

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS  
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 21

SEPTEMBER 17, 1968, TO SEPTEMBER 25, 1968

(PAGES 27095 TO 28250)

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

#### By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, county of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to appropriate certain moneys to implement the recreation plan for the Angeles National Forest; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., Dallas, Tex., praying for increased appropriations for programs in the war on poverty; to the Committee on Appropriations.

### APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] as advisers to attend the annual meeting, Board of Governors, International Monetary Fund and World Bank, to be held September 30–October 4, 1968, at Washington, D.C.

### REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. SPONG, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 3883. A bill to authorize the Government of the District of Columbia to convey interests in certain property owned by the District of Columbia in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1577).

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

Francesco Costagliola, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Ernest C. Arbuckle, of California, Edward J. Daley, of California, Edwin D. Etherington, of New Jersey, Edgar F. Kaiser, of California, James J. Ling, of Texas, John L. Loeb, of New York, Everett Mattson, of Texas, George Meaney, of Maryland, David Rockefeller, of New York, and John H. Wheeler, of North Carolina, to be incorporators of the Corporation authorized by section 902(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; and

Donald C. Burnham, of Pennsylvania, Gilbert W. Fitzhugh, of New York, William A. Hewitt, of Illinois, Andre Meyer, of New York, Stuart T. Saunders, of Pennsylvania, and Leon N. Weiner, of Pennsylvania, to be incorporators of the Corporation authorized by section 902(a) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968.

### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 4062. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, relating to census questions;

to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 4063. A bill for the relief of Cho Johnny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. McGOVERN):

S. 4064. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 4065. A bill for the relief of Alvin D. Veloso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 4066. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jose C. Fermo, Jr., and his wife, Dr. Meril Gorsepe Fermo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 4067. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the payment of overtime and standby pay to certain personnel employed in the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. RANDOLPH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 4068. A bill for the relief of Viorica Anna Ghitescu, Alexander Ghitescu, and Serban George Ghitescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### S. 4067—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO REMOVAL OF PAY LIMITATIONS ON EMPLOYEES ENGAGED IN AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL AND AVIATION SAFETY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the payment of overtime and standby pay to certain personnel employed by the Department of Transportation in the performance of duties which directly affect aviation safety and which are critical to the operation of the air traffic control system.

Mr. President, the purpose of this measure is to remove the GS-10 minimum rate limitation used in computing premium pay for overtime and standby time for certain employees of the Department of Transportation. The duties of these employees directly affect aviation safety—a critical national problem. This measure will affect approximately 9,000 to 10,000 air traffic controllers and approximately 6,000 airway facilities personnel who are classified in grades GS-10 and above.

Under existing law, payment of overtime is authorized at a rate of 1½ times the hourly rate of the employee's basic pay, if his basic pay does not exceed the minimum rate of GS-10. For those employees whose minimum rate exceeds the GS-10 level, their overtime compensation is based on the minimum rate for a GS-10. This system is applicable to the computation of pay for standby time.

In fact, employees above the GS-10 level receive less pay for overtime or standby time than for their regular work.

The measure I submit today will remove this inequitable limitation. It is identical to the legislation, H.R. 19136, which was approved by a 317 to 2 vote

in the House of Representatives on September 16.

There is no need to elaborate on the fantastic demands placed on air traffic controllers and airway facilities personnel in this jet age. The excessive work hours, the strain, and the hardships to which these employees are subjected is known to us. The need to alleviate these conditions is obvious—it demands attention. This measure to provide increased compensation for overtime and standby time is certainly one way in which the Congress can act immediately to an inequity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4067) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the payment of overtime and standby pay to certain personnel employed in the Department of Transportation, introduced by Mr. Randolph (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### RESOLUTION

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 395—RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE PRINTING OF A HISTORY OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. HILL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 395); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 395

*Resolved*, That there be printed with illustrations as a Senate document a compilation of materials relating to the history of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in connection with its one hundredth anniversary (1869–1969); and that there be printed for the use of that committee one thousand additional copies of such document.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1969—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1001

Mr. CLARK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 18707) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 1002

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2767 for myself and Senators NELSON, HARRIS, and ARKEN.

This amendment relates to another aspect of the conservation problem in the United States—the conservation of human beings.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal these days about the need for self-help. We work ceaselessly to provide opportunities for jobs. In recent years, we have stressed the need for helping those who can, to pull themselves out of poverty and dependency through work.

