

Studies have shown that they suffer most cruelly from lack of consumer protection and lack of buyer know-how. I consider this the most urgent challenge in the field of consumer information and education.

We must deal with the fact that today 34 million Americans—7 million families—must try to stretch poverty-level incomes to meet living costs. Studies show that these people are plagued by consumer problems unknown to the affluent majority.

They are unable to shop effectively for bargains or to buy in economical quantities.

They are often victimized by excessive costs of credit and merchandise.

They are subjected to countless fraudulent and deceptive marketing and financing practices.

Most of these problems are symptoms of the basic maladies which we are attacking in the war on poverty. Programs of consumer information and protection cannot cure them—but such programs can lessen their impact.

The Office of Economic Opportunity has already made 56 grants totaling almost \$3 million, to support consumer education and related programs throughout the country. In the future, this Office will become a clearinghouse for distribution of educational materials to the poor. It will be a powerful source of incentive and support to the poor in their efforts to achieve fairplay in the marketplace.

I pledge the all-out effort of the Federal Government to help our poorest citizens to spend their limited funds more efficiently as we work to enhance their incomes.

Credit is a particular problem for the poor. Often it is available only at high interest rates, and its overextension can lead to the garnishment of wages and the loss of jobs. The situation is particularly severe because the poor are susceptible to emergencies that eliminate any limited financial reserves they may have.

Cooperative sources of low-cost credit, such as credit unions, combined with sound and impartial debt and financial counseling, and with legal services, can be of great benefit to the poor.

I am directing the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity and my Committee on Consumer Interests to intensify their efforts to encourage the development of such services in community action programs.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE

The measures I have recommended—truth in packaging, truth in lending, and the others—will help protect the consumer in the marketplace.

But beyond this there lies an even more important concern—that the consumer continue to have a dollar of stable purchasing power. Even the wisest consumer laws will not help the American public if their hard-earned dollars and savings are eroded by inflation.

The rewards and challenges of prosperity are central to the consumer's in-

terest today. For the past 5 years, the American consumer has participated in and contributed to an unparalleled and uninterrupted economic advance.

This has been the most inflation-free expansion in the history of our Nation. Apart from the improvements in quality and the benefits of new goods, the upward drift in prices has been only one-fourth as rapid as the growth in the real income of consumers. The healthy growth of consumer income has been built on—

Rapid technical advances by business; Productivity gains from the greater skill and diligence of labor;

Cooperation among labor, management, and Government;

Prudent fiscal policies; The careful efforts of consumers to get the most for their money.

The success of our efforts to bring full prosperity to the American economy has sharpened the challenge of maintaining price stability.

We are determined to have the benefits of both full employment and price stability—not one at the expense of the other.

That environment of stability is strengthened whenever responsible action is taken on prices and wages.

It is strengthened when we support a pay bill for Federal workers consistent with the administration's wage-price guideposts.

It is strengthened when businessmen lower prices to share the benefits of lower costs and rapid productivity gains.

It is strengthened when unions bargaining for wage increases stay within the bounds of productivity gains, as they did in many industries last year.

On many occasions, I have asked management and labor to make their price and wage decisions with full regard to the interest of the entire Nation in price and cost stability. I renew that request today.

The consumer's interest is broad in scope. So are the effects required to promote and protect that interest. The recommendations I have made will require action on many fronts by many groups.

The Congress holds the key to historic achievements in areas of consumer information and safety. This administration will marshal its forces to promote consumer welfare in close cooperation with the States and local governments.

Yet the basic job of furthering the consumer cause lies in the hands of private citizens—the consumers themselves. With the full cooperation of all, we can look ahead toward an ever-rising standard of living for American consumers.

Together, we can achieve a free marketplace where better goods can be bought, where real incomes continue to increase, and where the dollar's purchasing power remains firm and stable.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 21, 1966.

The SPEAKER. The message is referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mrs. SULLIVAN. 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 gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed pleased to know of the continued strong support of President Johnson for the kind of consumer legislation which I have been seeking to have enacted into law. His message today on consumer interests is an excellent presentation of the issues which confront us as consumers, and I congratulate the President and his Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, the Honorable Esther Peterson, who is also Assistant Secretary of Labor, for their dedication and efforts devoted to this cause.

