

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

FTC has concentrated its force on halting law violators who do at least some of their selling across State lines.

Thus, while the FTC cannot undertake to settle your private or purely local difficulties, it does stand ready to halt important instances of deception—and at no cost to the one who brings the complaint. The reason for this is that the FTC never brings an action on behalf of an individual; instead, it must itself investigate the matter and then act only if there appears to be sufficient public interest in stopping it. Nevertheless, alert consumers perform a valuable service to FTC by inviting its attention to deceptive practices that should be investigated.

The way to do this is simple: Just write a letter to the Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D.C. The letter should give as many facts as you have available, including any evidence of the chicanery, such as a copy of misleading advertising used to sell the product or the service. (Too many applications for complaint are long on indignation and short on facts that would help the FTC to determine whether the matter warranted investigation.) In writing this letter you have FTC's assurance that your identity will be completely protected. If the deception has sufficient public interest and the FTC is the appropriate authority to tackle the job, your obligation is ended. The FTC will take over the matter from that point on. You will, of course, be advised of what disposition is made of your application for FTC action.

What kinds of action might the FTC take? Depending on the gravity of the law violation, it could be settled by the violator giving FTC assurance and evidence that the improper act would be immediately discontinued. (And this would be no empty assurance because the violator would be in no doubt that a second offense would bring quick formal action.) The FTC, however, might well decide the violation was too serious to be settled by such an assurance of discontinuance, in which case it would issue a formal complaint looking to the issuance of a cease-and-desist order forever prohibiting the respondent from engaging in the illegal act. Should the order be violated thereafter, the FTC would bring action in court seeking a fine of up to \$5,000 per day for each violation of the order.

Thus, the FTC provides you, the consumer, with a final defense against many instances of deception in the marketplace. But it is important to remember that you can do a great deal for yourself by following this advice:

1. Shop more before you buy.
2. Bring your complaint first to the seller.
3. Report false advertising to the media carrying it.
4. Report deception to local organizations concerned with better business standards.
5. Write the facts to the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, of course they can go to the corporation counsel, and he tries to do the best job he can, or they can go to the Better Business Bureau. They are told, "Make a complaint in writing. Spell it out to us."

Some of these people do not know how to do it. They accept the situation. This is the sort of thing that we are fighting

in stolen household pets, including dogs and cats.

Our noteworthy achievements and increased activity in the medical sciences research fields are extremely important. However, in pursuing the most worthy objectives that we seek in research, we must not in the process permit our humanity to be diminished.

It has come to my attention that the need for animals in research, particularly dogs and cats, has become great, and as a result, a primary source of these animals has become a thieves market of household pets. Apparently unscrupulous persons lure household pets into their control, and through various marketing mechanisms, sell them to research units, by the pound.

Not only is this inhumanity deplorable, but the anguish and misery caused to the owners of the stolen dogs, often young children, is the worst kind of cruelty.

Accordingly, the proposal which I now place before the Senate will provide for the policing and regulation of the acquisition of research animals by the research facilities.

Mr. President, I hope we can halt this disgraceful practice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wonder if I could pose a parliamentary inquiry. If the hour of 1 o'clock arrives, will the Senate still be in the morning hour, and will I be able to transact some morning business? I understand that the morning hour will terminate at 1 o'clock. I should like to introduce a bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that unless it is concluded sooner, the transaction of morning business will continue until 2 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. I have no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I merely wished to introduce this bill. Several House Members have introduced similar bills. I ask that it be appropriately referred.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, by a curious and happy coincidence, I was waiting to obtain the floor in order to send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation of certain animals in commerce and the handling of such animals, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I can join in this laudable effort to stop this disgraceful practice.