Of all the groups that need support, all would agree I think to the importance of helping the mother on welfare to help make this escape. The mothers and children of this country now receiving aid to families with dependent children are among those most deserving of every kind of help we can provide to escape the vicious cycle of poverty that traps generation after generation, one after another.

In recent years, mothers across the country have been helped to help themselves escape this cycle. Through jobs in antipoverty and related programs, they have been able to both help the people they know best, and at the same time help themselves move from being "tax eaters" to being taxpayers.

One policy instrument that has helped in making this possible has been the work incentives provided in the Economic Opportunity Act and related acts. Under these arrangements, mothers have been permitted to keep part of the income they earn without having it deducted from their welfare grant.

The idea has worked well. When a mother receiving an AFDC grant is able to work and keep a portion of her earnings without having it deducted from her grant, she not only is taking a first step toward independence, but she also is able to lift her family a little above the poverty level. So far the policy has enabled many women working on such programs as teacher aides in elementary and secondary schools, Project Headstart, citizens community centers, and new careers to make an excellent contribution as effective staff assistants as well as enabling many to add needed income to their families out of their own efforts.

Not only have the women benefited, but also the community, both from the service they have provided, but also from the fact that the women and their families have been able to participate more as part of the mainstream of American life.

Unfortunately, this entire program now has been destroyed in many States. But the program can be retrieved, if the amendment I offer is adopted.

Under the 1967 Social Security Amendment, several earnings exemption plans for AFDC recipients employed in Federal programs were terminated as of June 30 of this year. In place of these special plans, the 1967 amendments establish a new general earnings exemption arrangement for all employed recipients regardless of the nature of their employment.

The 1967 amendments stipulate that State implementation of a new general plan is optional until July 1, 1969. After that date, States are required to adopt the system. However, the old plans stopped July 1, 1968.

The problem is this: many States need enabling legislation to implement the new earnings exemption. If the State legislature was not scheduled to meet, welfare departments could not start the new program last July.

The results in these States have been disastrous. AFDC recipients who were employed in poverty, education, and job training programs suddenly found them-

selves losing money. For all of a sudden, the earnings exemption was gone.

Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD a chart prepared by HEW showing the status of this program now.

The report shows clearly that 31 States, including Minnesota, were unable to put the new earnings incentive plan into effect on July 1 when the old plans were terminated.

The cost in human terms already has been enormous; 1,709 people have been affected in Minnesota alone.

I should like to insert one of the many letters I have received from Minnesota concerning the human hardship that has already been created.

Mr. President, I am sure that it was not the intent of Congress that this happen as a result of the passage of the 1967 social security legislation. I am sure that the drafters of the legislation intended, not that the incentives be discontinued and that people be forced to stop work, but rather that the incentives continue to provide needed aid to mothers already working.

It is with this in mind that I introduce the amendment to this measure this afternoon.

The very simple intent of this amendment is to permit the program to work with equity in the States.

This amendment would keep the former work exemptions in effect for those persons who were receiving them in June 1968, until the States have a chance to act. The amendment would terminate at the end of the State's next regular legislative session and in no event later than June 30, 1969.

It would apply only to those States that have not had legislative sessions this year.

Mr. President, this amendment has the endorsement of other Senators. Senators HARRIS, NELSON, and AIKEN are cosponsors.

The American Public Welfare Association, the State Welfare Departments, the National Assembly of Social Policy and Development, the Child Welfare League of America and other groups all have endorsed the intent of the legislation. Congressman FRASER has introduced a measure with similar intent on the House side. The Seventh Annual Midwestern Governor's Conference relative to aid to families with dependent children also has endorsed the need for legislation of this kind.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time letters and editorials endorsing the goal of this legislation. I hope this amendment will be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the letters and editorials will be printed in the RECORD.

The letters and editorials, presented by Mr. MONDALE, are as follows:

ABILITY OF STATES TO IMPLEMENT 1967 AFDC AMENDMENT

(This report shows that 31 States, including Minnesota and Wisconsin, were unable to put the new earnings incentive plan into effect on July 1 when the old plans were terminated.)

Disregarding the first \$30 of any income

earned per month plus 1/3 of the remainder earned (Guam, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands—not reported.)

Will implement July 1, 1968, or soon thereafter, 17 States.

