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Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." Therefore, every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must be operated in compliance with this law.
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INTRODUCTION

This booklet contains brief synopses of legislation enacted by the 94th Congress which affects physically and mentally handicapped persons. It is a widely disseminated document designed to help program planners, students and interested citizens gain insight into the output of Federal policy formulation. These laws authorize programs with varied objectives benefiting handicapped persons.

The booklet is divided into two sections. The first contains summaries of "Major Legislation Benefiting the Handicapped." The second relates to "Other Legislation Benefiting the Handicapped." Following the legislative summaries are two appendices. Appendix A contains a table which traces the development of each law through the legislative process. Appendix B provides cross references to individual summaries of laws found in the 1963-67, 1968, 1971, 1972 and 1974 federal legislative summaries, also published by the Office for Handicapped Individuals. In many instances, legislation reviewed in this booklet amends or is closely related to laws summarized in these previous publications.

It is our hope that this information will prove helpful as a reference guide to a wide variety of individuals interested in programs for handicapped children and adults.
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PART I. MAJOR LEGISLATION BENEFITING THE HANDICAPPED

1. Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (P.L. 94-103)

General Scope: On October 4, 1975, President Ford signed into law a bill to extend and amend the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1970 (P.L. 94-517). The legislation authorizes a three-year extension of state formula grants to assist in planning and implementing programs on behalf of developmentally disabled children and adults and continued support for university affiliated facilities. In addition, P.L. 94-103 makes numerous changes in state plan requirements, modifies provisions and establishes safeguards to protect the rights of developmentally disabled persons.

Before final passage of the legislation, several key provisions of the Senate-passed bill were eliminated, including: (1) detailed federal operating standards for residential and community facilities; (2) the applicability of Title II to persons served through federal programs other than the Developmental Disabilities program; (3) provision for cutting off all federal aid to residential and community facilities which fail to comply with standards by December 31, 1979; (4) a method for assessing compliance with standards; (5) establishment of a separate national advisory council on standards; (6) authorization of federal grant assistance to upgrade community and residential facilities; and (7) a requirement for client program coordinators for each disabled person in a service program.

Implications for the Handicapped: P.L. 94-103 makes several significant changes in the original statutory authority for the Developmental Disabilities program, including:

Definition. The term "developmental disability" is broadened to include autism and dyslexia; however, only dyslectic children and adults who also suffer from mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy or autism are to be eligible for services.

Formula Grants. The authority for formula grants to the states is extended for three additional years. Authorizations are set at: $40

University Affiliated Facilities. The authority for demonstration and training grants to university affiliated facilities is continued for three years (authorization levels: $15 million in FY 1976, $18 million in FY 1977 and $25 million in FY 1978). A portion of increased grant funds (above $5 million) must be set aside for feasibility studies and operating support of satellite centers in states without UAF programs.

UAF Renovation. A new funding authority is added to assist in renovating and modernizing university affiliated facilities. Three million is authorized for each of three fiscal years for the program.

Project Grants. A new special project authority is included in the legislation. The purpose of this program is to assist public agencies and non-profit organizations to demonstrate new and improved techniques for: (a) serving developmentally disabled persons (especially disadvantaged and multi-handicapped clients); (b) informing the public about the needs of the target population; (c) coordinating and using community resources; (d) providing technical assistance to service and planning agencies; (e) training specialized personnel; (f) gathering and disseminating information; and (g) enhancing the quality and administration of programs for the developmentally disabled. Twenty-five percent of appropriated funds must be set aside for national significance grants. Authorizations for the program are set at $18 million in FY 1976, $22 million in FY 1977 and $25 million in FY 1978.

State Plan Requirements. Numerous changes are made in state plan requirements, including: (1) reduction in the maximum percentage of a state’s allotment which may be obligated for construction purposes (from 50 to 10 percent); (2) a requirement that the state plan incorporate a deinstitutionalization and institutional reform plan (not less than 10 percent of the state’s allotment must be obligated for this purpose in FY 1976 and 30 percent in succeeding fiscal years); (3) provision for the state planning council to review and comment on all state plans affecting the developmentally disabled, to the maximum extent feasible; and (4) provision for protecting the interests of employees in any deinstitutionalization plans.

Affirmative Action. A requirement that all DDSA grantees take affirmative action to employ and advance qualified handicapped individuals has been added to the Act.

Evaluation. P.L. 94-103 directs the Secretary of HEW to develop a comprehensive performance based system for the evaluation of
services provided to developmentally disabled persons within two years after the enactment of the legislation. States must implement the system within two years after its promulgation by the Secretary.

National Advisory Council. The composition of the National Advisory Council on Services and Facilities for the Developmentally Disabled is revised to include nine ex-officio members and sixteen members appointed by the Secretary of HEW. In addition, the duties of the Council are expanded to include: (a) advising the Secretary on grants made under the Act; and (b) submitting an annual report to Congress on the administration of the program.

In addition to changes in the existing Developmental Disabilities program, P.L. 94-103 adds a new title (Title II) designed to protect the rights of developmentally disabled individuals. Highlights of this new title include:

Preamble. A Congressional finding that "persons with developmental disabilities have a right to appropriate treatment, services, and habilitation for such disabilities."

Minimum Standards. Incorporation of a list of minimum standards for the operation of residential facilities for the developmentally disabled, including: (1) provision of a well-balanced diet; (2) provision of sufficient medical and dental treatment; (3) prohibitions against the use of chemical and physical restraints; (4) provision for reasonable visiting hours; and (5) compliance with adequate fire and safety standards. The legislation also calls for "comprehensive" residential programs to meet standards applicable to mental retardation facilities, to the extent that such standards are appropriate considering the size and service delivery arrangements of the facility. Other residential facilities are expected to meet the needs of their residents and provide humane and sanitary care in an environment which safeguards the residents' rights. Non-residential programs are to be appropriate to the needs of their clients.

Habilitation Plans. All DDSA funded programs must have individualized habilitation plans on every client served in the program. These plans must be reviewed and updated annually and must meet the minimum specifications included in the legislation.

Advocacy System. A provision is included in Title II which requires all states to develop a system for protecting and advocating the rights of developmentally disabled persons by October 1, 1977. Any state which fails to have such a system in operation by that date will be ineligible to receive its DDSA allotment. The authorization in each of the next fiscal years to assist states in developing such protective service and advocacy systems is $3 million.
Study of Standards. The Secretary is directed to review and evaluate standards and quality assurance mechanisms under existing federal programs affecting the developmentally disabled and make recommendations for rationalizing and improving such requirements. His recommendations, which must be based on performance criteria for measuring and evaluating the developmental progress of disabled persons, must be submitted to Congress within 18 months after enactment of the legislation.

Title III of P.L. 94-103 directs the Secretary to forward to Congress, within six months after enactment of the legislation (and annually thereafter), his recommendations on conditions which should be included in the term "developmental disabilities." He also must commission an independent contractual study of the appropriateness of the current definition, recommendations for revisions in the definition and the adequacy of services to excluded disabled groups. The final report of this study must be submitted to Congress within eighteen months after the date of enactment of the first appropriation bill including funds for the study.

2. Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142)

General Scope: On November 29, 1975, President Ford signed into law a $7.8 billion aid measure to assist states in educating handicapped children. P.L. 94-142 calls for a sharply increased federal commitment in order to insure that all handicapped children receive full and appropriate educational services. Current estimates indicate that only $3.9 million of the eight million handicapped youngsters in the nation are receiving an appropriate education.

Passage of the legislation marks a significant milestone in the nation's efforts to provide full and appropriate educational services for handicapped children. It also represents the culmination of four years of unrelenting effort on the part of both the sponsors and supporters of the measure.

Implications for the Handicapped: P.L. 94-142 contains the following major provisions:

Formula. The legislation includes a new entitlement formula which will go into effect in FY 1978. Under this new formula, states will be entitled to receive an amount equal to the number of handicapped children between 3 and 21 years of age receiving special education and related services times a specified percentage of the average per pupil expenditures in public elementary and secondary schools in the United States. The percentage of federal aid will grow from 5 percent in FY 1978 to 10 percent in FY 1979, 20 percent in FY 1980, 30 percent in 1981 and 40 percent in FY 1982 and succeeding fiscal years.
At full entitlement, states would receive the following amounts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 1978</td>
<td>$387 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1979</td>
<td>$775 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1980</td>
<td>$1.2 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1981</td>
<td>$2.32 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1982 and succeeding years</td>
<td>$3.16 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should actual appropriations in any fiscal year be less than the amount necessary to grant full entitlements, the legislation provides for a ratable reduction in each state's allotment. There is also "hold harmless" language which assures that no state will get less than it received in FY 1975.