The bill will come to our Committee on Commerce. So far as I am concerned, I should like to ask unanimous consent to call it the Clark-Magnuson bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I am very happy to have those cheering words, and I join the Senator in the introduction of his bill. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to make a brief statement regarding this subject. I shall look forward to early hearings on the bill by the Committee on Commerce, which is presided over with such distinction by the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. I yield for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last week a dalmatian dog belonging to a Slatington, Pa., family was stolen from a street in that town by an animal profiteer. After passing from one dog napper to another and being taken into another State in this illicit traffic, the family pet finished her days on an operating table in a New York City hospital, the victim of an experiment which was later determined to be futile.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that in our presumably civilized country, in the summer of 1965, it should be possible for Americans to feel that their family pet dogs and cats are free from the threat of abduction from their owners for the purpose of being sold at a profit to laboratories for scientific experiments.

For this reason, Mr. President, I join the Senator from Washington in introducing a bill for the regulation of the commerce in dogs and cats used for experimental purposes. Enactment of this bill would make it a Federal offense to steal a family pet for sale to a laboratory; in addition, all dealers in dogs and cats who supply animals for laboratories would be required to be licensed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; all users of animals for experimental purposes would be required to buy those animals from licensed dealers; dealers in laboratory animals would be required to maintain set standards of care; and, finally, violation of these regulations would carry a penalty of a \$10,000 fine and 1 year in prison.

It is ironic that the Federal Government as the major supporter of scientific experimentation in a very real sense subsidizes the purchase and encourages the traffic in stolen pets. For example, it is widely reported that 65 percent of all dogs and cats used for medical research are stolen animals. The need for this legislation is further emphasized by the fact that dealing in animals for laboratory purposes is big business. One dealer in my home State of Pennsylvania reported a net income of \$700,000 in 1 year.

Mr. President, if the funds for experimental grants come from the Federal Government surely the Federal Government has not only the right but the obligation to require that dogs and cats used in laboratory experiments be purchased through legitimate means. Only a naive, indifferent or irresponsible researcher could be led to believe that a well cared for dalmatian is a stray mongrel that has been caught by a dog-catcher's net and subsequently disposed of as unwanted or unsought for. Let the Federal Government cease to be a party,

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE TRAFFIC IN STOLEN HOUSEHOLD PETS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that is designed to put an end to a criminal, but lucrative, practice of traffic

wittingly or unwittingly, to this unlawful practice of pet snatching.

There is nothing in this measure which in any way interferes with the use of dogs and cats for scientific purposes. Indeed, we all recognize that experimentation with animals has furthered our scientific knowledge. Let me now assure my good friends engaged in research that this is not an antivivisectionist measure. It is a bill intended to put an end to the illegal and inhumane practice of procuring dogs and cats for medical experiments by stealing family pets, often out of their backyards or out of their owners automobiles. I ask for a tough law to punish these thieves who make a living this way. Let us make dognapping—and catnapping too—a crime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2322) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs and cats intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

POWER LAWNMOWER SAFETY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, one day last summer in Seattle, a 13-month-old girl sat on the porch steps watching her mother mow the lawn. The mother was using a popular type of rotary blade power lawnmower, 30 to 40 feet away. Suddenly the child cried and slumped over, blood coming from the left side of her neck. The mother remembered hearing the sound of the mower striking a hard object. When the little girl was taken to Children's Medical Center in Seattle, doctors discovered that a piece of rusty wire, slightly more than 2 inches long, had passed into her neck and was lodged near her shoulder blade. Miraculously, it had missed her windpipe, vital blood vessels and nerves, and could be removed without complications.

This child was only one of the more than 80,000 people in this country injured, permanently maimed, or killed by power lawnmowers last year. During the summer months, 110 power mower injury victims were rushed to Seattle hospital emergency rooms. In Dayton, Ohio, emergency rooms were treating 22 to 25 such patients per week. These figures reveal nothing of the many injured who were treated by private physicians or who did not receive medical attention at all.

As the summer of 1965 proceeds, there is little to indicate that such injuries will decrease. It is time we realized that such an apparently simple and safe operation as lawn mowing presents great danger to thousands of users of power mowers and innocent bystanders every year. Over 22 million power mowers are now in use; 4 million more will be sold this year. Ninety percent of them will be rotary blade mowers—the most hazardous type. Rotary power lawnmowers have been called by the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Prevention

"probably the most dangerous machine you can have around the home." Some physicians have even suggested power mowers be outlawed.