California	Montana
Colorado	New Jersey
Connecticut	New York
District of Columbia	North Dakota <sup>1</sup>
Hawaii	Ohio <sup>2</sup>
Iowa	Oklahoma
Kansas	Rhode Island
Kentucky	West Virginia
Massachusetts	

Cannot implement at present because of lack of State funds, 23 States.

Alabama	Maryland
Alaska <sup>3</sup>	Michigan
Arizona <sup>4</sup>	Nevada
Arkansas <sup>5</sup>	New Hampshire
Delaware	New Mexico
Florida	Oregon <sup>7</sup>
Georgia	Pennsylvania
Idaho	South Dakota
Illinois <sup>6</sup>	Tennessee
Indiana	Texas
Louisiana	Wyoming
Maine	

Needs enabling legislation, nine States.

Minnesota <sup>8</sup>	Utah <sup>12</sup>
Mississippi <sup>9</sup>	Vermont <sup>13</sup>
Missouri <sup>10</sup>	Washington
Nebraska <sup>11</sup>	Wisconsin
South Carolina	

Needs formal Board action, two States.

North Carolina <sup>14</sup>	Virginia <sup>15</sup>
------------------------------	------------------------

<sup>1</sup> Has not made firm decision but probably will implement.

<sup>2</sup> Already implemented effective April 1, 1968.

<sup>3</sup> Estimate 231 persons will be affected.

<sup>4</sup> Estimate 125 persons will be affected.

<sup>5</sup> Estimate 100 or more persons will be affected.

<sup>6</sup> Estimate 300 persons, almost all on OEO projects, will be affected in Chicago, alone; expect strong adverse reactions to situation. However State agency already has a large deficiency in budget and is seeking a supplemental appropriation to meet it.

<sup>7</sup> Estimate 75 persons will be affected.

<sup>8</sup> Estimate 1,709 persons will be affected.

<sup>9</sup> Legislation being considered in current 1968 session.

<sup>10</sup> Estimate 200 persons will be affected.

<sup>11</sup> Estimate 200 persons will be affected.

<sup>12</sup> Estimate 175 persons will be affected.

<sup>13</sup> Have prepared an amendment for consideration of legislature.

<sup>14</sup> Estimate only small number of persons affected.

<sup>15</sup> Have not asked for Attorney General's opinion; Board action will be necessary; availability of funds a factor.

<sup>16</sup> Proposal to be presented to State Board at July meeting.

Source: SRS—APA, June 18, 1968.

AUGUST 12, 1968.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing you concerning the Directive from Dept. of Public Welfare which went into effect July 1. From Oct. 18 to June 18 I worked as an Outreach Aide for Goodhue Rice Wabacha Citizens Action Council, Inc. on June 18 I was notified that because of this directive my grant for July would be cut 82— from wages earned in May and I was cut \$115 for wages earned in June. What kind of laws are passed that affect wages 2 months before we know of them. I was forced to quit work. \$30 a month will not cover the increase in food costs, lunches away from home, dry cleaning, hosiery, etc. I applied for training under MDTA but do not live in the Twin Cities area so have been unable to receive it and there is no allowance for

us to move into an area where there is training. We hear a great deal about the increase in costs of welfare but when we try to get off we're punished. I know I'm not the only AFDC mother hurt by this law but I do know how it hurt me and my family. Why do they feel we can work for nothing? Where is the incentive to try and get off welfare. I was hoping to use my earnings to pay for my own training; instead I'll be months trying to balance a budget upset by this change. If I had known prior to this directive I could have made arrangements but before I knew of the change I had lost \$200. Surely Congress must realize a welfare family isn't in position to lose \$200 without warning.

I do not know anyone who wants to be on welfare but where do we get help to get off. I receive 252 for basic needs plus 70 housing allowance for myself and 5 children, that certainly doesn't allow any extra for training or moving to where there is training, etc.

Does Congress want us to get off welfare rolls or to stay on.

I would very much like to know what our Senators and Representatives are doing to try and help those of us that want to be self supporting.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN RICHARDSON.

MAZEPPA, MINN.