Until the new distribution formula is implemented (i.e., in FY 1976 and FY 1977), the special emergency funding formula adopted in 1974 (the so-called Mathias formula) will be used. However, while the entitlement base totals $680 million under the Mathias formula, an appropriations ceiling of $100 million is imposed for FY 1976 and $200 million for FY 1977.

**Limitations on the Number of Children Counted.** In order to prevent states from including non-handicapped children, P.L. 94-142 limits the number of children who may be counted to twelve percent of the total school age population between the ages of five and seventeen. In addition: (a) no more than 1/6 of a state's total count (or 2 percent) may consist of children with specific learning disabilities; and (b) children who are counted for purposes of determining the state's entitlement under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (as amended by P.L. 89-313) may not be counted under the new program.

**Pass Through.** During FY 1976 and FY 1977 all federal funds will be controlled by the state education agency and distributed to local agencies according to an approved state plan. After the new distribution formula goes into effect, however, a set percentage of federal assistance must be passed through to local education agencies. In FY 1978, 50 percent of the state's allotment must be forwarded to LEA's while in FY 1979 and succeeding fiscal years 75 percent must be passed through.

Local school districts with a total entitlement of less than $7,500 in any fiscal year will be ineligible to receive direct federal aid. Instead, the entitlements for such small districts will be pooled and distributed by the state agency. The purpose of this provision is to avoid the administrative costs associated with monitoring many small programs and to encourage small districts to enter into cooperative programs with nearby districts.
**Full Service Mandate.** In order to qualify for federal assistance, a state must agree to establish a goal of serving all handicapped children between the ages of 3 and 18 by September 1, 1978, and between 3 and 21 by September 1, 1980. However, this timetable will not apply to children from 3 to 5 and 18 to 21 where mandatory services to such children would be inconsistent with state law or practice or a binding court order.

**Pre-School Incentive.** A separate authority is included in the Act to encourage states to serve children between the ages of 3 and 5. States will receive up to $300 for each child served within this age range. Per capita grants will be ratably reduced if appropriations are insufficient in any fiscal year to cover the states' full entitlements.

**Individualized Educational Program.** P.L. 94-142 stipulates that an individualized educational program must be developed for each handicapped child. This program must include: (a) a statement of the child's current educational performance; (b) annual goals and short-term instructional objectives; (c) a description of the services to be provided and the extent to which the child will be able to participate in regular educational programs; and (d) the projected initiation date and the anticipated duration of services. Each child's individualized educational program must be reviewed at least annually.

**Statutory Priorities.** Under the legislation, first priority must be given to unserved children and second priority to severely handicapped youngsters who are not receiving adequate services. The conference committee on the legislation emphasized that it did not intend that "any one or two categories of disabilities be recognized.. as the 'most severe' categories, but rather than an attempt be made to reach and provide appropriate services to children with the most severe handicaps without regard to disability category" (committee's emphasis).

**State Plan.** In order to qualify for federal assistance, a state must submit a plan to the U.S. Commissioner of Education which: (a) assures that all federally funded education programs for the handicapped (including those funded under Title I, ESEA and the Vocational Education Act) are consistent with the state's P.L. 94-142 plan; (b) outlines a comprehensive plan for personnel development; (c) provides for free services to handicapped children placed by LEA's in private elementary and secondary schools; (d) assures that federal funds will be used to supplement and increase and not to supplant state and local funds; (e) describes procedures for evaluating, at least annually, the effectiveness of programs in meeting the educational needs of handicapped children; (f) provides for the appointment of a panel to advise state education officials on
unmet needs and rules and regulations; and (g) specifies procedures for record keeping and accounting for federal funds.

**Local Plan.** Local education agencies (and intermediate school units) must submit an application to the appropriate state education agency in order to qualify for federal support. This application must: (a) assure that federal funds will be used exclusively to pay the excess costs attributable to the education of handicapped children; (b) provide that all handicapped children within the jurisdiction, regardless of the severity of their handicaps, will be identified, located and evaluated; (c) establish policies to safeguard the confidentiality of personal records; (d) establish a goal of providing full educational opportunities to all handicapped children; (e) establish a detailed timetable for accomplishing this goal; and (f) describe the kinds and number of facilities, personnel and services necessary to accomplish the goal.

The state education agency is authorized to withhold federal funds if any local or intermediate school district fails to comply with the above requirements.

**Procedural Safeguards.** All of the due process safeguards incorporated in the 1974 amendments to the Act (P.L. 93-380) are retained and several further provisions, designed to protect the interests of the handicapped child and his or her parents, have been added. The rights of the handicapped child and his parents or guardian include:

- an opportunity to examine all relevant records regarding identification, evaluation and educational placement of the child;

- appointment of a parent surrogate in cases where the child is a ward of the state or the natural parents are either unknown or unavailable;

- written notice of identification, evaluation or placement of the child in an educational program (including the right to be notified in one’s native language);

- an opportunity to present complaints.

In addition, a state or local educational agency must conduct an impartial due process hearing on any complaint received from a parent or guardian. At such hearings the parent has the right to be represented by counsel, to present evidence, cross-examine and compel the attendance of witnesses, and receive a statement of factual findings and decisions. If the complainant is dissatisfied with the decision of the hearing examiner, he or she may appeal the verdict and eventually bring a civil action in a state court or in a U.S. District Court.
**State Educational Agency.** P.L. 94-142 stipulates that the state education agency will be responsible for insuring that the provisions of the new program are carried out. In addition, the state agency must assure that all educational programs for handicapped children, including those administered by other state and local agencies, are under their general supervision and meet education agency standards.

**Special Studies and Evaluations.** The legislation requires the Commissioner of Education to conduct evaluative studies, collect program information and report on the number of handicapped children requiring and receiving services. The Commissioner also is directed to transmit an annual report to Congress on the progress achieved in providing appropriate educational programs to handicapped youngsters within 120 days after the close of each fiscal year. A statistically valid survey of the effectiveness of individualized educational programs also must be conducted.

**Employment of the Handicapped.** P.L. 94-142 requires all recipients of federal assistance under the Act to take affirmative steps to employ and advance in employment qualified handicapped individuals.

**Architectural Barriers.** The new legislation authorizes such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of removing architectural barriers in educational facilities.


**General Scope:** A bill to amend and extend the National School Lunch Act and other federal child nutrition statutes was enacted into law on October 7, 1975 when Congress voted to override President Ford's veto of the measure. Called by sponsors the best child nutrition legislation in history, the 1975 Amendments attempt to streamline and improve existing federal programs by increasing eligibility for reduced-cost meals, expanding the summer feeding, preventive nutrition and school breakfast programs and extending child nutrition benefits to children in residential institutions.

**Implications for the Handicapped:** P.L. 94-105 contains several important provisions affecting handicapped children. First, the definition of a "school" under the National School Lunch Act and Child Nutrition Act of 1966 is expanded to include "any public or licensed non-profit private residential child care institution (including, but not limited to, orphanages and homes for the mentally retarded) . . ." This amendment makes public and non-profit residential institutions for the mentally retarded eligible for assistance under the School Lunch and
School Breakfast program. Previously, such facilities were only entitled to receive surplus commodities.

Second, a broader child care food program is authorized under the new law to replace the former special food service program for children. Non-residential child care institutions serving needy youngsters, including facilities "providing day care services for handicapped children," are eligible for aid under the School Lunch and School Breakfast programs.

The 1975 Amendments also:

extend the Special Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children through September 30, 1977 and expand authorizations for the program;

broaden the Summer Food Program and extend authorization through September 30, 1977;

increase eligibility for reduced price lunches by raising the family income ceiling to 95 percent above the poverty income guidelines (currently $9,770). Previously, maximum family income was fixed at 75 percent above the poverty level ($8,770).

4. Special Health Revenue Sharing Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-63)

*General Scope:* The omnibus, $2 billion health revenue sharing bill became law on July 29, 1975, when Congress succeeded in overriding President Ford's veto of the measure. In approving the measure, Congress voted to continue aid for such existing programs as community mental health centers, family planning and migrant workers. The measure also revises and extends the health revenue sharing, nurse training and community health centers programs and authorizes a National Health Services Corps to place doctors, dentists and nurses in underserved areas of the country.

