

precedent. One realizes quickly that 35 years of service have not dulled his enthusiasm for his work or his pride in the responsibilities assigned him.

Every Member of the House, I am sure, is secure in the recognition that Mr. Deschler's counsel is available to all, and is given conscientiously, impartially and wisely.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, it is truly gratifying to praise the accomplishments of a selfless man. It doubles that satisfaction when the man who deserves and gets that praise is my friend. I add my voice to that of many others when I give just recognition to the more than 35 years of understanding service rendered to the House of Representatives by Lew Deschler.

Before I speak for anyone else, I first speak for myself. When I was new here, Lew personally helped me to avoid legislative mistakes. He increases my efficiency as the Representative of the people who send me here.

What Lew Deschler does for me, he does for every Member of the House who seeks his counsel.

This same patience and sagacity lubricate the parliamentary wheels of the full legislative body. As the years accumulate, as the influence of legislation enacted here increases around the world, as emerging nations struggle to form parliamentary systems of their own and emulate one already functioning, who but the probing historians of future years can fathom the impact this one quiet, knowledgeable man may have had on the history of his fellow men?

To paraphrase a verse from a New Testament parable, "Well done, thou good and faithful public servant."

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, it is a real privilege to join in this well-deserved tribute to our distinguished Parliamentarian, Lewis Deschler. His vast knowledge, unbelievable memory and alert mind have won him top recognition in his chosen field and every Member of the House will attest to the fair and impartial manner in which this outstanding capability is exercised. His ready smile is sincere and warm. His huge frame commands attention upon first meeting, but association soon demonstrates he possesses a heart and spirit of equal size.

Lew Deschler has seen history made during some of the most stirring periods of our Nation. His role, though great, has been little known, largely due to his quiet and unassuming manner, but those who have glimpsed him in action know how effective are his rapid fire responses as he counsels and advises. The tribute of the Speaker gives special validity to this attribute. It is my hope that Lew Deschler will continue to discharge his important service to our Nation for years to come. We congratulate him on his birthday and extend every good wish.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in all the words they have uttered in praise of our able Parliamentarian Lew Deschler. Lew was on the job when I came to Congress almost a quarter of a century ago, and I learned quickly to seek his counsel and advice, all of which proved to be good. Lew Deschler possesses that sixth sense, to see

the right, and to live right during every minute of the day.

I could go on for hours, Mr. Speaker, expounding my high esteem of this great and good man, but it is simply not possible to gild the rose, neither is it possible to say anything that would add to the love and high esteem that all have who know well, my friend, Lew Deschler.

I only wish for you, Lew, many more years of service to the Members of Congress and to our beloved Nation, which you have served so well for over one-third of a century.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a legislative body like the House of Representatives with 435 Representatives of such widely different areas and interests, the daily functioning of the House in a smooth and orderly way is a continuing tribute to its Parliamentarian.

However, on the occasion of Lew Deschler's 35th anniversary in that post, it is fitting to pay special and explicit tribute to the service he has rendered to the House and, with exemplary impartiality, to all its Members. The rules of the House are both numerous and technical. There are more than 11,000 rulings that constitute precedents for the conduct of House business. In these circumstances, the sureness with which Lew Deschler makes his judgments, represents ample evidence of his immense accumulation of knowledge and of his dedication to his work.

I should like to join many of my colleagues in congratulating our distinguished Parliamentarian on his anniversary and his birthday. I hope his highly valued service will continue so that I shall have many occasions in the future on which to renew these congratulations.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of well-deserved tribute paid to one of the best friends the House of Representatives has, Lewis Deschler. For more than 35 years he has displayed his genius as a parliamentarian. His guidance is accompanied always by wit and courtesy, and his warm good nature has endeared him to us all. Without subtracting from Lew Deschler's own outstanding talents, and with perhaps more truth than modesty, I would like to point out that he exemplifies the sort of character we from Ohio think of as typically Buckeye. In addition to having had the original good sense of being born in our great State, Lew comes from Chillicothe. As a freshman that won my heart immediately, since the Minshalls were politically active in Chillicothe for almost a century. All in all, it is hard to fault Lew Deschler, a man of enormous talent, graciousness, and dedication. Ohio is proud of him and the U.S. House of Representatives is deeply in his debt.

