not believe in people living together in peace. We must strive to get rid of the black eye that we the community has sustained."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 24, 1967]

OCEANSIDE LEADERS CRY IN VAIN TO Perdue Negroes: ANY Attempt At Assembly He Will Move Because of Tenure—CLERGY SEEKS SUPPORT OF LONG ISLAND

(On Air Sulpucka)

OCEANSIDE, LONG ISLAND, November 24—

Community leaders in an interview said that the community had already been told that he was still determined to move because of the bomb attack and did not want to have a bomb curtailed through his dining room window.

The homeowner, Edward Revander, said that he was not interested in the fact, being told by the community that but that he was still determined to move because of the bomb attack and did not have a bomb curtailed through his dining room window.

Mr. Revander, who is a real estate broker in Queens, recalled that he had received a Wednesday signed by the "White Knights of Oceanside" telling him to leave the community.

FOR THE WHITE PEOPLE

Mrs. Revander read part of the letter which said: "You got the message. Leave Oceanside. We don't want you here." She added: "We're a fighting people. We have had to fight for the lives of our two children, and for educational, 3 years old."

We're a fighting people. We have had to fight for the lives of our two children, and for educational, 3 years old.

On Monday, more than 75 residents crowded into the Methodist church and pledged $50 toward a reward for information leading to the capture of the bomb throwers.

Mr. Caliandro said that a petition was circulated throughout 30,000 of the community that they would not sell their home.

Statement by Consumer Affairs Subcommittee Chairman Leonor K. Sullivan on Actions by Banking and Currency Committee on H.R. 11601, Consumer Credit Protection Act ("Truth in Lending")

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN OF MISSOURI IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 28, 1967

MRS. SULLIVAN, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning, by a vote of 30 to 1, approved with some modifications the bill on consumer credit, H.R. 1186, which I introduced on July 20, 1967, on behalf of myself and a bipartisan group of Members of my Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, and which was introduced as H.R. 11806 by the gentleman from New York (Mr. Mitchell), acting member of the parent committee, with numerous cosponsors.

I am, of course, pleased that the committee completed action on the Consumer Credit Protection Act, which includes truth-in-lending provisions as its title I. This is an issue to which I have devoted many years of effort, and I am gratified that, for the first time since Senator Douglas proposed such legislation 7 years ago, the House committee has approved a bill covering most of the things Senator Douglas originally called for.

H.R. 11601, as approved by the House Committee this morning, has many very good, very strong points. It goes substantially beyond S. 5, the Proxmire bill passed by the Senate July 11.

GOES BEYOND SENSATE-PASSED TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

For instance, it applies to the advertising of credit; it sets up administrative enforcement machinery so that the individual consumer does not have to institute his own lawsuit in order to obtain redress; it applies to first mortgages, which were exempt from the Senate bill; where credit life insurance is mandatory, it requires inclusion of this cost as part of the "finance charge" on which the percentage rate must be figured; administrative enforcement is provided in the collection of consumer debts along the lines of the New York State law on this subject; and it creates a National Commission on Consumer Finance to investigate all aspects of consumer credit and make recommendations for further legislation.

None of these things was included in S. 5. Furthermore, we made the legislation effective 9 months from the date of enactment rather than July 1, 1969—the effective date in S. 5—and omitted a provision in the Senate bill permitting firms which extend credit to use a figure representing "dollars per hundred per year on the average unpaid balance" instead of annual percentage rate. Under H.R. 11601 the percentage rate would be required to be stated on and after the effective date.

On the other hand, the consumer lost on two very important votes in the committee—on the first Wednesday when the language of the Senate bill was adopted exempting department store and similar types of revolving credit from annual rate disclosure requirements, permitting such creditors to state only a monthly rate. This morning the Senate language was adopted to exempt from annual rate disclosure requirements all transactions in which the credit cost is less than $10, meaning loans or purchases up to about $110.

FLOOR FIGHT SET ON LOOPHOLE AMENDMENTS

I serve notice now that I have every intention of fighting both of these weakening amendments when the bill comes up in the House, but I am going to need much greater support from the administration, consumers, and from independent businessmen than I have had until now. Nor shall I be offering installment rather than computerized revolving credit which will be adversely affected by the Sears-Ward's-Penney amendment which gives the big chain the right to charge the annual percentage rate on their revolving credit costs.