*Implications for the Handicapped:* Authority to make grants to the states for comprehensive public health services (Section 314(d) of the Public Health Service Act) is extended and revised under Title I of the legislation. Authorization levels are established at $100 million in FY 1976 and $110 million in FY 1977. As under previous law, fifteen percent of funds appropriated for Section 314(d) grants must be used for mental health services.

P.L. 94-63 requires state mental health authorities to submit a plan which will eliminate inappropriate placement of mentally ill persons in institutions, insure the availability of noninstitutional services and improve the quality of care to persons requiring institutional care. In addition, all state 314(d) plans must include provisions designed to
protect employees' rights when deinstitutionalization efforts are initiated.

State mental health authorities also must: (a) prescribe standards for the operation of mental health programs; (b) assist the courts and other agencies to screen persons considered for inpatient care; and (c) provide follow-up care to individuals discharged from mental health facilities.

Title III of P.L. 94-63 extends the Community Mental Health Centers Act through FY 1977. Applicants for CMHC grants must provide, or plan to provide, a range of comprehensive services, including: (a) inpatient, outpatient, partial hospitalization and emergency services; (b) a program of specialized services for the mental health of children; (c) a program of specialized services for the mental health of the elderly; (d) consultation and education services; (e) assistance to the courts and other public agencies in screening persons considered for referral to a state mental health facility; (f) follow-up services to persons discharged from a mental health facility; and (g) alcohol and drug abuse programs if HEW determines such programs are required.

The following types of grants are authorized under Title III:

**Planning Grants.** Funds are authorized for grants to public and non-profit agencies to plan community mental health center programs ($3.75 million in FY 1976 and $3.75 million in FY 1977).

**Initial Operation Grants.** Project funds are authorized to assist public or non-profit community mental health centers in meeting the initial costs of operation. The duration of such grants may not exceed eight years, with a declining rate of federal participation. The amount of any initial operating grant will be the lesser of the following: (a) the difference between the center’s projected operating expenses in the fiscal year and anticipated revenues from other sources; and (b) a fixed percentage of total operating costs ($50.0 million for FY 1976 and $55.0 million for FY 1977).

**Consultation and Education Grants.** Funds are available to assist community mental health centers in developing consultation and education services ($10.0 million in FY 1976 and $15.0 million in FY 1977).

**Conversion Grants.** Federal support is authorized to help existing community mental health centers expand their programs to comply with the new comprehensive service requirements ($20 million in FY 1976 and $20 million in FY 1977).

**Financial Distress Grants.** Aid is authorized for community mental health centers when their staffing or operating support grant has expired and they would be forced to reduce the types or quality of
services rendered unless further federal assistance was made available ($15.0 million in FY 1976 and $15.0 million in FY 1977).

Facility Grants. Formula grants to the states are authorized to assist in purchasing, renovating, leasing and equipping community mental health centers and for the construction of centers serving poverty areas ($5.0 million in FY 1976 and $5.0 million in FY 1977).

Under Title VI of the legislation, the Secretary of HEW is directed to appoint a Committee on Mental Health and Illness of the Elderly to study the mental health needs of older Americans and report its findings to Congress within one year of the date of enactment of P.L. 94-63.

This same section of the Act calls for the establishment of two temporary government commissions. The first body, the Commission for the Control of Epilepsy and Its Consequences, is charged with developing a national plan for the control and treatment of epilepsy. The nine member commission's final report must be submitted to the President and Congress within one year of the date of enactment of the legislation. A similar national plan is to be developed by the Commission for the Control of Huntington's Disease and Its Consequences.


General Scope: On October 20, 1976 President Ford signed into law a measure which included a number of amendments to the Supplemental Security Income program. In addition to extending benefits to aged, blind and disabled recipients in publicly operated community residences, P.L. 94-566 also authorized a new assistance program for SSI-eligible children.

While P.L. 94-566 was the most significant SSI legislation enacted during 1976, several other amendments to Title XVI of the Social Security Act, the statutory authority for the SSI program, were also passed by Congress.

Implications for the Handicapped: As signed into law, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-566) contain the following provisions affecting handicapped persons:

Services to Blind and Disabled Children. Prior to enactment of P.L. 94-566, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was required to make provision for referral to all disabled individuals "to the appropriate State agency administering the State plan for vocational rehabilitation services..." However, since rehabilitation agencies are only authorized to serve adolescents and
adults of working age, childhood beneficiaries were left in a state of limbo.

The 1976 amendments correct this oversight by requiring the Social Security Administration to refer all SSI eligible children, under 16 years of age, to the state crippled children's agency or another agency designated by the Governor. This designated agency is required to develop a state plan which includes provision for: (a) administration of the program; (b) coordination with other agencies serving disabled children; and (c) establishment of a unit which is responsible for:

- providing appropriate counseling to disabled children and their families;
- developing an individual service plan for each child and prompt referral to appropriate medical, educational and social services;
- monitoring adherence to each individual's service plan; and
- providing pre-school disabled youngsters, age 6 and below, and children who have never attended public school, with medical, social, developmental and rehabilitative services which will enhance their ability to benefit from subsequent education or training or otherwise enhance their opportunities for self-sufficiency or self-support as an adult.

Thirty million dollars is authorized in FY 1977 and the succeeding two fiscal years to cover the cost of counseling, referring and serving blind and disabled youngsters who are eligible for SSI benefits. These funds are to be distributed among the states based on the relative proportion of children under age 7 in each state. The federal matching ratio is 100 percent.

Up to 10 percent of a state's allotment can be used to counsel, refer and monitor the status of SSI childhood beneficiaries (16 or under). The remainder must be used to provide services to SSI-eligible children under 6 years of age and youngsters who never attended public school.

Federal funds made available through this authority cannot be used to replace state and local expenditures. In addition, only the excess costs of services to blind and disabled children can be paid for with federal monies. Children, like blind and disabled adults, are required to accept any services offered or they will lose their SSI eligibility.

The Secretary of HEW is responsible for promulgating regulations prescribing the criteria to be used in approving state plans. HEW also must publish annually state allocations under this new grant program, using the latest data available from the Department of Commerce.
Eligibility of Group Home Residents. Under prior law, only residents in privately operated group homes and similar facilities were eligible to receive SSI payments, since Section 1611(e)(1)(A) of the Social Security Act prohibits "an inmate of a public institution" from receiving such benefits. However, Section 505 of P.L. 94-566, the so-called Keys Amendment, modifies the definition of a public institution to exclude publicly operated community residences serving 16 or fewer individuals. The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate a major disincentive to the development of group homes for the mentally retarded under public auspices.

State and Local Assistance. Section 505 also stipulates that assistance furnished on the basis of need to, or on behalf of, an SSI applicant by a state or local government will not be counted as unearned income for purposes of determining eligibility or the amount of an individual's SSI payment. Under the old law, only certain types of public payments were disregarded (e.g. formal state supplemental payments, and payments for medical care and social services). The administrative task of distinguishing between countable and non-countable income derived from state and local sources proved to be a major headache and led to significant inequities in some jurisdictions.

State Standards. Section 1616(e) of the Act was repealed by P.L. 94-566. This controversial provision called for a dollar-for-dollar reduction in the federal SSI payment when a state made a supplemental payment on behalf of any eligible resident in a facility providing services which could have been financed under the state's Medicaid program. In its place, the 1976 amendments substitute a provision requiring the states to establish and enforce standards governing care in non-medical facilities housing a significant number of SSI recipients.

States are obligated to designate state and local authorities to establish, maintain and insure the enforcement of standards for any category of institution (including foster homes and group homes) in which a significant number of SSI recipients reside. These standards have to be appropriate to the needs of the residents and the character of the facility. Included in the standards must be provisions governing admission policies, safety, sanitation and protection of the residents' civil rights.

States are required to make available for public review, as part of their annual Title XX social services plan, a summary of such standards. In addition, a copy of the standards, procedures for enforcing them, waivers granted, and recorded violations must be made available to any individual requesting such information. Each state is mandated to certify annually to HEW that it is in compliance
with these requirements. The federal portion of the SSI payment will be reduced in the case of individuals who are in group care facilities which are not approved by the state and/or local standard setting authority.

