

is certainly their business. But I hate to see them spend more than they have to, simply because they don't understand. I am sure a lady would rather have a hat.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Thank you. I have taken up too much time.

Mrs. Dwyer?

Mrs. DWYER. I again want to congratulate Miss Furness for her very fine statement and for accepting this very responsible position in Government. I am always happy to see people like this join our Government agencies.

I would like to ask you one question, Miss Furness. Judging from what you have said, can you be sure if it is Westinghouse?

Miss FURNESS. Mrs. Dwyer, I always was sure if it was Westinghouse and I would like to feel that if I bought a Westinghouse product on credit today I could be sure of what I was paying for it on credit.

Mrs. DWYER. I asked you that because of the advertising provisions in the Sullivan bill.

Now, Mr. Barr, as I said in my opening statement, judging from the unanimous action in the Senate in the pending bill before this committee, it seems apparent that we will enact consumer protection legislation during this Congress. The strongest differences of opinion, however, surround the different treatments of the revolving credit accounts. Judging from the 90 to 0 vote in the Senate, any substantial change in the House will involve revolving credit accounts and will run into difficulty in Congress. But let me ask you this, first. Is the administration satisfied that annualizing the typical $11\frac{1}{2}$ percent per month charge to 18 percent in monthly bills, accurately would reflect the consumer is being charged when such a company claimed that their typical revolving charge account customer pays far less than 18 percent? With regard to those department stores who work from the adjusted balance system, is it not a fact that converting $11\frac{1}{2}$ percent a month to 18 percent results in a substantial distortion by the so-called 30-day free period?

Mr. BARR. Mrs. Dwyer, some way or other the retailers and the U.S. Treasury are just not communicating. We frankly don't understand each other in this area. You will hear a lot of disagreement here. I might add in direct answer to your question, that the U.S. Treasury and the administration are confident that annualizing these monthly rates is the correct way to do it. You will find no such agreement among the retailers, I might add. Here is the way we argue our case, Mrs. Dwyer.

You go to the store and you buy \$100 worth of pants and shirts and shoes and things like that for the children. If you pay that bill in 30 days there is no credit charge. But after the 30-day period runs out there is a $11\frac{1}{2}$ percent per month charge that is levied on that credit. Now, the difference between the Treasury and the retailer is this: The retailers obviously assume that the charge for the credit starts the day of the transaction. If we assume that, you went in there and bought on July 1 this \$100 worth of merchandise and there is no credit charge until July 31, we say, all right, there is no credit charge. But then, starting on August 1 there is a $11\frac{1}{2}$ -percent charge that is added to that basic \$100 balance. We say that is where the credit transaction starts, not on July 1, but on August 1, and if you just make that little assumption you come out at 18 percent. We make that assumption, the retail-