, Native Hawaiians, and other aboriginal persons, under certain State public assistance programs established pursuant to the Social Security Act. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Senate has twice approved the bill I introduce today to reimburse the States for public assistance payments to native Americans including Indians, Aleuts, Eskimos, and Hawaiians. Unfortunately, on both occasions my proposal was lost—in 1970 when the House refused to go to conference with the Senate on the bill, H.R. 17550, social security amendments and again in 1972 when the House-Senate conference rejected this Senate amendment to H.R. 1, the comprehensive social security bill of the 92d Congress.

In the 93d Congress, 12 other Senators and I offered S. 2505, a measure which I have now redrafted and introduce today.

The Finance Committee has indicated that my first proposal was rejected by the conference committee because it was too broad. Members of the committee suggested that the amendment would more likely be approved if the definition of Indian were narrowed and I have accordingly modified it.

My original proposal said, and I quote:

(c) The term "Indian" refers to any individual (1) any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consists of the States of the United States (other than Hawaii) and the District of Columbia prior to the discovery of America by Europeans, (2) who regards himself as an Indian and who holds himself out, in the community in which he resides, as being an Indian, and (3) who is regarded, in the community in which he resides, as being an Indian. The amendment I offer today says, and I quote:

(c)(1) For the purposes of this section, the term "Indian" means any individual who (i) is a member of a tribe, band, or other organized group of Indians, including those tribes, bands, or groups terminated since 1940 and those recognized now or in the future by the States in which they reside, or who is a descendant, in the first or second degree, of any such member, or (ii) is considered by the Secretary of the Interior to be an Indian for any purpose, or (iii) is determined to be an Indian under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare which regulations shall further define the term "Indian."

I have added a new phrase to my original proposal. At the end of paragraph (c)(1) cited above, the period is removed, a comma is inserted and a fourth phrase is added as follows: "or, (iv) is enrolled in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act."

The distinguished senior Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) has advised that this language is essential if the bill is to meet its intended purpose.

As I have said, what I seek here is reimbursement to all of the States for welfare payments to Indian people not only for aid to dependent children, but for supplemental security income and medicaid.

Under existing law, special Federal payments are made to two States for programs of aid to dependent children of Indian people living on reservations within their boundaries. I wish to expand the authority to include all States and all eligible native Americans and all public assistance. Let me explain.

At the end of 1973, the Congress approved a provision in another social security bill—Public Law 93-233—that partially restored special Federal payments made to States in behalf of the Navajo and Hopi, a provision that was repealed in the Social Security Amendments of 1972.

It is this special Federal assistance to Arizona and New Mexico over the last 25 years that was the genesis of my amendment. Perhaps a brief history of the measure is in order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by the Honorable Wilbur J. Cohen, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. Cohen's history of the legislation which I will summarize, appeared in the Social Security Bulletin for June 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. In 1949, Senators O'Mahoney, Hayden, Chavez, McFarland and Anderson sponsored legislation that was ultimately approved in 1950 as Public Law 474, which increased from 75 percent to 95 percent the Federal share of public assistance for the Navajo and Hopi residing on reservations in New Mexico and Arizona. The provision affected payments for old age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind.

As the Social Security Amendments of 1972 authorize a 100-percent Federal share for old-age assistance, disability payments, and aid to the blind, there remained three programs in which the States pay a share of the cost. These are aid to dependent children, medicaid, and supplemental security income. As we have seen, by amendment to the Social Security Act at the end of last year, the special payments for aid to dependent children in behalf of Navajo and Hopi Indians were restored so that the States of New Mexico and Arizona are now receiving this reimbursement.

Other States, with substantial native American populations, either on reservations or in villages and cities, do not receive such special Federal aid.

