

in which many, many interesting and very educational facts and points and articles brought to the attention of some of us the need to inform and I don't think the intangible work of writing an article can fully be described in the total contribution that it has made in concrete terms. So I take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of many people who would not have a chance to acknowledge your work.

I want to thank you for your support of the garnishment provision of this bill. I am intensely interested in that although my State long ago, as early as 1875 by constitutional inhibition, prohibited garnishment of wages and services.

Why, may I ask you, does not the union movement nationally take a more militant and aggressive attitude toward the need for this legislation?

Would you be able to hazard a guess?

Mr. MARGOLIUS. I think they do. I think that perhaps tactically they felt it would be better just to get this much of the bill through at this time. I think that they are very concerned about the garnishee problem. They are concerned because workers get fired. And in a number of States bills have been introduced to bar firing of workers for garnishees; for example, Ohio, New Jersey, and other States. But only two States have managed to pass this. Hawaii recently passed a full ban for firing for garnishee, a law which was secured by the Hawaii State Federation of Labor. New York has a modified law in which a worker can't be fired if he has just one garnishee in 12 months.

Unfortunately, these laws don't work too well and I think I can criticize them because I myself proposed this way of trying to stop garnishee firings. I don't think it stops it because I understand from an assistant corporation counsel in New York City, Mr. Henry Stern, that small employers still don't want to bother with garnishees even if the law says they can't fire the employee. There are other ways to get rid of an employee. They don't want to bother with garnishees because of payroll problems.

So the only solution has to be to eliminate garnishments altogether. If it doesn't come now it will come 6 months or a year from now but in the meantime several more million people will be affected by it. Probably 5,000 to 6,000 people, as we sit here today, are getting hooked on plans which are based on the threat of a garnishment to make the final collection.

Now, Mrs. Sullivan asked before about deficiency payments and I have a well-documented case here, Mr. Williams. This is from the city of Chicago, a study made by Jerome Schur for John S. Boyle, chief judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County. They have a pretty rough problem there because they permit confession of judgment notes and they have 600 of these notes being filed a day. The lawyers put them through on an assembly line basis. The investigator found that very often they didn't even bother with the personal signature. The lawyer just rubberstamped the court notices as they put them through. Many of these are based on used-car contracts and used television sets. About 25 percent are based on clothing which is a pretty serious problem when you get down to where people are buying clothing on credit and being garnisheed for clothing purchases. In the case of used cars,