

As to stores charging higher prices in the store than they advertise, I think MEND has proved its point. On October 26, 1967, we surveyed six chain foodstores both in and out of ghetto areas. Here is the example of the Key foodstore at 110th Street and Third Avenue:

Product	Advertised price in New York Post, Oct. 25, 1967	Price actually marked on cans and charged in store
Chock Full O' Nuts coffee.....	\$0.69.....	\$0.79.
Nestle chocolate bars.....	3 for \$0.89.....	1 for \$0.39.
Key tea bags (100).....	\$0.75.....	\$0.93.
Del Monte peas.....	2 for \$0.43.....	2 for \$0.49.
Key peaches.....	3 for \$0.79.....	1 for \$0.31.
Key frozen orange juice.....	6 for \$0.79.....	6 for \$0.87.
Key frozen asparagus.....	\$0.45.....	\$0.51.
Coney Island potatoes.....	\$0.25.....	\$0.33.
Frozen Carnation shrimp.....	\$1.79.....	\$2.15.
Eat Good white bread.....	2 for \$0.35.....	2 for \$0.39.

All of the six foodstores in question received summonses on that date because of the fact their prices were higher than advertised. The summonses were handed out after the cashiers rang up the higher prices. Again it is interesting to note that one of the stores carrying on this practice was in a middle-income area. I bring this up to point out that practices like this are also used outside of ghetto areas against all different kinds of consumers.

Can we change these sort of practices. We at MEND certainly hope so. But from our point of view ineffective laws enforced by ineffective agencies certainly can't do the job. From looking at the type of protection the consumer gets in our country, you would never believe he is in the majority. It's about time we started using the phrase "Let the seller beware instead of the buyer."

EXHIBIT A

[From the Congressional Record, July 13, 1965]

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. HART. Mr. President, much has been said by opponents of the truth-in-packaging bill (S. 985) concerning the alleged lack of interest in the bill by the average consumer. Much also has been said by the opponents—all of it laudatory—about the intelligence of our American women. As opponents tell the story, women are much too smart to be fooled by the packaging they face in today's supermarket. Therefore, the argument continues, women have no interest in a bill which would correct some of those packaging practices.

There is no question in my mind as to the capabilities of American women. As a matter of fact, I have contributed several thousand words of praise to the ever-swelling collection of tributes.

However, one thing has struck me. That is that all of the defenders of the "too-smart-to-be-fooled" American women are American men. Women themselves have another story to tell.

Recently, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs Esther Peterson—a very intelligent woman who strongly supports the truth-in-packaging bill—exchanged letters with another of our intelligent American women who also strongly supports—and wants—the bill. Mrs. Peterson thought the exchange so typical—as do I—that she wanted to share the letters with the Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the correspondence of Mrs. Stephen Press, of New York City, with Mrs. Peterson be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"NEW YORK, N.Y.,
"May 18, 1965.

"Mrs. ESTHER PETERSON,
"Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C.

"DEAR Mrs. PETERSON: Thank you so much for your letter of May 10.

"I would certainly have no objection to having any part or all of my letter inserted in the Congressional Record. Would it be possible for me to obtain a