The truth-in-lending bill, pioneered by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, would give the consumer facts on which to base credit decisions. Credit is an essential tool of our economy today; no one wants to interfere with legitimate credit activities. But the consumer deserves to know the facts. I have been proud to sponsor the Douglas bill in the House as chairman of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NEED FOR COMPREHENSIVE LEGISLATION ON FOODS, DRUGS, AND COSMETICS

Mr. Speaker, I particularly appreciate the strong position taken by the President on necessary reforms in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. I have sponsored safe cosmetic legislation for 14 years, and, for the past 5 years, have incorporated such a provision in my own omnibus bill, H.R. 1235, which covers all of the many loopholes which still exist in the 1938 act. The President's message clearly points up the need for such improvements.

As one who has devoted so many years to consumer causes in the Congress, I am proud of what has been achieved so far, but deeply concerned over the gaps which still remain in our laws. That is why, 5 years ago, on the opening day of the 87th Congress, I introduced H.R. 1235 as an omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

Nearly all of the proposals made by President Johnson in his consumer message today for improvement or strengthening of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act are contained in H.R. 1235, so I am hopeful that we can finally have action on this broad-gaged legislation. I hope that, in keeping with the President's instructions to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare "to begin a thorough analysis of the legislative authority now available and to recommend new steps that may be needed to close the gaps in the laws dealing with cosmetics and medical devices," the HEW will now find that H.R. 1235 either meets its requirements or can easily be amended to carry out administration policies.

INTEREST RATES RISING ALARMINGLY—SHOULD BE REVEALED

The President's message on consumer interests reaffirms the support President Johnson has personally and consistently given to consumer interests and the dedicated efforts made by Mrs. Peterson to coordinate and give guidance to the multitude of activities carried on by Government agencies which are intended to help consumers.

With interest rates rising so alarmingly, as has been pointed out many times by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, who has dramatized for us what this means in terms of lowered consumer purchasing power and higher Federal debt service, it is more important than ever for the consumer to know what credit actually costs him.

WHAT WOULD TRUTH IN LENDING DO?

The truth-in-lending bill would require that all lenders and all merchants, selling on credit, fully disclose the finance charges to the borrower or buyer before the sale is completed or the contract is signed.

Under present trade practices, the consumer is often not told what his use of credit will cost, either in terms of the dollars-and-cents charge or in terms of the annual percentage rate. Lenders often quote deceptively low interest rates to consumers. That is to make them believe they are paying less for credit than they actually are paying.

The consumer is being gouged, bilked, fleeced—pick your own word for it—and the people who are doing it to him do not want him to know how badly they are actually skinning him.

Now let me tell you, with a few examples, how truth in lending would work. Suppose you were to borrow \$1,800 to buy a car. Under present practice you might be told you would have to pay \$59.22 a month for 36 months, including "6-percent interest."

Under truth in lending: You would be told an investigation fee would be \$8, interest would be \$324, making a total finance charge of \$332, or an 11.3 percent annual rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On a TV set, say you borrow \$180 to finance it. You might be told you would pay \$11.30 a month for 18 months, including "carrying charges."

Under truth in lending: You also would be told you would pay \$23.40 interest, or a 15.8 annual percentage rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On a house, say you borrow \$15,000 at 6 percent for 25 years. You might be told you would pay \$96.65 a month for 25 years, including principal and interest.

Under truth in lending: You would be told you would pay \$14,025 interest over the life of the loan, or a 6-percent annual rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On department store revolving credit, say you charge \$700 worth of purchases. You might be told that you would pay a small service charge for each month that you owed money to the store.

Under truth in lending: You would be told that the store's finance charges were at the rate of 18 percent per year and you would receive a monthly statement showing the dollars-and-cents costs for credit during the previous month.

Truth in lending would not in any way control the terms or costs of credit use. It would merely require that the borrower or buyer be fully informed about the finance charges so that he could make an intelligent choice about where to borrow money, whether to pay cash or buy on credit, and, if on credit, where to do so.

LEGISLATION ON COSMETICS

In 1938, cosmetics came under Federal supervision in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. This legislation was enacted only after numerous women had been blinded by unsafe eye preparations. However, several loopholes still exist:

The burden of proof, for example, is still on the Government in the law's sections relating to cosmetics. There is no requirement that cosmetic manufacturers must pretest their products for safety. Thus, the consumer can become an unknowing guinea pig on a new cosmetic item. When, and only when, enough consumers get hurt—burned, scalped, disfigured, scarred, or infected—from a new cosmetic, can the Government move in and remove the product from the market. We have had several tragic examples in cosmetics to illustrate the inadequacies of this law: Several years ago, it was discovered that some false fingernails when removed would also remove the user's real nails. Also, several hair dyes have made women bald or nearly bald.

