have developed I have learned a lot more about it than I thought I knew. I have been in the practice of law and have used it upon occasion when I was practicing law.

However, we have a provision in our State of Georgia about the amount that could be taken under garnishment proceedings from a wage earner. But there are some things that have been pointed out and you have pointed out some of them—the fact that it goes just beyond the fact that you are going to garnishee a man's wages. You might also prevent some wife from collecting alimony payments that are due to her.

Secretary WIRTZ. Or child care.

Mr. STEPHENS. And also a very important item: The Federal Government uses the garnishment procedure very much. In a complete review of garnishment it is true that the position of the Federal Government also may cause people to be discharged because of garnishment.

I have a tendency to feel that this committee, not composed of lawyers and people recognized in that field, might better wait and let the Judiciary Committee go into extensive hearings. They have more experts than we have on our committee in the field of judicial processes.

I would like to ask you to develop with me further if you would the differences between the original provision of S. 5 that we now have before us that would be preferable to what we have.

Secretary WIRTZ. My statement at the top of page 3 lists the three principal differences. As S. 5 started out it did cover the open end or revolving credit. It did cover first mortgages on homes and it covered transactions where the finance charges went down below the $10. The three changes made in the Senate were with respect to those points. Those are the ones that I have particularly in mind. I would add another one, that wasn't in the original S. 5, on which there has been considerable discussion. I think there is a considerable case to be made for extending these truth-in-lending requirements to advertising of credit.

That was not in the original S. 5, so I mentioned that in a separate category. It is in 11601 as are the other matters listed on page 4.

In specific answer to your question, it is the three points that were in the original S. 5 and were dropped out.

Mr. STEPHENS. Thank you very much.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Fino?

Mr. FINO. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, in view of the fact that you did not read your statement, I don't know whether you did cover in your statement two other points that have been the subject of some testimony and controversy before this subcommittee.

One of them is the garnishment which you have elaborated on. The other one is the standby controls on consumer credit. Some of the Government witnesses have testified.

Do you have the same position?

Secretary WIRTZ. I know there has been that discussion. I am afraid I can't answer on that. I have no sensitivity to testifying, I just don't know enough about it to know what standby controls might be necessary here.