My bill would make Federal reimbursements to all States—not only New Mexico and Arizona—for all public assistance—not only aid to dependent children as now provided for Navajo and Hopi families. My amendment would reimburse Alaska for medicaid, aid to dependent children, and supplemental security income for Aleuts and Eskimos; it would repay Hawaii for payments for native Hawaiians and Montana for support of the Blackfeet, Crow, and Northern Cheyenne, as well as other American Indians, whether on the reservation or not. My bill would authorize Federal reimbursement for public assistance to Indians living on State reservations such as those in Maine. It would repay Minnesota for aid to eligible Indians, whether living in Minneapolis or on the Blue Earth Reservation.

Mr. President, the State of Montana has seven Indian reservations within its boundaries and a substantial population living in our towns and cities. The total number of American Indians living in Montana approaches 30,000.

Our assistance to Indian people in the three categories encompassed in my bill costs Montana $1 million annually; Alaska reports expenditures in excess of $9 million. North Dakota is spending $2.3 million for such aid to dependent children for reservation Indians alone.

In Montana, in North and South Dakota, and in many other States, we are doubly burdened by public assistance expenditures for Indian people in that the existence of the reservations, of nontax-

able Federal property, deprives us of revenue that would be raised that could help support welfare aid. We lose the tax revenue we need and, at the same time, have added expenditures in behalf of a people whose unemployment rate runs between 2 and 10 times the national average, even at today's rate.

Mr. President, great strides are being made on Indian reservations and among urban Indian people today as a result of improved education opportunities and their participation in economic development, health, job training, and housing construction programs. The Congress, in extending these opportunities to Indian tribes as entities of Government, has given recognition time after time of the special responsibility of the Federal Government for Indian welfare. But beyond that, and consonant with the principles of impact aid to areas deprived of tax revenues because of the Federal presence, we have been neglecting our responsibilities for welfare assistance to Indians, except for the special payments in behalf of the Navajo and Hopi.

The improvement in life for Indian people is reflected in increased enrollments and numbers of graduates from secondary schools as well as from colleges and universities, in the increased numbers of Indian people returning to the reservations to live, in better housing and health. Training programs and economic development promise a significant reduction in unemployment.

I am convinced that Indian people are on the threshold of a dramatic change for the better, that the quality of their lives whether on or off reservation is going to be enormously improved within a decade if present trends continue. I think there is every likelihood that the cost of public assistance will be dramatically reduced as the change I foresee takes place at long last. But I emphasize that my bill does not propose a new program, rather it proposes a shift from the States to the Federal Government of a responsibility that is Federal. I hope it will be approved.

Public Assistance Provisions for Navajo and Hopi Indians: Public Law 474

(By Wilbur J. Cohen*)

On April 19, President Truman approved Public Law 474, providing for the rehabilitation of Navajo and Hopi Indians. Section 9 of this law provides for increasing the Federal share of public assistance payments for needy Indians of these tribes who reside on reservations or on allotted or trust lands and who are recipients of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, or aid to the blind. The new law becomes effective July 1, 1950. It provides that with respect to assistance payments for these Indians the Federal Government will pay, in addition to its regular share under titles I, IV, and X of the Social Security Act, 80 percent of the State's regular share. The maximums for individual payments specified in the Act apply to these payments.

Thus, in a payment of $20 to a needy individual, the regular State share is $5 and the Federal share is $15. For Navajo and Hopi Indians the Federal Government will pay $4 additional (80 percent of the $5 State share) or a total of $19 out of the $20 payment. The Federal share in such a payment would thus be increased from 75 percent to 95 percent. In a $50 payment the Federal share would be increased from $30 to $46, or from 60 percent to 92 percent.[1] The accompanying table illustrates the effect of section 9 on public assistance payments to Navajo and Hopi Indians.

