

New Orleans, Los Angeles, Chicago, Miami, Florida, and Boston, Mass.

Some examples: In Washington, D.C., a portable Admiral television set selling for \$129.95 on the ethical market in downtown District of Columbia sold in low-income areas for as high as \$269 with most stores in the low-income areas selling the set at prices between \$150 and \$200. An Emerson portable available for \$119.88 on the ethical market, in one case was priced in a low-income area at \$289 and in the same area a repossessed set of the same make and model sold for \$166.

In New Orleans, an Admiral television set selling for \$118 on the legitimate or ethical market, was priced at from \$169.60 to \$249 in all but one of the stores visited in the low-income areas.

In comparison shopping trips made just last week in Boston, a Philco television set selling for \$149.95 on the legitimate market was priced at \$179.95 and \$210 in the low-income market.

And we must not forget that most of the sales in low-income areas are installment sales which cost the buyer, in addition to the inflated prices, interest and carrying charges often amounting to about 30 per cent per year. In the area of food market prices, the most recent, and apparently most reliable, data available to OEO—and I am not here including the recent news items in Washington, D.C., newspapers—have come from a consumer price survey conducted this past summer by Prof. Carleton Wright of Cornell University, under the auspices of the office of Deputy Mayor Costello of New York. We have been promised a copy of Professor Wright's final report which I will be happy to submit for the record, hopefully early next week.

In the meantime, I have attached to the prepared text of my statement transcripts of a series of radio broadcasts made by Dr. Costello over station WNYC, based on the survey findings. A sample of these findings indicates that in food purchases, as in television set buying, the poor in fact do pay more:

1. On one given day, a food basket in Jackson Heights, Queens, a middle-class neighborhood, was bought for \$8.99. In a neighboring, low-income shopping district (Astoria), the same shopping basket on the same day was priced at \$9.47. The quoted prices are derived from a combination of common lows from each neighborhood.

2. Tomatoes on one given day in Astoria were priced at 55 cents per pound, while in Jackson Heights the price was only 39 cents.

3. In Fort Greene and East Harlem, both low-income districts, one day the price of tomatoes was 55 cents, while in other parts of the city the price was only 45 cents.

There are, certainly, causative factors which operate here other than a lack of concern for the poor on the part of merchants or chain-store managers, or a desire on their part to exploit the consumer. It is undoubtedly true that luxury or specialty items, like caviar or pâté de foie gras, which are higher profit items than the staples, do not sell in a poor neighborhood. This means that the store has less margin within which to operate. Other overhead costs may be higher. Unhappily, breakage and pilferage will often be higher, as will the cost of insurance.