*Eligibility Criteria for Disabled Children.* Although four years have passed since the initial legislation authorizing the Supplemental Security Income program was enacted, the Social Security Administration has not yet issued adequate guidelines for determining when a child, under 18 years of age, meets the statutory test of disability. P.L. 94-566 requires the Social Security Administration to publish criteria for making childhood disability determinations within 120 days after enactment of the legislation.

Beside the provision contained in the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1976, the following additional SSI amendments were enacted by Congress last year:

*Interim Assistance.* P.L. 94-365 makes permanent a provision of the Social Security Act under which the federal government reimburses the states for payments made to individuals awaiting determination of their SSI eligibility. This provision, which was added to the Act in 1974 to alleviate hardships resulting from long delays in processing SSI applications, was originally scheduled to expire on June 30, 1976.

*Home Valuation.* P.L. 94-569 provides that the value of an individual's or couple's home will be disregarded in determining eligibility for Supplemental Security Income benefits. Previously, only a home of reasonable value could be excluded from the SSI resources test.

*Extension of Presumptive Disability to Blind Applicants.* Presumptive disability, a procedure for initiating payments to certain severely handicapped individuals prior to completion of a formal disability determination, was extended to blind persons by P.L. 94-569. Prior to the enactment of this legislation, only disabled applicants could be declared presumptively eligible.

*Pass Through.* Under P.L. 94-585, any state which supplements the federal SSI payment is required to pass along federal cost-of-living increases which are intended for SSI recipients on or after July 1, 1977. This so-called "pass through" amendment is intended to eliminate the practice of offsetting all or part of a federal benefit increase by a corresponding reduction in the state's payment.

6. **Social Services Amendments (P.L. 94-401)**

*General Scope:* On September 7, 1976, President Ford ended weeks of uncertainty by signing into law a compromise social services bill. Earlier
in the year Congress failed to override President Ford's veto of a similar measure when the Senate fell three votes short of obtaining the required two-thirds majority.

The President referred to his earlier veto in remarks at a signing ceremony in the White House Rose Garden. Calling H.R. 12455 "a new and better bill," Ford said that the measure contains "a major compromise on a key issue which led to my earlier veto." Noting that the new law will spare states and localities "the heavy burden of costly and controversial Federal standards for child day care services," the President also praised the fact that Congress incorporated several concepts contained in the social services proposal introduced by the Administration earlier in the year, including group eligibility and elimination of state matching funds.

Implications for the Handicapped: The new law (P.L. 94-401) contains the following major provisions:

**Eligibility for Social Services.** States are permitted to waive individual eligibility determination procedures when there is reason to believe that a substantial portion of a particular group have incomes below 90 percent of the state's median income. This authority does not apply to child day care services, except when such services are provided to the children of migrant workers. The previous requirement that at least 50 percent of Title XX funds be targeted on AFDC, Medicaid and SSI recipients is retained and states are required to validate the income status of persons determined eligible on a group basis through the use of "generally accepted statistical and sampling procedures."

**Postponement of Child Care Standards.** Under prior legislation, federal standards for child care facilities serving children ages 6 weeks to 6 years were suspended from October 1, 1975 to February 1, 1976. The new legislation extends this suspension through October 1, 1977 (retroactive to February 1, 1976). The requirements of state law have to be met and standards cannot be lowered from their September, 1975 levels.

**Increased Title XX Allotments.** The existing ceiling on Title XX expenditures is increased by $40 million during the transitional quarter (July 1 - September 30, 1976) and by $200 million during FY 1977 under the new legislation. The current Title XX allocation formula will be used to distribute these additional funds; however, a state's allotment of the new funds may not exceed its actual Title XX expenditures for day care services.

**Increased Federal Matching Ratio.** The federal matching ratio for the additional funds is 75 percent during the transitional quarter and
100 percent during FY 1977. The matching ratio for existing Title XX allotments, however, remains at 75 percent.

*Emphasis on Employing Welfare Recipients.* In using their additional Title XX allotments, states are required to increase employment opportunities for welfare recipients and other low income persons.

*Aid to Child Care Providers.* Non-profit and proprietary child care centers, whose caseload consists of at least 20 percent Title XX recipients, are eligible to receive federal assistance. Such aid is limited to $5,000 per employee per annum in a non-profit center and $4,000 in a proprietary facility. Proprietary centers are also eligible to receive WIN tax credit of up to $1,000 per employee per year for the purpose of hiring welfare recipients as child care staff.

*Waiver Provisions.* States are permitted to waive the federal staffing requirements through September 30, 1977 when: (a) child care facilities conform to state standards and serve five or fewer children or no more than 20 percent federally funded children; and (b) group day care homes conform to state standards and serve no more than 20 percent federally funded children (not counting the day care mother's own children unless they are under six years of age).
PART II. OTHER LEGISLATION BENEFITING THE HANDICAPPED

1. Older Americans Amendments of 1975 (P.L. 94-135)

In addition to amending and extending several provisions in the Older Americans Act of 1965, P.L. 94-135 extends the authorizations for the Older American Volunteer Programs (Foster Grandparents, Senior Companions, and R.S.V.P.) for two additional years. The authorization levels for the programs are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1977</th>
<th>FY 1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foster Grandparents</td>
<td>$35.0</td>
<td>$35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Companions</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.S.V.</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As part of its report on the legislation, a House-Senate conference committee directed the ACTION agency to revise its policies and permit Foster Grandparents to continue serving eligible "grandchildren" after they reach the age of 21. The conferees criticized ACTION for its rigid interpretation of the maximum age limit on participation in the program and expressed the belief that "...no hard and fast cut-off point" can be set "for the maximum age after which a 'child' is no longer eligible under present law to be served by a Foster Grandparent" (H. Rept. No. 94-670). Noting the Agency reported that some 300 to 400 mentally retarded adults are currently being served by Foster Grandparents, the committee expressed concern that the precipitous termination of these services might have a number of undesirable effects.

ACTION was directed by the conference committee to:

- establish age 21—rather than 18—as the normal ceiling on eligibility for FGP services;
- permit existing or replacement Foster Grandparents to continue serving individuals over 21 years of age who are currently enrolled in the program. The conferees stressed that "the Foster Grandparent relationship should be permitted to cease when and only when the Agency is certain that an alternative arrangement—mutually satis-
factory to the Foster Grandparent, the child's family, and the sponsoring institution—can be made . . ";

establish, to the maximum extent possible, Senior Companion programs coterminous with Foster Grandparent programs in order to provide a smooth transition from the FGP program to an alternative companionship program when the child reaches adulthood. Whenever possible, the committee suggested, this transition should take place during the grant cycle in which the "child" becomes 21 years old;

continue services, in the interim, to adults currently enrolled in Foster Grandparent projects (using mental age rather than chronological age as the basis for eligibility) until increased funds become available for alternative adult programs;

issue revised regulations implementing the above policies.

2. Child Care Standards (P.L. 94-120)

Legislation to delay imposition of minimum child care standards under Title XX was signed into law by President Ford on October 21, 1975.

Under the provisions of the Social Services Amendments of 1974 (P.L. 93-647), these standards were scheduled to go into effect on October 11, 1974. However, after day care operators and state social service officials complained that implementation of Title XX staffing standards would force hundreds of facilities (including some serving handicapped children) to close, the House of Representatives attached a rider to a minor tariff bill (H.R. 7706), which called for a six-month moratorium on enforcement of the standards. The Senate modified the bill to provide for only a one month delay. A House-Senate conference committee on H.R. 7706 then agreed to compromise and postpone the standards for four months.

3. Medicare Amendments (P.L. 94-182)

Just prior to adjournment in 1975, Congress completed action on emergency Medicare amendments. Included in the measure, which was signed into law by the President on December 31, 1975, is a provision permitting eligible skilled nursing homes (SNF's) and intermediate care facilities (ICF's) to comply with the 1973 Edition of the Life Safety Code.

Current law specifies that the 1967 Edition of the Code must be applied in Medicare and Medicaid eligible facilities. However, this same section gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to recognize other codes imposed by state law, if they "adequately protect patients in nursing facilities."
P.L. 94-182 requires eligible SNF's and ICF's to meet the 1973 Code six months after the enactment date of the legislation. However, any facility meeting the 1967 Edition of the Code prior to implementation of the legislation would continue to be an eligible provider under Titles XVIII and XIX as long as it maintained compliance with the earlier version of the Code.