Thus, the bill, as it now stands, calls for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the guilty persons.

The committee is asking that anyone with information about this guilty person should not remain guilty of silence. They owe a duty to their community, to their State, and to their Nation to come forward.

I have been in touch with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the Nassau County police commissioner, with the Nassau County district attorney, and with other State and local officials. Information can be made available to any of these persons as well as to any priest, minister or rabbi.

Cry for Justice Heard

On Thursday evening, December 7, 1967, a public meeting will be held at the Walter S. Boardman School in Oceanside, when the residents of Oceanside and neighboring communities will be present to express their revulsion of this shooting incident.

The committee of sponsors for this public meeting consists of Congressman HERBERT TENZER, honorary chairman, Mr. Arthur Izer, trusted, Oceanside Board of Education, ad hoc chairman, Rabbi Phill- more Berger, Temple Ahavah, Father John Joe, Holy Name's Roman Catholic Church, Rabbi Benjamin Blech, Young Israel of Oceanside, Reverend Ernest Caliandro, pastor, First Methodist Church, and more than 50 individuals and civic, religious, and educational organizations in Oceanside and neighboring villages.

Citizens who take pride in their community and who are anxious to see that justice is done will so indicate by their presence.

Mr. Speaker, the conscience of Oceanside will express itself against this act of hatred, and it will answer the cry for justice from the Revanders.

R E W A R D O F F E R E D

The citizens of Oceanside have established a reward fund. It is their hope that one of the co-conspirators or someone with knowledge will come forward with information leading to the arrest and conviction of the guilty persons.

I commend the move on the theory that just as "there is no honor amongst thieves," we have honor among co-conspirators. If we make it worthwhile, someone will talk.

I am adding $500 of my personal funds to the reward fund which I hope will soon reach the sum of $10,000. It is anticipated that many individuals and organizations in the community will support the fund.

The reward fund will be used exclusively for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the guilty persons.

The committee is asking that anyone with information about the guilty person should not remain guilty of silence. They owe a duty to their community, to their State, and to their Nation to come forward. I have been in touch with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, with the Nassau County police commissioner, with the Nassau County district attorney, and with other State and local officials. Information can be made available to any of these persons as well as to any priest, minister or rabbi.
for truth in lending—the whole truth—for furniture stores, music stores, hardware stores, appliance dealers, small loan firms, and other lenders or merchants offering installment credit; however, it is a half-truth—or rather one-twelfth-truth—bill for Sears, Ward's, Penney's, and other big retailers or credit revolvers.

Furthermore, every credit firm which can arrange to do so will do its best to crawl in under the revolving credit exemption or under the $10 exemption on as many transactions as possible, so while it is a one-twelfth-truth-in-lending bill on open-end credit, it is a no-truth bill on any credit transaction costing less than $110.

CONSUMERS MUST GET INTO THIS BATTLE

So while I am pleased that we have concluded action and approved what was in many respects is a good, strong bill compared to the Senate bill, I am certainly not expressing any great jubilation until we get a bill through the House which requires that all interest rates and credit costs in consumer credit transactions be set forth in a completely straightforward and undisguised manner, and that means annual rate disclosure across the board, and applying equally to all who give credit.

When consumers pay their monthly bills next week, or next month, I hope they will pay particular attention to the credit charges for which they are given little or no explanation, and then wish me luck on this fight. It is their fight. They can help in this fight by writing to their own Members of Congress for a bill that will require the same disclosure for all. It is expected this bill will come to the House floor for vote late in January.

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

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

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

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, of immense moment these days is the background debate on whether to escalate in Vietnam or not. Suggestions have been heard that the departure of the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, is related to this debate about escalation. Further, we have the proposal by General Eisenhower for an end run around the DMZ to enter North Vietnam and battle the main forces there.

This issue is the most critical one in our present time because it can involve us more deeply in what might become a world war.

We should have no doubt that the response to an end run around the DMZ will be equal to the dirt. If North Vietnam is unable to provide the forces, there