Mr. ALBERT. Now, Mr. Speaker, to conclude these remarks I would like leave of the House to read a letter:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 2, 1963.

HON. LEWIS DESCHLER,
Parliamentarian, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LEW: I have learned from the Speaker that on Monday you will be honored by the Members of the House of Representatives for your long record of service to the Con-

gress. In your parliamentary capacity over 36 years, you have played a unique and vital role in the life and work of the House of Representatives. I had an opportunity myself as a Member of Congress to know of your wise and effective influence.

With warmest best wishes.

Cordially,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the resolution was unanimously agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced the Truth-in-Lending Act. This bill, which is sponsored in the other body by Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and other Senators, requires simply that there shall be a full written disclosure of charges for credit when credit is extended to consumers.

Installment buying is a major part of our economy. Since the end of World War II consumer credit has increased more than eightfold from less than \$6 billion in 1945 to more than \$55 billion. Although credit buying is a large segment of consumer buying, it is often impossible for the consumer to know exactly the price he pays for an item bought on credit.

Dr. Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co., in testimony during the 1961 Senate hearings on automobile financing stated:

The variety and complexity of finance and insurance arrangements and the charges for them are such as almost to defy comprehension. It is impossible for the average buyer to appraise the rates for the finance and insurance services offered, as compared with alternatives available elsewhere.

In an article written by the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO it is pointed out:

Easy credit and the ruthless imposition of consumer debt upon the unwary have led to frightful abuse and sometimes to tragic consequence. Because of the ignorance regarding the true costs of money, lives

have been needlessly scarred or even wrecked. Unless excesses are halted, the entire American business community may be discredited.

The truth-in-lending proposal spells out the disclosures, including the total amount to be financed, the amounts to be credited as downpayment and/or trade-in, which are to be made by merchants and lenders when they extend consumer credit. The information will enable the consumer to know how much is added by credit to the cost of things he buys. This legislation will aid almost every American. Economists estimate that almost every family uses some form of consumer credit at some time, and on the whole Americans spend 13 cents out of every dollar they earn for repayment of installment loans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this legislation will be acted upon favorably during this session.

TAX PROGRAM

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Members of the House informed on the facts in connection with the President's tax proposals upon which the Ways and Means Committee is presently holding hearings, I would like to include as a part of my remarks the testimony of one of the best informed witnesses to appear on the tax question. He is Mr. Roswell Magill, of New York City, and the statement he presented to the committee this morning will appear at the end of these remarks.

I would like to emphasize that President Kennedy's tax program is contradictory to its announced objectives in four basic ways. First, the investment capital incentive is penalized because consumer purchasing power is overly stressed; second, the structural reforms defeat rate cuts; third, the timing is bad, there being no immediate stimulus as intended; and, fourth, the budget is further imbalanced through lack of expenditure control.

The testimony contained a six-point constructive tax recommendation with which I am in agreement:

First. Substantial rate reductions should be made in the individual income tax. It would be a good idea to spread these over several years.

Second. To moderate the revenue loss in individual rate reductions, the opening rate on the new scale might be set at 16 percent instead of 14 percent. This one step would eliminate the need for revenue-raising reforms and keep the total tax reduction within the level set by the President.

Third. The corporation tax rate needs to be lowered quickly, if the reduction is to have the desired effects. The simplest way to do this is to permit the Korean rate increase on corporations from 47 to 52 percent to expire on June 30, as scheduled.

Fourth. Structural reforms need not be undertaken in this bill but should be treated in a separate measure. In any case, only true reforms that would improve the structure should be considered, and not revenue-raising measures such as the reduction of allowable deductions by 5 percent of gross income, the repeal of the dividend credit, and the proposed new levy on unrealized capital gains, levied at death or transfer by gift.

Fifth. For the long run, we should work toward a top rate on the individual income tax of 50 percent. Similarly, for the long run, a much lower level of taxation of business would be desirable. To make this possible, the Congress should consider alternate business or transaction taxes in the future to provide substitute revenues and relieve the burden of taxation on profits.

Sixth. Finally, Federal expenditures should be rigorously held at least to the fiscal 1963 level, preferably to a lower level so as to insure that the budget will actually reach a balance in the near future when the good effects of the tax reduction program begin to appear.