Code compliance problems have proven to be a major stumbling block to meeting Federal ICF standards in many public and private facilities for the mentally retarded. While there are numerous differences between the 1967 and 1973 Editions of the Life Safety Code, in general the 1967 Code emphasizes the use of fireproof materials while the 1973 Code stresses the installation of sprinkler and smoke detection systems.

4. Education Appropriations (P.L. 94-94)

Congress over-rode President Ford's veto of the FY 1976 education appropriations bill (H.R. 5901). This education money bill contains a sharp increase in appropriations for state grants to assist in educating handicapped children and an expansion in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped's Early Childhood Education program. Congress more than doubled the amount requested by the President for grants to the states and increased early childhood education funds by $8.7 million.

5. HUD — Independent Agencies Appropriations (P.L. 94-116)

As part of the FY 1976 appropriations bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Congress increased loan authority to build housing for the elderly and handicapped to $375 million—or $160 million more than the amount requested by the Ford Administration. The bill (H.R. 8070) was signed into law by President Ford on October 17, 1975.

In addition, P.L. 94-116 includes language ordering HUD to use the handicapped/elderly funds, authorized under Section 202 of the National Housing Act, to award direct, long-term loans. Under regulations issued earlier in the year, Departmental officials had been planning to tie Section 202 loans to eligibility for Section 8 (rent subsidy) financing. They argued that, if long-term financing of construction projects is handled through the rent subsidy program, Section 202 funds could be recycled approximately every two years rather than tying up the limited amount available in 30 to 40 year mortgages.

Advocates for the elderly and handicapped, however, contended that most non-profit groups working with older Americans and disabled citizens would be unable to qualify for Section 8 financing because they lacked experience in building facilities and the capital assets
necessary to qualify for conventional or FHA loans. Congress sided with the advocacy groups and directed HUD to provide 100 percent permanent financing of Section 202 projects and to limit cash equity requirements to no more than $10,000.

6. Supplemental Appropriations (P.L. 94-157)

On December 18, 1975, President Ford signed into a law a supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 10647) which includes funds for a number of federal agencies, including several HEW programs which lacked authorizing legislation when the regular Labor-HEW money bill was considered by Congress. Among these programs are grants to the states for the developmentally disabled and demonstration and training grants to university affiliated facilities. Funds for both the DDSA formula grant program ($30,875,000) and the university affiliated program ($4,250,000) were maintained at the same level as in FY 1975. In addition, an initial appropriation of $1.5 million was included for advocacy programs on behalf of the developmentally disabled and $500,000 for evaluative studies. The advocacy grant program was authorized under the recently enacted amendments to the Developmental Disabilities Act (see pages 1—4).


On August 3, 1976 President Ford signed into law a measure (S.3295) which expands and liberalizes federal loan authority for constructing elderly and handicapped housing (P.L. 94-375).

The legislation authorizes the following changes in existing federal housing statutes:

*Increased Borrowing Authority.* The borrowing authority for loans under Section 202 of the Act (housing for the elderly and handicapped) is increased to $1,475 billion immediately and subsequently raised to $2,388 billion on October 1, 1977 and $3.3 billion on October 1, 1978. Before passage of the legislation, the borrowing ceiling was fixed at $750 million.

Congressional support for increasing the Section 202 borrowing authority grew after loan requests totaling over $6 billion were received by the Department of Housing and Urban Development earlier in the year. This was the first round of applications since the Section 202 authority was revamped by Congress in 1974.

*Lower Interest Rates.* P.L. 94-375 also contains provisions designed to lower the interest rates for Section 202 loans. The effect should be to lower loan interest rates by one percent or more. Under prior law the 202 interest rate was established on the basis of the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the
U.S. Government with similar maturing periods. The interest rate on 202 loans in 1976 was approximately 8.25 percent.

**Redefinition of Elderly and Handicapped.** The definition of the term "elderly or handicapped families" was modified to permit the following groupings to qualify: (a) two or more handicapped or elderly persons living together; (b) one handicapped or elderly person living with another non-handicapped person who provides care for him or her (i.e. "an essential person"); and (c) a surviving member of the family who was living in a 202 subsidized unit at the time of the death of his or her spouse or other family member. This new provision should make it possible for a larger number of handicapped persons to qualify for Section 202 housing projects.

**Disregarding Housing Subsidies.** Under another provision of the Act, public housing and rent subsidy payments cannot be counted as income in determining whether an aged and disabled person is eligible for Supplemental Security Income benefits. Enactment of this provision should prevent needy elderly and handicapped individuals from suffering a reduction in their SSI benefits when they move into a federally assisted housing project.

**Eligibility of Centers for the Handicapped.** Earlier in 1976, the Department of Housing and Urban Development issued regulations which would have forbidden local governments from using Community Development Block Grant allocations, authorized under Title I of the Act, to build centers for handicapped persons. P.L. 94-375 rescinds this policy by adding centers for the handicapped to the statutory list of purposes for which Title I funds may be used.

### 8. Rehabilitation Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-230)

P.L. 94-230 extended the federal-state vocational rehabilitation program for one year with an automatic extension for a second year if further legislation is not enacted prior to April 15, 1977. The authorization levels specified in the measure are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>FY 1977</th>
<th>FY 1978</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic State Grants</td>
<td>$740 million</td>
<td>$760 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and Expansion Grants</td>
<td>25 million</td>
<td>25 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>30 million</td>
<td>30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>25 million</td>
<td>30 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Projects</td>
<td>Sums as appropriated</td>
<td>Sums as appropriated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Facility Grants</td>
<td>Sums as appropriated</td>
<td>Sums as appropriated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Early in 1976 Congress dealt a severe blow to President Ford's plans to clamp a tight ceiling on social welfare spending by overriding his veto of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for FY 1976. On January 27, the House voted to override the veto by 28 votes more than the required two-thirds majority (310 to 113). The Senate followed suit on January 28, by a vote of 70 to 24.

Democratic leaders in both the House and Senate argued that the $45 billion measure was in line with Congressional spending priorities and exceeded the President's original budget requests for the two departments by only 2 1/2 percent. They suggested that the override vote marked an important test of the will of Congress to reassert its Constitutional responsibility for establishing spending priorities.

As a result of the vote, several HEW programs affecting the handicapped were assured of increased funds in FY 1976. The following significant increases were contained in P.L. 94-206:

**Vocational Rehabilitation.** Funds for basic grants to the states were increased by $40.3 million (from $680 million to $720.3 million). In addition, the major portion of Administration proposed cuts in innovation and expansion grants were restored and research funding was increased by $4 million.

**Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children.** Appropriations for MCH-CC grants to the states were increased by $28.8 million above the FY 1975 figure and $101.7 million above the Administration's request. The final bill also restored $6.2 million for research and training activities, thus avoiding most of the cuts in support to university affiliated facilities for the developmentally disabled.

**National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.** P.L. 94-206 increased the NICHD budget by $10.2 million above the FY 1975 appropriation and $28.3 above the level requested by the President.

**Older Americans Volunteer Program.** Funds for Older Americans Volunteer Programs were increased by $4.4 million. This increase was intended to support the Foster Grandparents and Senior Companion programs.

In late September, 1976, both Houses of Congress voted by over­whelming margins to override President Ford's veto of the HEW-Labor appropriations bill for FY 1977 (H.R. 14232).

In his veto message Ford called the $56.6 billion money bill ". . .a perfect example of the triumph of election-year politics over fiscal restraints and responsibility . . ." Noting that the bill exceeded his original budget estimates by nearly $4 billion, the President added that "I have compassion for those who cannot help themselves but I have compassion for the taxpayers, too."

The key to adoption of the override motion was the large number of Republicans in both Houses who broke with the White House and voted to override. The 312 to 93 vote in the House and the 67 to 15 vote in the Senate far exceeded the two-thirds majority required to override a Presidential veto.

The FY 1977 Labor-HEW appropriations measure includes several significant funding increases for programs affecting handicapped children and adults, including:

A $127.5 million increase in appropriations for grants to the states to assist in educating handicapped children;

A $20 million increase in the federal/state vocational rehabilitation program;

The full authorized amount ($3 million) for implementing statewide protection and advocacy systems on behalf of the developmentally disabled;

A one million dollar increase in appropriations for demonstration and training grants to university affiliated facilities (including $250,000 for planning satellite centers).


