

money lenders but what they lose can often be made up from future earnings. The vast majority of those 65 or over depend on infrequent social security increases for improvement of their economic situation. Social Security increases of 7½ per cent in 1958 and 7 per cent in 1965 did not even keep up with the rise in living costs.

The National Council of Senior Citizens is campaigning for the 20 per cent over-all social security increase recommended by President Johnson but with full knowledge that an increase in this amount would be but a step toward a level of payments sufficient to assure elderly poor a modest but adequate standard of living.

The House Ways and Means Committee, which recently reported out a social security bill, refused to go along even with the modest increase asked by the President.

The National Council of Senior Citizens feels strongly that Congress and the nation owe older Americans, who helped make today's affluence possible, a great deal more than the inadequate social security package that has come out of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Members of the National Council are well aware of the requirements of the Vietnam War and the additional cost of needed domestic improvements, but they are saddened and angered at the spectacle of those who would play politics with human misery by using the Vietnam situation as an excuse to hold down needed social security benefits, Medicare and Medicaid improvements and to cripple or destroy the anti-poverty program and other much needed domestic programs.

The leaders of the Senior Citizens clubs affiliated with the NCSC are absolutely astounded at those lawmakers who have even gone so far as to refuse, with whoops of hilarity that will haunt them, a modest appropriation for control of rats that spread disease and inflict injury in our city slums.

We of the National Council would like to point out that the main opposition to truth-in-lending and other consumer protection legislation comes from those who obey the dictates of the business interests that insist they should decide the ethics of the marketplace regardless of the harm done the consumer.

The National Council of Senior Citizens is a non-partisan organization enjoying support of leading Senators and Congressmen of both major parties but we believe in calling a spade a spade.

We invite those Senators and Congressmen who have a sincere interest in economy and are not simply using this issue as a club to beat down all pro-public legislation, to consider the need for a strong Truth-in-Lending law, for here is an area that involves absolutely no expenditure of Federal funds other than the comparatively insignificant amounts that might be required for enforcement.

The National Council further points out that as a nation we may soon be called upon to pay more Federal taxes. By enacting a strong Truth-in-Lending measure and other needed consumer legislation, Congress could offset any tax increase that may be imposed on the taxpayer by helping him or her save by stretching their spending money.

We are happy to note that the Subcommittee Chairman's bill duplicates the coverage of the original Truth-in-Lending bill sponsored by former Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois for many years in the Senate and that it plugs the loopholes in the Proxmire Truth-in-Lending bill that recently passed the Senate.

The harmful effect of costly revolving credit and garnishment on wage earners is expressed in many letters on these subjects received by the National Council of Senior Citizens.

Here is a letter from an Illinois member on revolving credit:

"I'm glad the Senate passed the Truth-in-Lending bill but I was surprised to see there is nothing in it on store credit. I used to charge what I bought until I found out that I was paying 24 per cent a year on what I owed. That's four times the amount of interest you pay on an ordinary bank loan. Not many people realize what they cost and that explains why there are so many charge accounts. Here's hoping, when the Truth-in-Lending bill is finally passed it will have something in it to control the interest people pay for store credit."

A California member writes on garnishment:

"I see where the Senate has passed a Truth-in-Lending bill. That's good. But, from what I understand it has nothing in it about getting garnisheed. I'm retired, but, when I was younger, I had my pay garnisheed just for getting a little behind on one installment payment. I nearly lost my job. Now, my son, who has a wife and five kids, is being garnisheed, and it's murder. His take-home pay is cut