Finally, a basic fallacy in the President's proposal, the longstanding policy on percentage depletion, is not reexamined in terms of whether the percentage allowance is too large or whether the policy is good. Admittedly the percentage depletion provisions have been effective in achieving their objectives over the past 35 years. Nevertheless, the proposal is that the basis for calculating depletion be changed in a way that would restrict severely the very activities that percentage depletion is designed to encourage.

In this constructive criticism of the President's tax proposals and the positive program offered, we have the basis for the discussion of a workable tax cut and reform program if the administration sincerely wants tax cuts and reform instead of just a political issue.

STATEMENT TO THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BY ROSWELL MACILL, MARCH 4, 1963

The President's special message to Congress on January 24, 1963, is specifically addressed to two topics—tax reduction and tax reform. The recommendations in the message all have to do with the income tax. In general, the tax reform proposals are devised to recoup some of the revenue that would be lost if the tax reduction proposals were adopted.

The message was preceded by a number of speeches by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, emphasizing that the current Federal tax structure impedes economic growth. The prescription to cure that malady was said to be a substantial reduction in taxes on business and on the upper income brackets to stimulate investment incentives and unleash venture capital. The income tax was described as a drag on the economy.

These statements, with one notable exception, repeated in substance what the business community has said for years. The business community has emphasized that the weakness of the Federal tax structure lies primarily in the fact that the U.S. Treasury is almost wholly dependent for tax revenue upon the income tax; that a reduction in the steeply progressive income-tax rates, coupled with the substitution of another form of tax to produce some of the revenue now pro-

duced by the income tax would be highly desirable.

The reforms proposed in the special message are all income tax reforms. In general, they are devised to produce additional revenue from taxpayers in the middle and upper brackets. The Secretary of the Treasury has urged in substance that the two parts of the program should be adopted together; that the price of tax reduction is the adoption of the reforms, that if the reforms, or some of them, are not adopted, then the tax reduction program must be modified, at the expense of taxpayers in the middle and the upper brackets.

1. Will the administration's tax proposals achieve these objectives? It is unfortunate, however, that the tax package proposed by the administration is not well designed in the judgment of many of us to accomplish the objectives of removing barriers to business growth. The tax reduction and tax reform proposals appear to be contradictory. They contain conflicts both in purposes and ideas which tend to neutralize each other and thus to cancel out the good effects we seek. May I refer specifically to four of these conflicts.

2. The first contradiction is in the economic thrust of the entire program. The tax reductions proposed by themselves would be a constructive reform in our present income tax. The new scale of rates suggested for individuals—14 to 65 percent—represents an across-the-board reduction ranging from about 28 percent at the lowest income bracket to something over 20 percent at the highest and averaging about 23 percent. Such a reduction in rates has long been advocated by all who believe a lower tax burden is imperative.

Moreover, this proposal would be an excellent first step toward a long-range permanent income tax scale. Ultimately the top rate of the individual income tax should be brought down to 50 percent on the principle that a taxpayer's interest in earning a dollar of additional income should at least equal the Government's.

The administration has coupled these rate reductions with a series of revenue-raising measures labeled "tax reforms" which completely transform the proposed tax cuts. The tax liabilities are reduced by 40 percent at the lowest bracket, by 29 percent in the \$3,000-to-\$5,000 income bracket, and by only 9 percent in the \$50,000-and-over bracket. Minimizing tax reductions in the middle and upper income brackets while concentrating the tax relief in the lowest brackets, is justified by the proponents on the theory that what the economy needs is more consumer spending. While the President and Dr. Heller recognize the need to expand investment opportunities, the tax relief proposed is overbalanced in favor of more consumption spending.

Similarly, the proposal to lower the corporation tax is a first step in what I believe should be a most important long-range goal, namely to lower the level of business taxation. Profit margins would be increased and more earnings freed for business expansion. Lowering the corporate tax rate would be a fundamental step toward stimulating larger capital investment and furthering job opportunities and economic growth. But of the total \$10 billion reduction in tax liabilities in these proposals, less than one-fourth applies to corporations.

Moreover, the proposed rate reduction is coupled with a proposal to speed up corporation tax payments and 5 years will elapse before corporation tax payments are lower by the full extent of the 5 percentage point tax cut. The 5-percent cut in the corporate rate would still leave the corporation tax substantially higher than in the pre-Korean war years.

Less than a year ago, Secretary Dillon, arguing for the investment credit before the