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 31 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 financial 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 fair play 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 so 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—tough 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 and legal protections are meaningless to 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 interest 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. And, in 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:

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 judgments.

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 prices 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 the Federal 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 the American consumer.

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.

B. B. JOHNSON.


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 DOUGLAS, 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 I.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.
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 the 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 dollar-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 $1,000, say under present practice, you might be told you would have to pay $36, or 3.6 percent, interest over the life of the loan, or a 5.5 percent annual rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On a $1,000 loan, for example, you might be told you would have to pay $500 more for it, for 30 months, including “6-percent interest.”

Under truth in lending: You would be told an investigation fee would be $8, interest would be $324, making the total finance charge of $332, or an 11.1 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 15.9 percent annual rate on the declining balance.

Under present practices: On a house, you borrow $15,000 at 6 percent for 25 years. You might be told you would pay $99.65 a month for 25 years, including principal and interest.

Under truth in lending: You would be told you would have to pay $14,023 in interest over the life of the loan, or a 6.2 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: NOT IN ANY WAY CREATING MORE DANGER 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, scarred, disfigured, 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 placed them under scrutiny 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 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 innocuous 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: 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 stored?

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 ingredients. 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 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 $90-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 them. 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 merchandising, 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 different 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 for the items 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 obviously less educated shoppers must suffer a real inability to determine comparative costs. As a result, the
people who are paying the highest
prices 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 com-
parisons.

By making that possible, the fair pack-
aging bill may cut substantial amounts
from grocery bills for the average fam-
ily. 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 con-
siderable; 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. ARENDTS. 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. ARENDTS. 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 Ser-
vices Committee, I salute the Strategic
Air Command. We cannot fail to rec-
ognize that SAC has been a major de-
terator to aggression. Its very existence
has been an effective deterrent 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 Viet-
nam, 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, our B-52 bombers 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 as emergency
measures must not be utilization and
appropriation bills to meet our military
needs for Vietnam somewhat belies the
computer wisdom of Secretary Mc-
Namara'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 Com-
mitee on Armed Services, that we have
not had a bomber replacement program
and we do not have new bombers in pro-
duction. The B-52 of 1956 vintage. We have about 600 of them, and they, along with the B-58, are being phase
out.

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

On this, 20th anniversary of our Strate-
gic Air Command, I remind the House of
the importance of this arm of our de-

defense, and I remind the House that we
have the duty and responsibility of main-
taining 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 de-

defense, second to none.

AN AWESOME LOOPHOLE

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unan-
imous 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 John-
son's outstanding message on consumer
protection. I applaud this kind of lead-
ership and this concern for the average
American citizen.

There is no fear 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
certain toxic chemical residues or edible
poisons.

I am also informed that these unpack-
aged items are beyond the control of the
Federal Trade Commission under existing
law.

This is no longer a matter for lawyers
to discuss and split hair about, Mr.
Speaker. This is a matter that involves
American lives and throws in question
what is the very purpose of the law.

I urge the Congress to address itself
to this matter with the urgency that it
merits, as well as the urgency that it
demands. This is a matter far more
pressing than the particular technical
questions with which the Congress is
concerned.

I am aware of what this or that prod-

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 com-

ting with President Johnson'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
their nature and usages, as well as the
right to be protected from products de-
terimental or fatal—are privileges I have
long respected. Therefore, I welcomed
and wholeheartedly support the Presi-
dent's request to Congress that these
rights be secured by comprehensive legis-
lation, passed in this session.

Two main areas which are in need of
vast improvement were cited by the Presi-
dent in his recent message. They are
lending and packaging of consumer
substances and materials. Regardless of
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 advertise-
ment 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, where credit products are sold, 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 legisla-
tion 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 decep-
tion 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
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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 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 medicare 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 not 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 by Federal 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 reading 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 maintain a monetary cost to 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 cost of the car and yet an automobile is still a game of chance. The posted price is inflated at the time of printing and the dealers' seasonal 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 false pretenses has 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 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 rate. The rate must any rate anywhere and everywhere. 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 correct 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 Banking and Credit 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 the President 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 today 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 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 Senate will support, aid, and encourage today in his long effort to give the consumers of this country the protection that they need.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to dispel any impression that American business is solidly against the packaging bill. I have received considerable 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 shows 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.