Legislative History

The first form (S. 1407) of the legislation that became Public Law 474 was introduced on March 25, 1949, by Senators O'Mahoney, Hayden, Chavez, McFarland, and Anderson. Companion bills, H. R. 3476 and H. R. 3489, were introduced in the House of Representatives.[2] S. 1407 passed the Senate on July 6, 1949, with amendments, and passed the House with some further amendments on July 14, 1949.[3] In the Conference Committee a new provision dealing with increased Federal grants to the States for public assistance to Navajo and Hopi Indians was included in section 9. The Conference Report was accepted in both the House and the Senate on October 3, and the bill was then sent to the President. The President vetoed the bill on October 17, 1949,[4] but his veto message did not contain any objection to the public assistance provisions of the bill.

The Senate deleted the provisions of the bill to which the President objected and passed a new bill S. 2734, on October 18, the day after the veto was received. Immediate consideration of the bill in the House on October 19 was objected to by Representative Kean, a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means.[5]

With the adjournment of Congress, S. 2734 went over to the second session in 1950. The House passed the bill on February 21, 1950, with several amendments, one of which changed the method of determining the Federal share of public assistance payments to the two tribes. However, this amendment was based upon an erroneous interpretation of section 9 and in effect made the entire public assistance provision inoperative.[6] The Conference Committee therefore deleted certain language from the amended section 9 and thus restored the section's effectiveness.[7] The Conference Report was adopted by the House on April 6, 1950, and by the Senate on April 10. The President signed the bill on April 19, 1950.

The basic issue as to whether Indians should be given public assistance entirely at Federal expense or on the same basis as other individuals has been the subject of lengthy debate. When the House added the provision to S. 1407 to make all Indians within the Navajo and Hopi reservations subject to the laws of the State in which they live, it became necessary to consider whether this same principle should be applied to public assistance recipients or whether it should be modified in some way. The following quotation from the Conference Committee Report describes the difference of opinion between the two houses:

The House conferees insisted upon section 9, but the Senate conferees wanted it eliminated for the reason that the extension of State laws would obligate the States to make available the benefits of the State social security laws to reservation Indians, an obligation which has not been assumed by New Mexico and Arizona for two reasons: First, they have not admitted their liability, claiming that under the enabling acts and Federal laws the Indian was an obligation of the Federal Government. Second, because of the large Indian population, the States strenuously urged their financial inability to meet this obligation.[8]

The Conference Report also explains the justification for the "80-percent formula":

Less than 20 percent of the Navajo and Hopi Indians speak the English language. The States have indicated their willingness to assume the burden of administering the social security laws on the reservations with this additional help. The Conference Committee was of the opinion that this was a fair arrangement particularly in view of the large area of taxfree land and the difficulty in the administration of the law to non-English-speaking people, sparsely settled in places where there are not adequate roads; and that it would be of particular advantage to the Indians themselves. This arrangement can and no doubt will be changed as soon as the Indians are rehabilitated. Both States assume full responsibility for nonreservation Indians at the present time.

The percentage to be paid by the States under this section, other than the cost of administration, is the same as was worked out in a conference at Santa Fe, New Mexico, between representatives of the Federal Security Agency, Bureau of Indian Affairs, the offices of the Attorney General of the States of Arizona and New Mexico, and the State Department of Welfare of the States of Arizona and New Mexico, on April 28 and 29, 1949. At this conference, it was agreed that the net cost to the State would not exceed 10 percent of the total cost incurred by the Federal and State Governments in aid to needy Indians (aged, blind, and dependent children). This is the agreement under which the States are now operating. However, it is the opinion of the Conference Committee that the Indians would be greatly benefited by the States' assuming full responsibility for the administering of this law, and it would assure a continued assistance which would not be dependent upon appropriations through the Bureau of Indian Affairs from year to year.