[From the Seventh Annual Midwestern Governors' Conference, Milwaukee, Wis., June 30-July 3, 1968]

RESOLUTION XI. AID TO FAMILIES WITH DEPENDENT CHILDREN

Whereas, 1967 Amendments to the Social Security Act (P.L. 90-248) and to the Economic Opportunity Act (P.L. 90-222) provide that after June 30, 1968, recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children will no longer be entitled to certain disregards of income currently provided by other federal acts including the Economic Opportunity Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; and

Whereas, Congress in amending the Social Security Act (P.L. 90-248) did provide a new disregard of income; and

Whereas, Congress further provided that the several States will have until July 1, 1969 to implement the new income disregards; and

Whereas, the majority of States will be unable to implement the new income disregards until sometime after July 1, 1968; and

Whereas, in those States unable to act until after July 1, 1968, many recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children in training and/or employment will be denied the benefits of income disregard which they are presently entitled to; and

Whereas, denial of income disregard benefits will discourage recipients both from remaining in training and/or employment and from entering training and/or employment under current federally-aided programs:

Now, therefore, be it Resolved that the Midwestern Governors' Conference urge Congress to take action deferring the effective dates of appropriate sections of P.L. 90-248 and P.L. 90-222 until July 1, 1969.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, June 7, 1968]

PROTECTION OF POVERTY WORKERS' PAY ASKED (By Dick Cunningham)

The Minneapolis Urban Coalition voted Thursday to apply its influence at the state level to see that mothers working in poverty programs don't lose the financial incentive that makes it possible for some of them to work.

The coalition—of major business, labor and community agency representatives—voted to ask Morris Hursh, Minnesota welfare commissioner, to administer regulations

so the women will not lose \$100 a month starting July 1.

If Hursh needs it, he should ask Minnesota Atty. Gen. Douglas Head for a legal opinion that would allow Hursh to save the money for the women, the coalition advised.

The group also empowered its executive director, Larry Harris, to ask the National Urban Coalition's new legislative unit in Washington, D.C., to work for a change in the national law that is jeopardizing the women's money.

Finally, the group voted to set up in a task force to study the 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act to seek changes in any that may threaten the well-being of Hennepin County poor people.

The specific change that threatens the income of some of the mothers in poverty programs is the result of an attempt by Congress to shift financial incentive from one law to another.

Congress repealed a provision of the Economic Opportunity Act that permitted women on Aid to Families of Dependent Children (AFDC) to keep \$115 instead of only \$15 of extra income each month, provided the income comes from work and/or training in a poverty program.

Congress provided for a similar incentive in an amendment to the Social Security Act, but the provision requires action by the state legislatures to become effective in Minnesota and in many other states.

The Minnesota Legislature does not meet until 1969.

Therefore, without action by Hursh or Congress, women under the program may lose \$100 a month starting July 1, explained Cecil Newman, head of the coalition's employment task force.

More than 200 women in Minneapolis would be affected, said Harris. In one program alone, New Careers, about 60 women have said they will have to quit, said Mike Roan, community relations director of the Hennepin County Mobilization of Economic Resources.

[From the Minneapolis Tribune, June 23, 1968]

EARNINGS INCENTIVE LOST IN LEGAL SNARL

To the Editor:

When a mother receiving an AFDC (aid to families with dependent children) grant is able to work and keep a portion of her earnings, without having it deducted from her grant, she not only takes the first step toward independence, she is also able to lift her family a little above the poverty level.

This sensible policy, put into practice in the antipoverty programs, is known as an earnings-incentive program. It has enabled hundreds of women throughout the state working on such programs as teacher aides in elementary and secondary schools, Project Headstart, Citizens Community Centers, and New Careers to make an excellent contribution as effective staff assistants and to add needed income to their families out of their own efforts.

The community is enriched not only by the unique contribution these women make to these important programs but also by the fact that this policy enables AFDC families to participate more normally in the mainstream of life.

Now the earnings-incentive program, widely accepted by every knowledgeable expert as a necessary change in the welfare system, is going down the drain in Minnesota.

An amendment to the Social Security Act adopted by Congress last year provides an earnings-incentive program, but one that is pegged very much lower than that permitted under the antipoverty programs. It also eliminates the present incentive policy of the poverty programs.

Because the State Legislature did not pass enabling legislation, Minnesota cannot take advantage of even the incentive policy of the new amendment for a least a year.

The issue is more than just a technicality that was overlooked in the law. It is symptomatic of how confused we are in dealing with poverty.

On the one hand, everyone seems outraged at features of a welfare system that perpetuates chronic dependency. On the other hand, we have been led into a blind impasse that undercuts the one feature that could lead to a revived sense of self-reliance, a decent earnings-incentive program.

This legislative muddle illustrates the increased helplessness that poor people feel when confronted with bureaucracies.

Who will suffer? A sizable portion of the 42,000 children on AFDC grants.

