

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Secretary, I hope you will use whatever influence you have with the Attorney General, the Office of Economic Opportunity, and your own Department, which is involved in this investigation, to complete this study as soon as possible because I sincerely feel that garnishment is one of the really important problems facing the American worker in this country.

Secretary WIRTZ. I am grateful for this comment.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Wylie?

Mr. WYLIE. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, Mrs. Peterson, I, too, express my appreciation for your taking the time to appear here this morning. I, too, think the hearings have been most educational, at least for me and part of the reason is that we have been able to hear witnesses of your high caliber. Thank you.

Apparently the area of major controversy, maybe the only area of controversy is in the area of revolving credit.

Have you formed an opinion regarding the revolving credit provisions of the two bills? One bill provides that an effort should be made to relate revolving credit to an annual rate and the other bill provides for disclosure of the monthly rate of interest.

Secretary WIRTZ. I know this is a difficulty. It was debated out on the Senate side quite fully with the conclusion reached contrary to the original bill we had supported. We had supported the original bill which did cover revolving credit and it would be a mistake to say that we have changed our mind about it. In my judgment, and in our collective judgment, it should be included.

My answer is, on the merits, I think there ought to be a requirement of truth in lending which extends to the revolving credit situation.

On the practical question of time, without seeming to be presumptuous or invading your province, my reaction would be that we have to wait on that.

Mr. WYLIE. I don't mean to be presumptuous on that, either, but there is some objection to S. 5 on the basis of what the revolving credit people have to disclose. It may be an advantage to them if the disclosure is based on a monthly rate of, say, $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent, whereas the installment seller disclosure, say, 18 percent on annual basis, and disclosing interest may not be too meaningful to the person going in to make purchases, anyway.

I have two questions then. One, would it be more meaningful if we said that everybody, every seller, had to disclose their interest charges on a monthly basis?

Secretary WIRTZ. A monthly basis? It would be better on the annual basis straight across the board. I think they all ought to be on the same basis, Mr. Wylie.

Mr. WYLIE. That was my point. Maybe they should all be on the same basis so they could actually relate the charges. If you could do it so all interest charges could be on the same basis, an annual basis would be your preference?

Secretary WIRTZ. That is correct. We have grown up in terms of an annual figure. The only reason they say $1\frac{1}{2}$ percent is that somebody is going to relate it with the low 4 percent they grew up on, and I think they have a point.

Mr. WYLIE. That may be true.