Before the passage of the Social Security Act, the Federal Government assumed full responsibility for needy reservation Indians, and there is strong argument that the Federal Government still has full responsibility for their care. The additional cost of the extension of social security benefits not heretofore assumed by New Mexico and Arizona is only part of the cost of the extension of State laws to the reservations. Therefore, the Conference Committee is of the opinion that the amendment which was adopted is a fair and equitable division of the expense.[9]

The 80-percent formula embodied in Public Law 474 is based upon a formula proposed in bills S. 691 and H.R. 1921, introduced in both houses on January 27, 1949, for all Indian "wards" in any State. Testimony was given before the House Committee on Ways and Means in favor of H.R. 1921,[10] but the Committee did not report that bill out nor did it include any special provision for Indians in the social security bill, H.R. 6000, reported out by the Committee.

Footnotes at end of article.

FEDERAL SHARE OF ILLUSTRATIVE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS TO NEEDY MEMBERS OF THE NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES

	Federal share of payment, by specified amount							
	To aged or blind individual				To 1 dependent child		To 3 dependent children	
Law	$20	$40	$50	$60	$27	$54	$63	$106
Social Security Act Amendments (1948)	$15	$25	$30	$30	$16.50	$16.50	$40.50	$40.50
Public Law 474 (1950)	19	37	46	46	24.90	24.90	58.50	58.50

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

On several occasions Congress has given consideration to legislation affecting Indians receiving public assistance under the Social Security Act. In 1935 when the original social security bill was being considered in the Senate, a provision for payment by the Federal Government of the full cost of Indian pensions was passed by the Senate as an amendment to the pending bill. The proposed amendment provided for a new title in the Social Security Act making payments to Indians "a pension from the United States in the sum of $30 per month." [11] This amendment was sponsored by Senator Norbeck of South Dakota. It was dropped, however, by the Conference Committee and was not included in the final law.

In a special report of the Social Security Board on proposed changes in the Social Security Act, which President Roosevelt submitted to the Congress in January 1939, the Board stated as follows:

A number of States have a considerable Indian population some of whom are still wards of the Federal Government. The Board believes that, with regard to certain Indians for whom the Federal Government is assuming responsibility in other respects, and who are in need of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, or aid to dependent children the Federal Government should pay the entire cost. If this provision is made, the Board should be authorized to negotiate cooperative agreements with the proper State agencies so that aid to these Indians may be given in the same manner as to other persons in the State, the only difference being in the amount of the Federal contribution. The Board believes that it should also be given authority to grant funds to the Office of Indian Affairs for this purpose, if that appears more desirable in certain circumstances.[12]

The House Committee on Ways and Means, however, did not include any provision concerning Indians in the 1939 social security bill. The Senate Committee on Finance considered an amendment affecting Indians but did not report it out. On the floor of the Senate, an amendment was offered which provided that "notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Social Security Board shall not disapprove any State plan under titles I, IV or X of this act because such plan does not apply to or include Indians." [13] This amendment passed the Senate but was deleted by the Conference Committee and was not included in the final 1939 law.

The Social Security Administration has consistently interpreted the Social Security Act to mean that a State public assistance plan could not legally be approved if that plan discriminated against any citizen of the United States on account of race. Twenty-four of the 26 States in which there are Indians residing on reservations provide public assistance under the Social Security Act to these individuals. In Arizona and New Mexico, however, questions have been raised over the years by both State agencies as to whether reservation Indians were to be included in the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act.

The immediate factors that led to the inclusion of the public assistance provisions in section 9 of Public Law 474 first made themselves felt on April 17, 1947. On that date the State Board of Public Welfare of New Mexico refused the application of a Navajo Indian for old-age assistance on the grounds that reservation Indians were not a responsibility of the State Welfare Department "just as long as they are under the complete jurisdiction of the Indian service and insofar as the expenditure of State money for their welfare is concerned." At about the same time the Arizona State Department of Public Welfare also took a position that it would not make payments to reservation Indians.

The Social Security Administration discussed the subject with the State agencies in an effort to resolve the conflict between the position they had assumed and the requirement of the Social Security Act that assistance must be available to all eligible persons within the State. Discussions continued over a period of time, and the States were informed that the continued receipt of Federal funds for their public assistance programs was dependent on whether the State programs were operating in conformity with the principle that applications are to be accepted from all who apply and assistance granted to all eligible persons. During the same period the Bureau of Indian Affairs made some payments, as their funds permitted, to needy Indians in the two States.