What can be done? Congressman Fraser and Senator Mondale are working to try to solve this legislative snarl. But they and all Minnesota congressmen need the letters of interested citizens urging them to delay the effective date of the new Social Security Amendment on earnings incentives until July 1, 1969, so that AFDC mothers will not be penalized by having to give up the incentive program they now have under OEO.

This will give our legislature time to act to take advantage of the new federal law.

ESTHER WATTENBERG,

Project Director, New Careers Programs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

STATE OF MINNESOTA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,

St. Paul, Minn., June 6, 1968.

Re: Public Law 90-222, Public Law 90-248.

Hon. DONALD M. FRASER, Representative in Congress, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: Under Congressional Amendments of 1967, the disregard of certain income of AFDC recipients will no longer be applicable after June 30, 1968. Programs affected are the Economic Opportunity Act, Manpower Development and Training Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

An estimated 1700 AFDC recipients in Minnesota now participating in these programs will not have the benefit of the income exemptions after July 1, 1968. This means they will have no financial incentive to continue working since their total earnings (after employment expenses are allowed) will be deducted in determining the amount of their AFDC grant.

Public Law 90-248 does provide a new disregard of income for AFDC recipients, effective July 1, 1968, but in Minnesota we must pass enabling legislation to implement this new exemption provision. And this we cannot do until the Legislature meets in 1969. I assume that a similar situation prevails in many other states.

We will greatly appreciate anything that you can do to get the effective date of the provision referred to deferred for one year. This would make it possible for our AFDC recipients to get the exemptions they are presently receiving right up to the time we implement the new exemption provision of \$30 per month plus one-third. (If Congressional action is taken on the June 30, 1968 date, it should relate both to P.L. 90-248 and P.L. 90-222.)

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS HURSH, Commissioner.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS INC., SOUTHERN MINNEAPOLIS CHAPTER,

Minneapolis, Minn., June 19, 1968.

Hon. DONALD FRASER, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: Our Southern Minnesota Chapter of the National Association of Social Workers is gravely concerned over the expiration of Title VII of the OEO Act on July 1, 1968. As you know, this means that AFDC mothers currently receiving income

exemptions under that Act will no longer be able to receive these exemptions.

Because our state legislature will not convene again until 1969, our AFDC mothers will not be able to take advantage of the new income exemptions provided under the Social Security Amendments of 1967, as our state does not have the necessary enabling legislation. We urge you to take whatever measures you can to defer the effective date of Title VII until July 1, 1969.

While writing on behalf of work incentives for AFDC mothers, we would like also to express our disappointment over the low amount of \$30 plus one-third of the remainder as provided in the Social Security Amendments. We do not feel that this provides an adequate incentive. Our NASW nationally has recommended a monthly exemption of \$85 and one-half of the remainder.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD C. WILSON,  
President.

AMERICAN PUBLIC WELFARE ASSO-  
CIATION,

July 29, 1968.

HON. GAYLORD A. NELSON,  
U.S. Senate,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: It is our understanding that you are planning to propose an amendment to legislation pending before the Senate which would extend for another year the recently expired provisions for disregarding portions of income earned by public assistance recipients from programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am pleased to inform you that the Board of Directors of the American Public Welfare Association has adopted a resolution in support of this measure. Because of the late date of enactment of the 1967 Social Security Amendments (actually, January 1968), the effective date of the termination of these provisions came quite abruptly. While a substitute provision was established, a number of states must first either enact legislation or appropriate additional funds before it can be put into effect. In the meantime, those families who are working under programs affected by these expirations are no longer allowed the exemption of part of their earnings, with the result that their net incomes are reduced and they are no better off for working than if they stayed at home and received assistance.

We are confident that most states who are thus affected will adopt the necessary remedial measures when their legislatures meet early next year. In the meantime the one-year extension of these expired provisions would enable them to continue to allow the exemptions, as they have prior to June 30, 1968.

We are appreciative of your effort in this regard and we are pleased to lend our endorsement to this measure.

Sincerely,

HAROLD HAGEN,  
Washington Representative.

CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMER-  
ICA, INC.,

New York, N.Y., July 10, 1968.

Senator FRED HARRIS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: The Child Welfare League of America wishes to endorse the legislation introduced by Mr. Donald Fraser in the House—and we understand by you in the Senate—that would permit states to continue in effect the earnings test presently being applied under Title IV of the Social Security Act until such time as the states can place in effect the new earnings exemp-

tion provisions required by the Social Security Amendments of 1967.