President Ford signed into law a measure to extend the general revenue sharing program at an October 13 campaign rally in White Plains, New York. Prior to enactment of the extension legislation, the much heralded program of no-strings-attached aid to state and local governments was scheduled to expire on December 31,1976.

The President praised the revenue sharing legislation as the embodiment of his Administration's commitment to eliminating federal red tape and editing the size of the government bureaucracy. He called revenue sharing "a people's program" which will "restore the necessary balance among Federal, State and local units of government."
The following are among the most salient features of P.L. 94-488, the "State and Local Fiscal Assistance Amendments of 1976":

**Length of Renewal Period.** The legislation extends the program for a total of 3 3/4 years, from January 1, 1977 through September 30, 1980.

**Funding.** A total of $25.6 billion in federal aid is authorized over the 3 3/4 period, with a total entitlement level of $6.9 billion in FY 1978 and the succeeding two fiscal years.

**Limitations on Use of Federal Funds.** The requirements that federal revenue sharing funds be used in certain specified priority areas of state and local services are repealed by the 1976 Amendments. Thus, there are effectively no programmatic restrictions on how a state or local jurisdiction may use its revenue sharing allocation. In addition, the prohibition against using revenue sharing funds to match federal grants received under other programs is also eliminated.

**Method of Payments.** To avoid the uncertainties involved in the regular authorization/appropriations process, payments to eligible state and local governments are based on an entitlement procedure, thus guaranteeing all jurisdictions their full entitlements during each payment period.

**Public Participation.** In response to complaints from a number of citizen interest groups, Congress tightened provisions requiring public disclosure of planned and actual use of federal revenue sharing funds by state and local jurisdictions.

**Non-Discrimination.** The non-discrimination provision in the former Act is broadened to encompass discrimination on the basis of age, handicapped status, and religion. The prohibition against discrimination involving "otherwise qualified handicapped individuals" will not apply, however, to construction projects commenced prior to January 1, 1977.

While a few jurisdictions have used general revenue sharing funds to initiate or expand services to handicapped persons, on the whole the original 1972 legislation has been a disappointment to those who envisioned the program as a major new funding resource. For example, a 1974 study by the General Accounting Office concluded that less than 3/10 of one percent of general revenue sharing funds awarded to the 250 largest cities and counties were used to support services or programs for the handicapped. Nothing in the 1976 Amendments suggests any major reversal in this trend.


The Second Supplemental Appropriations bill was signed into law by the President on June 1, 1976 (P.L. 94-303). This legislation increased
the FY 1976 appropriation for grants to the states to educate handicapped children to $200 million. Only $110 million had been included in the regular FY 1976 Labor-HEW money bill (P.L. 94-206) for this purpose.

Passage of this measure marked a doubling of the handicapped education funding level in one year and an important step toward full implementation of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142), passed by Congress in November, 1975.

Also incorporated in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act was an increase of $375 million in FY 1976 HUD authority for elderly and handicapped loans under Section 202 of the National Housing Act of 1959, as amended.

13. White House Conference Extension (P.L. 94-224)

Early in 1976 Congress approved a joint resolution extending the deadline for holding the White House Conference on Handicapped Individuals from December 1976 to December 1977.

Under the resolution, the President is required to convene the Conference before December 7, 1977. The period during which appropriated funds may be expended is also extended, from June 30, 1977 to September 30, 1978.

The 11-month delay in the appointment of the 28-member National Planning and Advisory Council for the Conference was cited as the major justification for the extension.


In July, 1976 Congress overrode President Ford’s veto of a public works employment bill. The principal thrust of the legislation was to provide immediate economic stimulus to geographic areas of the country experiencing high levels of unemployment.

Title I of P.L. 94-369 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Economic Development Administration, to make grants to state and local governments for the following three programs:

- **Direct Grant Program.** One hundred percent federal funding is available for construction, renovation, repair or other improvements in public works projects, including projects for which assistance is authorized under other federal statutes. These funds may also be used to complete plans, specifications and estimates for local public works projects.

- **Supplemental Grant Program** Grants are available to increase to 100 percent the federal share of the cost of any federally assisted public works project where such federal financial assistance is immediately available.
**State and Local Projects.** Federal assistance is authorized for all, or a portion of, the state or local share of any public works project authorized by any state or local law. However, such a grant may not provide both the state and local share. In addition, the state/local matching share must be immediately available and construction of the project not yet under way.

On-site labor must be scheduled to begin within 90 days of approval of the application for Title I funds. In addition, only projects which can be completed within two years are considered eligible. Priority must be given to public works projects sponsored by local governments.

State and local governments in areas with an average unemployment rate of 6.5 percent or more in the three most recent consecutive months, for which data is available, are eligible to receive assistance under Title I. Seventy percent of all appropriated funds must be allocated for projects in areas where the average unemployment rate exceeds the national unemployment rate. Of the remaining 30 percent, priority must be given to areas experiencing an unemployment rate exceeding 6.5 percent but less than the national average.

Late in 1976, several states applied for and received P.L. 94-369 funds to construct or renovate residential treatment facilities for mentally retarded and mentally ill persons.

Title II of the Act authorizes the so-called "Anti-Recession Fiscal Assistance Program." Under this new program, financial assistance is awarded to state and local governments to combat the effects of the recent economic recession. A total of $125 million is authorized for each quarter in which the national, seasonably adjusted unemployment rate reaches at least 6 percent. An additional $62.5 million is authorized for each one-half percentage point above 6 percent.

These funds are distributed to state and local governments in accordance with the general revenue sharing formula, with one-third reserved for the states and two-thirds for local governments.


Just before adjournment, Congress gave final approval to legislation appropriating a total of $3.7 billion to implement the Public Works Employment Act of 1976 (see description above). A total of $2 billion was included for Title I programs during FY 1977. Of the $1.25 billion earmarked for Title II grants, $312.5 million was reserved for the quarter ending September 30, 1976 and the remainder for FY 1977.


Besides extending programs authorized under the Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973 for two additional years (FY 1977 and FY 1978),
the 1976 Amendments direct the ACTION agency to allow mentally retarded individuals who are participating in Foster Grandparent programs to continue receiving services, under certain circumstances, after they reach 21 years of age.

P.L. 94-293 gives any private non-profit agency operating a Foster Grandparent program complete and exclusive authority to determine: (a) which children receive services; and (b) the length of time a child participates in the program. In general, the program must serve children under 21 years of age. However, if the local operating agency determines that continued participation is in the best interest of a mentally retarded individual, then the "child" may continue to receive services after reaching the chronological age of 21. Before the individual can be retained in the program beyond age 21, the mutual agreement of all involved parties must be obtained.

In its report on the legislation, the House Committee on Education and Labor made it clear that Congress did not intend that the Foster Grandparent program be opened to any retarded individual regardless of age. The procedure for exceptions, the Committee noted, is limited to only those retarded individuals enrolled in and receiving FGP services prior to attaining the chronological age of 21.

The new language in P.L. 94-293 reinforces the intent of Congress as expressed in the conference report on the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1975 (P.L. 94-135). Since the ACTION agency was ignoring the expression of Congressional intent accompanying the 1975 law, Congress decided to include a specific statutory provision in the 1976 Amendments.

17. Energy Conservation and Production Act (P.L. 94-385)

Included in a statute to extend the life of the Federal Energy Administration through September 30, 1977 is a program to assist low income persons, particularly the elderly and the handicapped, to weatherize their dwellings. The law authorizes $55 million in appropriations during FY 1977, $65 million during FY 1978 and $80 million during FY 1979.

The intent of the new weatherization program is to provide federal assistance of up to $400 per dwelling to help low income individuals adequately insulate their homes. To the maximum extent feasible volunteers, CETA trainees and other public service employees are to be used to install the insulation.

The Federal Energy Administration is responsible for administering the new program. Local responsibility will rest with units of local government, community action agencies, and Indian tribes.
A handicapped individual is defined in the Act as any person eligible to receive cash benefits under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Developmental Disabilities Act, Titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act and laws applicable to disabled veterans. Individuals eligible for cash assistance programs and those whose income falls below the poverty level, as determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, will be considered low income persons.


Under Title II of P.L. 94-562, a 23-member National Diabetes Advisory Board is established to review and evaluate the implementation of a long range plan to combat diabetes which was developed by the now defunct National Commission on Diabetes. The new advisory board, which will include the Director of the National Eye Institute, seven non-governmental experts on diabetes and five representatives of the general public, is responsible for submitting an annual report to Congress until its mandate ends in September 1980.