Finally, after all efforts to bring the States into conformity with the requirements of the Social Security Act had failed, the Commissioner for Social Security, after due notice, held hearings to determine whether there was a failure by New Mexico and Arizona to operate their plans in accordance with sections 4, 404, and 1004 of the Social Security Act. A hearing on New Mexico was held on February 8, 1949, and on Arizona on February 15, 1949. Before findings or determination based upon these hearings were made, the arrangements described in the quotations from the Conference Report on S. 1407 were completed at Santa Fe, New Mexico, on April 28 and 29, 1949, and assistance was provided for reservation Indians in these two States. It was the purpose of Public Law 474 to solve, by congressional action, the problems raised in the hearings before the Social Security Commissioner.[14] As stated in the Conference Report on the bill, the Committee felt that efficient operation could be more definitely assured if the State were to administer the entire program for needy Indians rather than share the responsibility with the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

FOOTNOTES

*Technical Adviser to the Commissioner for Social Security.

[1] The above figures and those in the table are used only as general illustrations of the amount of Federal participation. They are based on hypothetical individual payments, whereas actually, under the basic formula of the Social Security Act, the Federal percentages are not applied to individual payments but rather to the average payments of a State under each title. That part of any payment for a month in excess of $50 to an aged or blind recipient and in excess of $27 with respect to one dependent child in a home and $18 with respect to each of the other dependent children in a home is not counted in computing the averages.

[2] For the history of legislative proposals before 1949 see *Hearings Before a Senate Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 1407* (81st Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 3-7. Hearings were also held on H.R. 3476 by the House Committee on Public Lands.

[3] For proceedings in the House see *Congressional Record* (daily edition), July 14, 1949, pp. 9682-92.

[4] Ibid., Oct. 17, 1949, pp. 15119-20.

[5] Ibid., Oct. 19, 1949, pp. 15243-46.

[6] Ibid., Feb. 21, 1950, p. 2129.

[7] See Conference Report on S. 2734, *Congressional Record* (daily edition), Apr. 5, 1950, p. 4835.

[8] House Report 1338 to accompany S. 1407, Sept. 22, 1949, p. 7.

[9] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[10] *Hearings before the House Committee on Ways and Means on H.R. 2892* (81st Cong., 1st sess.), pp. 791-801.

[11] *Congressional Record*, June 18, 1935, p. 9540; see also letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs stating that he was "in sympathy with this proposal," pp. 9540-41.

[12] *Hearings Relative to the Social Security Act Amendments of 1939 Before the House Committee on Ways and Means* (76th Cong., 1st sess.), February 1939, p. 15. The Secretary of the Interior also urged that "social security benefits for Indians be administered as a part of the general plan for the citizens of the United States" (*Hearings Before the Senate Committee on Finance on H.R. 6635*, 76th Cong., 1st sess., June 1939, p. 272).

[13] *Congressional Record*, July 13, 1939, pp. 9027-28.

[14] On December 27, 1949, the Arizona State Board of Public Welfare adopted a resolution stating that it would not discontinue its policy of excluding crippled reservation Indian children in the provision of treatment services. The Commissioner of the State department in transmitting the Board's resolution to the Chief of the Children's Bureau of the Social Security Administration stated that it was "necessary to sever our connections." No Federal funds have been paid to Arizona under part 2 of title V of the Social Security Act since December 22, 1949.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am proud to once again join the distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) in sponsoring his bill which would provide 100-percent Federal reimbursement for the cost of all welfare assistance programs to American Indians. As you know, Mr. President, this bill has twice passed the Senate—once in 1970 and once in 1972. Unfortunately, it has been dropped in conference with the House. I continue to believe that this amendment is fair, important, and reasonable; I, therefore, continue to give it my full support.