The only significant improvement made in the cosmetic section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act came in the law on color additives enacted in 1960. This law related to the coloring matter used in foods, drugs, and cosmetics. Under this act, a color additive must be proven safe in the manner used before incorporation into a cosmetic.

But outside the coloring matter, no other ingredients of cosmetics have to be pretested for safety or subjected to any preclearance by the Government before use.

The burden of proof that a cosmetic is unsafe or contains unsafe ingredients is required before the Government can act, and this standard of proof is quite difficult: Proof must be beyond a reasonable doubt, and there must be actual legal proof of harm.

In the case of hair dyes, it does not matter how dangerous they are. They can be sold anyway, as long as the label clearly warns the purchaser that the product may be dangerous to use. The question is: In a beauty shop, how many women ever get to see the labels on the bottles or the drums in which hair dyes are shipped?

In addition to requiring that all ingredients in a cosmetic be safe, it is also necessary to require that significant ingredients of a cosmetic item be revealed on the label. Actually there are a few secrets in the cosmetic industry; most competing products use similar basic in-

redients. But for the woman who is allergic, there is no way but through painful trial and error in finding a suitable product, when certain chemicals are used to provide a distinctive selling point for a product.

Also, under present law, soap and hair dyes are exempt from coverage. There is no logical reason why these two products should be exempt from coverage.

ANALYSIS OF 14 SECTIONS OF H.R. 1235 IN RECORD

The complexity of modern cosmetics is such that only some one with a degree in medicine or chemistry can really determine the safety of most cosmetics. The Government has a responsibility to afford American women a degree of protection which very few are in a position to supply for themselves.

For those readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD who are interested in knowing about H.R. 1235 in more detail, I am placing in the RECORD today a separate statement containing a discussion and analysis of each of the 14 sections of the omnibus bill.

PACKAGING

Mrs. MINK. 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 gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to record my full support for the President's fair packaging bill. The packaging industry has grown to a \$20-billion business. The result has been many welcome improvements in the quality, freshness, and convenience of many of the items we buy. Where changes in packaging have brought a better product, consumers have always been happy to pay for it. Most buyers also are willing to tolerate the cost of certain frills and gimmicks associated with the American system of merchandising.

But when these frills and gimmicks are designed to conceal the true costs of merchandise, shoppers have a legitimate complaint.

It has reached the point now where even college-trained shoppers familiar with their own stores are not able to determine comparative costs of the items they buy.

As a result, they have to pay far more than they would otherwise do.

In a recent survey, intelligent women shoppers wound up paying about 9 percent more than they needed to, largely because of the confusion of package sizes. A group of college-trained housewives, trying to choose the most economical package of 20 different items in a supermarket, failed in 43 percent of the cases.

This would indicate that the average shopper pays quite a bit extra through no choice of her own. If even college-trained women pay more than they need to, it is obvious that less educated shoppers must suffer a real inability to determine comparative costs. As a result, the

people who are paying the highest premiums are probably the ones who can least afford it.

Is this really necessary? Does the American economy have to operate on such deception and waste? Is it unfair to ask business to make it easier for shoppers to compare prices?

I think it is about time that we do something for the American consumer so that he or she can make easier price comparisons.

By making that possible, the fair packaging bill may cut substantial amounts from grocery bills for the average family. This would be a particularly useful accomplishment in a period of rising prices.

The cost of the packaging bill itself would be negligible. But the saving to the average housewife would be considerable; according to Senator HART, as much as \$250 per year per family.

This factor alone ought to be enough to commend overwhelming support for the fair packaging bill.

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, today is the 20th anniversary of our Strategic Air Command. It was born out of our experiences in World War II. It had its beginning with only 600 propeller-driven bombers, 3 jet fighters and little more than 35,000 service personnel.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I salute the Strategic Air Command. We cannot fail to recognize that SAC has been a major deterrent to aggression. Its very existence has been an effective instrument for the maintenance of world peace.

Secretary of Defense McNamara, whose computers already failed to give him the right answers on several military matters, notably in connection with Vietnam, would have us believe that there is no longer any need for a long-range bomber. He would have us place sole reliance on missiles. He would have us put all our eggs in one basket. And yet, Mr. Speaker, it is the B-52 bomber flown from distant Guam, not missiles, that we are obliged to rely on in Vietnam.

The mere fact that we recently were obliged in a matter of days to rush through the Congress an emergency measure authorizing and appropriating bills to meet our military needs for Vietnam somewhat belies the computer wisdom of Secretary McNamara's long-range defense planning.

It is significant our military needs for Vietnam did not become known to us until after the regular budget had been prepared.

Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of great concern to me, as it is to the entire Committee on Armed Services, that we have

not had a bomber replacement program and we do not have new bombers in production. The B-52 bombers are of 1956 vintage. We have about 600 of them, and they, along with the B-58, are being phased out.

Missiles are an important item in our defense arsenal, but they are not, nor by their very nature can they be, an effective substitute for the bomber. Nor is the controversial F-111 an effective substitute.

On this 20th anniversary of our Strategic Air Command I remind the House of the importance of this arm of our defense, and I remind the House that we have the duty and responsibility of maintaining it. It is the Congress—not the President nor his Secretary of Defense—which has the constitutional right and duty to determine the kind of defense we should have.

I salute the Strategic Air Command by renewing my determination to give it new life that it may continue, as before, to provide our people with a balanced defense, second to none.

AN AWESOME LOOPHOLE

Mr. KREBS. 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 Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of President Lyndon Johnson's outstanding message on consumer protection. I applaud this kind of leadership and this concern for the average American citizen.

Too often we hear of what this or that special group needs, but we do not hear often enough what all Americans need. I think in this message today we have found the spirit of national concern for a national problem—and we have also found recommendations for a national answer.

I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a particular section of this message that bears our closest scrutiny. It is that section dealing with hazardous substances.

I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that many unpackaged toys, pieces of costume jewelry, and other novelty items are on the market today and that they contain or carry toxic chemical residues or edible poisons.

I am also informed that these unpackaged items are beyond the control of the Government because of an inadequacy in present law. There is a loophole and that loophole must be closed.

This is no longer a matter for lawyers to discuss and split hair about, Mr. Speaker. This is a matter that involves the lives of children who accidentally chew on these things or eat them or otherwise use them in such a way that injury and even death ensues.

We have heard the word "loophole" before, Mr. Speaker, and we sometimes grow tired of it. It sometimes seems

that every law has a loophole and every loophole must be closed. But I urge my colleagues not to take this particular matter lightly. We are today speaking of a small loophole that has very large and awesome consequences. We are speaking of a quirk in the law, a quirk which indirectly takes the lives of children and throws American families into grief and mourning.

It is incumbent upon the House of Representatives to move deliberately and swiftly in this matter. I strongly urge that we extend coverage of the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act so that it will allow the Food and Drug Administration to monitor all hazardous substances and materials, regardless of their wrapping or their lack of wrapping.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am completely in agreement with the President's message on the need for consumer legislation. For, the rights of the American consumer in the marketplace—the right to a variety of products from which to choose, the right to information about these various products as well as his right to be protected from products detrimental or fatal—are privileges I have long respected. Therefore, I welcomed and wholeheartedly support the President's request to Congress that these rights be secured by comprehensive legislation passed in this session.

Two main areas which are in need of vast improvement were cited by the President in his recent message. They are lending and packaging of consumer items. Protection has been sought for the consumer by lawmakers for decades, even before the corner store mushroomed into the block-long, self-service shopping center. But the dishonest practices of moneylenders and the false advertisement promoted by those too eager to sell a faulty product have necessitated a complete revamp of protective measures.

The public must be informed that credit is a commodity as much as is the product which they are buying on credit. And most important, they must know how much this commodity costs. The poor, apprehensive of being able to afford even the necessities of life are most often duped in the process of buying on credit. Thus, I am in complete support of the President's recommendation for legislation requiring lenders to state the full cost of credit, simply and clearly and to state it before any credit contract is signed.

I know we are all aware of the deception which is practiced in the misleading packaging of products found in our supermarkets. This is more than an economic question. It is a question of safety. Harmful products should not be

allowed to appear on the market. This protection falls within the realm of the Food and Drug Administration, which President Johnson has ordered expanded. Actually this expansion has already begun; however, legislation authorizing training programs for non-Federal officials would add needed support, thus, broadening Federal-State-local cooperation in this field.

In this same general area, the President has asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct an analysis of the legislative authority now available and to recommend new steps that may be needed to close the gaps in the laws dealing with cosmetics and medical devices. This analysis I will anxiously await and I look forward to a remedy to the despicable condition of trading on the illnesses of the public and the desperation of the sick.

The individual taxpayer will benefit greatly by the studies and improvements proposed by the President. The citizen's economic situation will be stabilized. As a result, the national economy will be strengthened.

The recommendations will require cooperative action in many areas by many people; but the laws governing these improvements must be made here and I propose we begin.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson on his message on consumer interests which was submitted to the Congress today.

The war on inflation is completely related to these efforts to bring quality merchandise to the consumer at a fair and reasonable price.