P.L. 94-562 also authorizes the Federal Government to spend a total of $52 million over a three year period to establish diabetes research and training centers. Under Section 435(a) of the Public Health Service Act, $12 million is authorized for FY 1978 and $20 million each for FY 1979 and FY 1980 to support such centers.

19. Copyright Amendments (P.L. 94-553)

The first comprehensive revision in the federal copyright law since 1909 was completed last year by Congress.

In addition to extending copyright privileges, allowing increased royalties for songwriters and affording authors and artists greater protection, the 1976 Amendments contain the following provisions affecting blind and deaf individuals:

Broadcasting performances of non-dramatic literary works, directed primarily at blind or deaf audiences, is not considered an infringement of copyright, provided: (a) the transmission is made without any purpose of commercial advantage; (b) the broadcasting facilities are operated by a governmental body, a non-commercial educational station, a radio sub-carrier or a cable system;

Broadcasting a single performance of a dramatic literary work, published at least ten years before the performance date and directed primarily at blind individuals, is not considered an infringement of copyright provided: (a) the transmission is made without any purpose of commercial advantage; (b) the broadcast is made through the facilities of a radio sub-carrier; and (c) no more
than one performance of the same work is completed by the same
performers or under the auspices of the same organization.

Under specified circumstances, up to ten copies or phonorecords of
copyrighted materials for broadcast by radio information service
carriers may be made by a non-profit organization for transmittal to
blind and deaf persons;

Braille copies are exempted from the statutory restriction against the
importation of non-dramatic, English language works not produced
in the United States or Canada;

The Register of Copyrights is required to develop forms and
procedures to obtain clearance to reproduce non-dramatic literary
works in braille or recorded form. As a result of this amendment, the
Division of the Blind and Physically Handicapped in the Library of
Congress should be able to expedite the production and distribution
of books in braille and recorded form.


Last Year Congress enacted the first comprehensive overhaul of the
United States tax code since 1954.

The following major provisions affecting handicapped individuals are
incorporated in this omnibus legislation:

Credit for Child Care Expenses. P.L. 94-455 permits taxpayers to
claim a 20 percent credit for child care expenses on their annual
income tax return rather than treating such expenditures as an
itemized deduction. In addition, the Act eliminates the $35,000
annual income ceiling and sets a limit on creditable expenses of
$2,000 for one dependent and $4,000 for two or more. Under the
former law, a taxpayer was allowed to deduct up to $4,800 for child
care expenses but the maximum deduction was reduced by one
dollar for every two dollars of annual income in excess of $35,000.

The net effect of this new approach to treating child care expenses
should benefit families who are required to pay for day care on
behalf of their disabled dependents. As under prior law, child care
expenses are generally limited to children under 15 years of age,
except when a dependent of the taxpayer is physically or mentally
disabled and incapable of self-care.

Removal of Architectural and Transportation Barriers. Businesses are
permitted to deduct up to $25,000 in any tax year for costs incurred
in removing architectural and transportation barriers to the elderly
and handicapped (including the deaf and blind) in any facility or
public transportation vehicle owned or leased for use in a trade or
business. This new provision of the Act, which is effective in the tax
years of 1977 through 1979, is intended to encourage the
elimination of architectural barriers by offering businesses an alternative to depreciating renovation costs over the useful life of the property. All barrier removal projects must meet existing government standards for physical accessibility in order to qualify for the new tax deduction.

**Lobbying by Public Charities.** A more precise delineation of the restrictions on lobbying by tax exempt organizations was also contained in the Tax Reform Act of 1976.

Under prior law, charitable organizations, exempted from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, were not permitted to devote any "substantial part" of their activities to propaganda or other attempts to influence legislation. This statutory test, however, was so vague that IRS was widely criticized for capricious and inequitable enforcement.

Effective January 1, 1977, P.L. 94-455 permits charitable organizations to either elect to remain under the "substantial" test or be covered under a new expenditures test. Under the new provisions, a sliding scale limitation on overall lobbying activity is established ranging from 20 percent of the annual expenditures of organizations with budgets of under $500,000 to $225,000 plus 10 percent of all outlays over $1.5 million for organizations with annual budgets exceeding $1.5 million. Organizations electing this new procedure will be required to disclose their annual lobbying expenditures.

In addition, instead of having the withdrawal of tax exempt status as the only penalty, the new provisions include authority to impose an excise tax for minor violations. Loss of exemption is reserved for sustained and excessive violations. What constitutes lobbying activities by tax exempt organizations is also spelled out in the Act.

Hundreds of charitable organizations serving handicapped children and adults will be affected by these provisions of P.L. 94-455.

21. Helen Keller Center (P.L. 94-288)

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was amended by P.L. 94-288 to provide that the Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, authorized under Section 305 of the Act, be renamed the Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.


A provision requiring the Director of the National Science Foundation to initiate a search for qualified handicapped individuals to fill executive level positions and serve on NSF advisory bodies is included in legislation extending the Foundation's mandate. Quarterly reports on the agency's progress must be submitted to Congress.
In addition, P.L. 94-471 directs NSF to conduct "experimental forums, conferences, workshops, or other activities designed to improve scientific literacy and to encourage and assist ... handicapped individuals to undertake and to advance in careers in scientific research and science education."


The major goal of P.L. 94-484 is to overcome the geographic maldistribution of health professionals by assuring federal scholarship support for physicians, dentists and other health professionals who voluntarily choose to serve medically underserved areas upon completion of their training. The intent of the federal policy on supporting medical schools and other public health training institutions is to encourage more physicians and related health practitioners to enter general practice rather than specialty fields.

In addition to the general impact of changing patterns in training support for health professionals, the 1976 legislation contains several provisions with specific implications for handicapped persons.

Title VII of P.L. 94-484 extends the existing authority for federal grants to train allied health personnel. Although the language of the statute contains no specific provision, the Senate committee report on the legislation emphasizes the need to prepare allied health personnel to serve blind and visually impaired persons. Special stress is placed on training low vision aid therapists, mobility therapists and rehabilitation teachers of the blind.

Similarly, under Title VIII of the Act, which authorizes special project grants, the Senate committee stressed the importance of training optometrists specializing in low vision services and low vision aid therapists.

Title VI of the legislation amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to make alien physicians ineligible for preferential admission to this country unless they have passed parts I and II of the National Board of Medical Examiners test and are competent in the English language. In addition, P.L. 94-484 adds new provisions which prohibit the issuance of exchange visas to alien physicians unless they: (a) are participating in a program sponsored by a U.S. school of medicine or another recognized educational institution; and (b) have passed both parts I and II of the National Board of Medical Examiners test; and (c) have made a commitment to return to their country of origin after completion of the educational program.
24. FY 1977 Appropriations for the District of Columbia (P.L. 94-446)

Included in the FY 1977 money bill for the District of Columbia is a $3.2 million increase in funds to improve conditions at Forest Haven, the District's home for the mentally retarded. These funds will be used to support 188 new positions at the facility.

25. FY 1977 Appropriations for the Department of Transportation (P.L. 94-387)

Under this measure applicants for federal mass transportation assistance are: (a) permitted to continue using preferential fare systems adopted prior to November 26, 1974; (b) allowed a reasonable amount of time to expand the coverage of existing preferential fare systems; and (c) authorized to define the eligibility of "handicapped persons" for purposes of conformity with other federal statutes.


Title II of P.L. 94-541 amends the existing federal architectural barriers law to impose a clear statutory mandate for seeing that public buildings are accessible to the physically handicapped. Coverage of the Act is also extended to Government-leased buildings intended for public use or in which physically handicapped persons might be employed. Buildings leased by the Government for public housing or for the U.S. Postal Service are also covered.

In addition, the legislation requires designated agencies (HEW, GSA, DOD and HUD) to establish a system of continuous surveys in order to insure compliance with the act. The Administrator of the General Services Administration must report annually to Congress on the status of activities related to the Architectural Barriers Act.

27. Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482)

In addition to extending and amending programs authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Vocational Education Act of 1963, P.L. 94-482 contains several provisions affecting handicapped children and youth.