The Federal Government has a unique responsibility toward the American Indian and toward the States in which the Indian lives. To a large extent as a result of Federal policies and actions, Indians have been forced to live in economically deprived situations. Many are trapped by their environment, into a pattern of repeated economic failure. As a group, Indians rank among the lowest on the economic scale. Frequently, the Federal Government has been responsible for the relocation and resettlement of Indian tribes from reservation to reservation and from State to State. This has added to the welfare burden on the jurisdictions in which the Indians are forced to live.

Since our national policies have contributed so heavily to the economic segregation, I believe the Federal Government has an obligation to eradicate the effects of the segregation. The bill offered by the Senator from Montana, which I am proud to cosponsor, represents an important means toward that end. Under its provisions, the Federal Government will assume the entire cost for AFCD, SSI, and medicaid for Indians. The bill will relieve the States of this financial responsibility and place it with the Federal Government. Two States currently receive Federal support for welfare assistance to Indians in those States. This bill would extend relief to all States.

This would not, by any means, relieve the States from responsibility for their Indian population. We would hope that, with the welfare burden lifted, States with Indian populations would channel some of the unburdened funds into other worthwhile projects aimed at helping the Indians. In addition, as a result of the

fact that much of the land on which the Indians reside is held in trust and not subject to State or local taxation, the States will continue to share some of the responsibility for the Indian populations. Additionally, because of the low economic status of many Indians, income tax revenues from this group are minimal.

This bill is very important to my State. In Minnesota, a large percentage of the Indian population is on welfare. In fact, the annual welfare bill for the Indian population is approaching $8 million, of which more than half is paid by State and local government. Under this bill, the State would be reimbursed for this amount. In Hennepin County, approximately $760,000 would be returned to the State. In Beltrami County, in northern Minnesota, where Indians make up approximately one-fourth of the welfare caseload, the savings from this measure would be approximately $600,000.

I urge my colleagues to once again act favorably on this bill. I sincerely hope that, because of significant improvements in the language of this version, the measure will, if passed, be retained by the conferees. The American Indians, and the States in which they live, deserve no less.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. MCCLURE):

S. 439. A bill authorizing and directing the Corps of Engineers to construct a four-lane high-level highway bridge between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho. Referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) and the Senators from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH and Mr. MCCLURE) and myself, I am today introducing legislation authorizing and directing the Corps of Engineers to construct a four-lane high-level highway bridge between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho.

This bill is identical to legislation we sponsored in the last Congress which was favorably reported by the Public Works Committee's Subcommittee on Water Resources. It is also identical to a provision of broader legislation which was favorably reported by the full Public Works Committee and passed unanimously by the Senate on October 11, 1974. Unfortunately, the House was unable to act on the bill prior to adjournment of the 93d Congress.

The need for this legislation is even greater now than when it was passed by the Senate last year. Consequently, I am extremely hopeful that both houses will take early action on this bill so that it can be enacted into law this year. I will certainly be working toward that end. I am especially grateful for the efforts which were made last year by the distinguished chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee (Mr. GRAVEL) and by the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee (Mr. RANDOLPH) to bring the legislation before the full Senate as quickly as they possibly could. Their continued leadership and assistance on this bill will, of course, be essential, and their efforts will certainly continue to be greatly appreciated.

Mr. President, at this time I will briefly summarize the bill, the need for its enactment, and the broad support it enjoys in the two areas that would be directly affected.

The bill would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Army, through the Corps of Engineers, to construct a four-lane high-level bridge across the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho. The Secretary would also be authorized and directed to construct the necessary bridge approaches. The new bridge would be located approximately 2 miles upstream of the present U.S. Route 12 bridge between the two cities. For their part, the affected State and local jurisdictions would be required to: first, hold and save the United States free from any damages resulting from the construction; second, provide without cost to the United States all lands, easements, and rights-of-way necessary for the construction; and, third, maintain and operate the bridge and approaches after they are built.