Credit is the most important commodity in modern American life. The consumer is entitled to know what part credit plays in the ultimate item which he purchases. The current action of the Federal Reserve which resulted in higher interest rates was a step which multiplied the cost of credit to every American consumer. It seems to me that our national interest is vitally related not only to the quality of credit or the truth in its actual cost but there also must be assurance that an adequate quality of credit is made available to the consumer. The ultimate cost of credit to the consumer is a vital matter for national policy.

The consumer price index is fatally defective in that it fails to include the cost of the credit to the consumer. In my community some people spend as much as 25 or 35 percent of their monthly income on installment credit. The cost of this credit is multiplied through Fed-

eral Reserve policies, which have an immediate inflationary effect upon the consumer. Unfortunately the low income groups are compelled to buy more credit at higher prices which are commanded by these unfortunate policies.

While the posting of the actual cost of credit would be a desirable thing in every sales contract, such posting will not of itself reduce the cost of the item to the consumer. Today's laws which require the posting of automobile prices serve in effect to perpetuate a hoax on the consumer. The posted price is utilized as a gimmick to convince the consumer that he is making a real buy when the posted price in fact represents a convenient rallying point for the automobile dealer. The posted price is inflated at the source so that it can provide the dealer with a convenient trade-in margin of almost 25 percent on which he can negotiate the prospective car buyer into a scheme of purchase. The posted automobile price bears little relationship to the ultimate purchase price. Today's purchase of an automobile is still a game of chance. The posted price is inflated at the time of printing and the dealers' seasonable discount is still the Nation's most highly guarded secret.

The publication of credit costs will inform the consumer—but care must be taken to insure that the publication is not used as a tool to validate exorbitant credit charges.

All of the wisdom and judgment of the ages which established laws against usury and its abuses have been completely discarded during recent years. State laws have legalized interest rates of 36 percent per year to the small loan operators. Department stores throughout America have established interest rates of 18 percent as a convenient carrying charge rate established not by act of law but by custom in the trade.

The public must be protected from usurious practices which have destroyed ancient civilizations. The use of money has a maximum fixed value in any age at any time and under almost any circumstance. The rule of the marketplace which covers the price of so many other items cannot be accepted as a substitute for laws of usury which were founded on justice and reasonableness. Therefore, Federal monetary policies must be developed which preclude the advance of usury. Credit can be restrained in many ways other than the increase in its cost. Steps must be taken to achieve these procedures.

The President's recommendations substantially support the proposals of Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS and pays tribute to the valiant fight that he has waged over the years in this area. The President's recommendations on the Fair Labeling and Packaging Act recognize comparable efforts by Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, who has contributed so much to the cause of honest packaging.

President Johnson's proposals in the Drug Safety Act, the Child Safety Act, and the proposed dangerous substances legislation dynamically brings the Federal Government face to face with the

real problems which confront the consumer. With the enactment of this legislation the 89th Congress could be labeled as the "consumer-minded Congress," a fitting designation in these days of inflationary pressure.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

Mr. PUCINSKI. 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 Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the message sent today by the President about enactment of consumer protection legislation.

This message again reflects the deep concern President Johnson has for all of the people of America. In my judgment, speedy enactment of this legislation can be the single most important anti-inflationary measure that this Congress can pass. Previous speakers and the message clearly indicate the extent to which people—and too often it is the people who can afford it the least—are exploited in their purchases by unscrupulous practices.

Mr. Speaker, I say that today should be a great day for the senior Senator from Illinois, PAUL DOUGLAS. I say this because the President in recommending enactment of the truth-in-lending legislation has now given full support to a measure that the senior Senator from my State, PAUL DOUGLAS, wished to achieve and a struggle which he waged at first singlehandedly for many years.

It appears that today finally this great effort of his and his determined fight to protect the consumers of America is getting unified support from the Presidency on down. It is my hope that the Senator will find a great deal of comfort, aid, and courage today in his long effort to give the consumers of this country the protection that they need.

PACKAGING

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to dispel any impression that American business is solidly against any bill requiring more complete disclosure of product information on packages.

This is simply not true.

Many of the business spokesmen who testified on the fair packaging bill agreed with the general principles of the bill, while finding fault with one small part of it. Others agreed entirely with the bill, but have chosen not to say so publicly for reasons of their own. This silent support may be substantial.

For example, a recent poll of small businessmen showed considerable support for the principles of the packaging bill. And it is the smaller, independent businessmen who account for the bulk of the business firms in the United States. They represent—often better than the larger firms—the essential virtues of the American free enterprise system.