A provision requiring that at least ten percent of basic federal/state grant-in-aid funds for vocational education be reserved for handicapped individuals is retained in the 1976 Amendments. In order to eliminate the practice of replacing state funds with federal monies in vocational education programs for the handicapped, P.L. 94-482 establishes a 50 percent state matching ratio.

In addition, Congress directed the states to use the set-aside funds to assist handicapped individuals, to the maximum extent possible,
participate in regular vocational education programs. The purpose of this provision is to minimize the number of handicapped students placed in segregated vocational classes.

Finally, the 1976 Amendments require that plans for expending the vocational education set-aside funds be consistent with the state's education of the handicapped plan, submitted in accordance with Section 613(a) of P.L. 94-142.

28. Emergency Medical Services Act (P.L. 94-573)

A rider to the Emergency Medical Services Act amends the National Research Act in order to extend for one year (through December 31, 1977) the mandate of the National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research.

Among the responsibilities of the Commission, which was established under legislation enacted in 1974, is to recommend safeguards for biomedical and behavioral research involving children, prisoners, and institutionalized mentally infirm individuals.

29. Health Research and Health Services Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-278)

Title IV of P.L. 94-278 replaces the existing authority for screening, counseling, treatment, research, information and education programs for sickle cell anemia and Cooley's anemia with a general authority applicable to all genetic diseases.

The Secretary of HEW is empowered to award grants and contracts for the operation of voluntary genetic testing and counseling programs and the development and dissemination of educational materials relating to genetic diseases. Thirty million dollars is authorized for this purpose in each of the following fiscal years: FY 1976, FY 1977 and FY 1978.

In addition, HEW is responsible for awarding grants and contracts to foster: (a) basic and applied research leading to the understanding, diagnosis, treatment and control of genetic diseases; (b) planning and developing special training programs for genetic counselors, social and behavioral scientists and other health professionals; (c) the development of programs to educate practising physicians, other health professionals, and the general public on the nature and treatment of genetic diseases; and (d) the development of counseling and testing programs related to the diagnosis, control and treatment of such diseases. Priority must be given to basic and applied research applications on sickle cell anemia and Cooley's anemia.

Title I of P.L. 94-317 authorizes a new program of research and demonstration grants to improve consumer health information and health promotion. The basic purpose of the legislation is to develop and demonstrate superior programs of preventive and school health, determine the most cost-effective preventive health modalities and initiate new health promotion and maintenance programs.

Title I also establishes an Office of Consumer Health Information and Health Promotion within HEW to serve as a focal point for policy development and coordination in the area of prevention.

Title II of the Act extends and revises existing authorities for preventing and controlling communicable diseases (measles, rubella, polio, diphtheria, tuberculosis, etc.), some of which are known causes of disability. In addition, programs to combat lead poisoning and other controllable diseases are also extended under this section of the legislation. A total of $277.2 million is authorized over a three year period for Title II programs.


This new law expands federal funding to include the purchase by public broadcasting stations of radio subcarrier receivers used by blind and physically handicapped individuals who are unable to read ordinary printed matter. Through the use of such receivers these individuals are able to obtain special radio reading services via closed channel broadcasts.

P.L. 94-309 also establishes a new telecommunications demonstration program within the U.S. Office of Education. One million dollars is authorized for such demonstration grants during FY 1977.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Date Introduced</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date Reported</th>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Date of Passage</th>
<th>Public Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Health Revenue Sharing</td>
<td>S.66 (HR 4925)</td>
<td>Jan 15</td>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>LPW</td>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>Mar. 6</td>
<td>94-192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act</td>
<td>HR 4006 (S.462)</td>
<td>Feb. 27</td>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>LPW</td>
<td>Mar. 13</td>
<td>May 22</td>
<td>94-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Standards</td>
<td>HR 7706</td>
<td>June 9</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>June 16</td>
<td>July 30</td>
<td>94-296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975</td>
<td>S.6 (HR 7217)</td>
<td>Jan. 15</td>
<td>EdL</td>
<td>LPW</td>
<td>June 26</td>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>94-332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Bill No.</td>
<td>Date Introduced</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Date Reported</td>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Date of Passage</td>
<td>Public Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Amendments</td>
<td>HR 10284</td>
<td>Oct. 22</td>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>Nov. 6</td>
<td>Dec. 12</td>
<td>94-626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Research and Health Services Amend-</td>
<td>HR 7988</td>
<td>June 17 1975</td>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>LPW</td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Dec. 5</td>
<td>94-498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ments of 1976</td>
<td>S 988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Keller Center</td>
<td>HR 12018</td>
<td>Feb. 23</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendmen-</td>
<td>HR 12216</td>
<td>Mar. 2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts of 1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of</td>
<td>HR 13172</td>
<td>Apr. 9</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>App</td>
<td>Apr. 9</td>
<td>May 6</td>
<td>94-1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tr>
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<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date Reported</th>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Date of Passage</th>
<th>Public Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A
### LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF LAWS RELATING TO THE HANDICAPPED, 1975-76—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Date Introduced</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date Reported</th>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Date of Passage</th>
<th>Public Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Aug. 26</td>
<td>94-1167</td>
<td>Aug. 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Aug. 27</td>
<td>94-1185</td>
<td>Sept. 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>June 10</td>
<td>94-938</td>
<td>Aug. 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LPW</td>
<td>May 14</td>
<td>94-888</td>
<td>May 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(HR 12861)</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 4</td>
<td>94-1086</td>
<td>Aug. 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(HR 14070)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 8</td>
<td>94-1232</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>May 27</td>
<td>94-1207</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PW</td>
<td>July 31</td>
<td>94-349</td>
<td>Aug. 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Amendments</td>
<td>S 22 (HR 15134)</td>
<td>Jan. 15 1975</td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Sept. 3</td>
<td>94-1476</td>
<td>Sept. 22</td>
<td>Oct. 19 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Nov. 20</td>
<td>94-473</td>
<td>Feb. 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Bill No.</th>
<th>Date Introduced</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Date Reported</th>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Date of Passage</th>
<th>Public Law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arthritis, Diabetes, and Digestive Diseases Amendments of 1976</td>
<td>S 2910</td>
<td>Feb. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct. 1</td>
<td>Oct. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Security Income Amendments</td>
<td>HR 7228</td>
<td>May 21</td>
<td>WM, Fin</td>
<td>Apr. 29</td>
<td>94-1071</td>
<td>May 13</td>
<td>94-569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services Act</td>
<td>S 2548 (HR 12864)</td>
<td>Oct. 22</td>
<td>IFC, LPW</td>
<td>May 5</td>
<td>94-1085</td>
<td>Aug. 24</td>
<td>94-573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Security Income Amendments</td>
<td>HR 13500</td>
<td>May 3</td>
<td>WM, Fin</td>
<td>June 2</td>
<td>94-1210</td>
<td>Oct. 21</td>
<td>94-585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The bills in parentheses are companion measures.

### TABLE OF COMMITTEE ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>App</td>
<td>Appropriations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC&amp;H</td>
<td>Banking, Currency and Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHUA</td>
<td>Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdL</td>
<td>Education and Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fin</td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Government Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFC</td>
<td>Interstate and Foreign Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Judiciary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPW</td>
<td>Labor and Public Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PW</td>
<td>Public Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWT</td>
<td>Public Works and Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM</td>
<td>Ways and Means</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developmentally Disabled Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (P.L. 94-103)</td>
<td>Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act</td>
<td>2, 8, 15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-142)</td>
<td>Education of the Handicapped Act</td>
<td>3, 11, 19, 24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child Nutrition Act of 1966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Health Revenue Sharing Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-83)</td>
<td>Community Mental Health Centers Act</td>
<td>2, 8, 15, 23, 25, 28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Health Service Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership for Health Amendments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Americans Amendments of 1975 (P.L. 94-135)</td>
<td>Older Americans Act of 1975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Standards (P.L. 94-120)</td>
<td>Social Security Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Amendments (P.L. 94-401)</td>
<td>Social Services Amendment of 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Amendments</td>
<td>Social Security Act</td>
<td>1, 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>1, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate Care Amendments of 1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary Security Income Amendments (P.L. 94-566; P.L. 94-365; P.L. 94-569; P.L. 94-585)</td>
<td>Social Security Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-230)</td>
<td>Vocational Rehabilitation Act</td>
<td>4, 20, 26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation Act of 1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White House Conference Extension (P.L. 94-224)</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Volunteer Service Act Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-293)</td>
<td>Domestic Volunteer Service Act of 1973</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>