Without such legislation, we only add one additional major discouragement to those receiving funds through the AFDC program. Failure to pass such an amendment will only result in further thousands of recipients being locked into a degrading welfare program.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH H. REID,  
Executive Director.

THE NATIONAL ASSEMBLY FOR SO-  
CIAL POLICY AND DEVELOPMENT,  
INC.,

New York, N.Y., July 11, 1968.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: We are familiar with the objectives that are being proposed by Congressman Donald M. Fraser with respect to earnings exemption for AFDC recipients. We believe that an important principle is embodied in the earnings exemption which benefits the recipients, the community and the nation.

It is our hope that appropriate action will be taken to prevent cessation of the earnings exemption until new legislation can take effect in the several States.

Respectfully yours,

C. F. McNEIL,  
Executive Director.

AMENDMENT NO. 1003

Mr. COOPER (for Mr. BAKER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. BAKER, to House bill 2767, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer an amortized deduction from gross income for assessments for depreciable property levied by soil or water conservation or drainage districts, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1004

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. HARRIS) proposed an amendment to House bill 2767, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 23, 1968, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3058) to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to revise the authorization of appropriations for administering the provisions of the act, and for other purposes.

#### NOTICE OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Senator MIKE MONRONEY, I wish to announce that public hearings have been scheduled on various contested postmaster nominations which have been pending before the committee since the first session of this 90th Congress. The hearing will be held next Friday morning at 10 a.m., September 27, in room 6202 of the New Senate Building.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of the nominations which will be considered, so those concerned will have notice.

There being no objection, the nomina-

tions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NOMINEE AND POST OFFICE

Harold F. Johnson, Belvidere, Illinois.  
Robert D. Yordy, Planagan, Illinois.  
David S. Miranda, Ashland, Kentucky.  
Edmond J. Michel, Marksville, Louisiana.  
Joseph V. Spreitzer, Allegan, Michigan.  
Arthur J. Flene, Alma, Missouri.  
Roy E. Boham, Bassett, Nebraska.  
Marvin R. Holz, Paxton, Nebraska.  
Tadeusz Leplanka, Franklin, New Hamp-  
shire.

Jean M. Hickman, Cedarville, New Jersey.  
Clair J. Nanno, Riverside, New Jersey.  
Jerome P. Meyer, Corfu, New York.  
Lowell E. Felder, Redwood, New York.  
Francis J. Foote, Valois, New York.  
Homer A. Crecellus, Bellevue, Ohio.  
Herbert W. Miller, Biglerville, Pennsyl-  
vania.

Edwin J. Caprioli, Canadensis, Pennsyl-  
vania.  
Michael Megaludis, Monroeville, Pennsyl-  
vania.

Bernard J. Brashears, New Oxford, Penn-  
sylvania.

#### HECKLERS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, we who watched television in order to see the events in Boston last Thursday, when the Vice President was confronted with hecklers and worse, have renewed admiration for the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. He showed no hesitation. He braved the opprobrium of the hecklers himself. And he made it certain where he stands, saying:

There is no room for seeking solutions by shouting and screaming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "HUMPHREY and KENNEDY," published in today's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HUMPHREY AND KENNEDY

Toward the end of the congressional campaign of 1966, when Senator Edward Kennedy had given more speeches around the country than he could remember, he observed that he thought the best speech of the campaign had been Hubert Humphrey's impassioned plea on behalf of Senator Paul Douglas's falling candidacy. To a remarkable degree, the youngest Kennedy has always been specially responsive to his liberal forebears in the Democratic Party, and he has felt an evident sense of continuity with them. All this was apparent again the other day in Boston when Senator Kennedy went out of his way to identify himself with the Vice President's troubled campaign and to lend him much-needed help.

Thursday marked Senator Kennedy's first experience of the 1968 presidential campaign since the murder of his brother, Robert. That event in itself would have provided a reason for the Senator's declining to participate, had he wished to do so. Moreover, though the differences between him and the Vice President on Vietnam are not nearly so large as is commonly supposed, the Senator might have chosen—as others have done—to invoke them as a reason for playing a lesser role in the Humphrey campaign. On the contrary, however, he went further than some of his advisers thought prudent—either politically or in terms of his own physical safety—to associate himself with the Vice President's candidacy, insisting after the squalid heckling had occurred that he wished