The need for the new Lewiston-Clarkston Bridge which would be authorized by this bill has been created by construction of the Federal Lower Granite lock and dam project on the Snake River. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that the new bridge and approaches be built at Federal expense as this bill would authorize.

Completion of the Lower Granite project this year will substantially raise the Snake at Lewiston-Clarkston. Consequently, the drawbridge that was built in the 1930's and now serves as the only link between the two cities will have to be raised far more frequently for vessel movement. That will be the case since the clearance under the bridge will be reduced from its present range of 26 to 45 feet to a range of 13 to 18 feet according to estimates by the Corps of Engineers. That, in turn, is projected by local officials to create serious traffic congestion on both sides of the river since there are now more than 22,000 two-way vehicular trips over the bridge on an average day. This will not only cause considerable inconvenience to the many persons who must daily commute between Lewiston and Clarkston, but it will also seriously affect the economy of the whole region. That is the case since the existing bridge is the only bridge across the river between Idaho and Washington in the entire area. The frequent openings of the old bridge will also create another problem that I believe to be of particular importance. Specifically, the increased openings will pose a direct threat to public health and safety since the only ambulance service available to Clarkston residents is headquartered across the river in Lewiston.

Mr. President, it is indeed rare when legislation so directly affecting not only two cities but also two counties and two States is the recipient of unanimous support. However, I am pleased to report that this bill has that kind of support. The States of Washington and Idaho, the counties of Asotin in Washington and Nez Perce in Idaho, and the towns of Lewiston and Clarkston all officially endorsed the bill during hearings held last year by the Water Resources Subcommittee. Also, prior to that time, both the Idaho and Washington State Legislatures formally memoralized Congress requesting Federal construction of a second bridge.

In closing, Mr. President, I express again my appreciation for the efforts made last year on this bill by the Water Resources Subcommittee and by the full Public Works Committee and strongly urge that the Senate once more pass this bill as it did in the last Congress. The need for the second bridge is even greater now than it was then.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleague from Washington, Senator MAGNUSON, and with Senators CHURCH and MCCLURE in support of the construction of a four-lane highway bridge to cross the Snake River between Clarkston, Wash., and Lewiston, Idaho. This legislation, I might add, is the culmination of the Lewiston-Clarkston area.

The present structure at U.S. Route 12, which has served the two cities for 35 years, will soon be inadequate as a transportation link. The lower Granite Lock and Dam Project, due for completion shortly, will raise the water level such that the normal flow of traffic will be greatly hindered by the constant need to raise the bridge. Currently, there are 22,000 two-way vehicular trips every day and 20 to 25 minutes is required to raise and lower the present span, causing traffic congestion. This is an especially critical consideration in light of the reciprocal agreements between the two communities for fire protection, ambulance service, and police ministration. Furthermore, the pathology lab and blood bank in Lewiston is the only one in the entire area, serving a population in excess of 37,000 people. The delay caused by the lifting of the bridge would render ineffective these much-needed services.

Mr. President, with 22,000 cars passing over the existing bridge each day every time the bridge is opened an average of 307 cars, containing perhaps 500 people, are inconvenienced with a 20- to 25-minute delay. This is only an average—during hours of heavy use I feel certain that the traffic volume over the bridge would at least double. This inconvenience, which really translates into both time and financial loss can be tolerated no longer. This problem needs to be addressed and resolved now.

The physical location of the new bridge would be 2 miles upstream from the present structure. In terms of logistics, it is planned that State and local jurisdictions would be required to: First, free the United States from any damage resulting from the construction and, keeping with normal practice, provide the necessary maintenance and operate the structure once the construction is completed.

I feel there is a definite and much warranted need for a new bridge to speed the flow of traffic, and for the public health and safety.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, today I join my colleague from Idaho (Mr. Mc-