The blades on these mowers rotate up to 4,000 times a minute and have a force of over 10,000 pounds per square inch—more than enough to shear through heavy shoe leather and to pull wayward feet and hands into the cutting area. The blades can throw up objects buried in the grass at speeds up to 300 feet per second—a speed equal to that of shell fragments and approaching that of a bullet. That does not give anyone much time to duck—in fact, most people never see what hits them. Objects may be hurled long distances and still inflict injury. In one case, a boy was standing on a bench 55 feet from the place where a power lawnmower was being operated and 7 feet above the ground. A rock thrown out by the mower struck him in the head, gashed his scalp, and knocked him unconscious.

In the past few years, there have been improvements in handle controls, wheel diameter, height of cut, mower housings, gas and oil gages, starters, and blade shapes that should add to the safety of power lawnmowers. The industry organization, the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, continues to sponsor safety standards and research for safety improvements. One such study is now going on at the University of Iowa, in conjunction with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In spite of these commendable efforts to introduce safety improvements, one study found that 70 percent of the accidents in its area involved machines less than 3 years old. The University of Iowa investigators reported that "the machine that can perform with ease, power, and optimum safety has yet to be put on the market," and that "today's machine is potentially as dangerous as the first model." In fact, William V. White, of the Public Health Service's Division of Accident Prevention, has warned that manufacturers' emphasis on new safety improvements may give power mower operators a false sense of security and safety, thus making them careless of those very great hazards which still exist and have not been corrected.

I think the industry has tried to overcome this. The members of the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute, Inc., which includes 95 percent of all power lawn mower manufacturers, have sponsored safety specification standards published by the American Standards Association. These are periodically revised to include new developments. The institute also has cooperated with public and private bodies in putting on an educational campaign for the public. This has been helpful in alerting people to the danger of power lawn mowers.

Nevertheless, one may ask if the institute's safety campaigns have been substituted for efforts to improve the mowers themselves. In radio spot announcements, the institute states that "virtually all power equipment accidents result from human carelessness," and further states that injuries from objects picked up and hurled out by the machine

are due to "your failure to properly clean the lawn." Although a quick tour of the lawn to check for debris might be a reasonable precaution, it seems to me that if one has to go over an entire lawn to remove every small stone and 2-inch piece of wire that might be embedded in the grass, one might as well cut the lawn with scissors. And operators are hardly able to follow completely the institute's advice to "get people, especially children, out of the way" when power mowers are capable of hurling objects well into a neighbor's yard.

Power lawn mowers have become big business. New sales this year will total over \$400 million. The institute claims it is willing to add safety devices when research shows what kinds are needed. The preliminary report of the University of Iowa investigators offers several suggestions which manufacturers can follow up now to demonstrate private creativity and concern for public safety.

The report recommends provision of a rotary power mower design that will intercept the flight of an object thrown out by the blades from under the mower or through the discharge chute. A minimal beginning here would be the elimination of center discharge chutes which most often throw up debris injuring the operator. It also recommends provision of a single lever for simple adjustment of wheel cutting height; simple and standard controls for all riding mowers; and a safe and simple method for removal or attachment of blades.

The report further suggests that, important as safety education programs are, the manufacturers must accept more responsibility in improving their mower designs:

For years, educators have warned mower operators to turn off the motor when leaving the machine or making adjustments—yet we continue to find the rotating blade a factor in many injuries. Obviously then, the blade should be designed to stop automatically any time the operator releases the handle or leaves the seat. He is already accustomed to a similar device for his safety when opening an automatic washing machine, dishwasher, clothes dryer. The challenge lies in designing equipment to take over a task we know man should do for his own safety.

Continuing research into the causes and prevention of power lawn mower injuries is necessary. But there are many safety improvements which we already know are needed right away. I trust that the industry will follow these suggestions and provide machines with the necessary safety devices, making sure that only machines with such safety improvements are sold.

Lawn mowing has been a family activity for most Americans—it goes on around the home, during the summer, when people may be hot, tired, or easily distracted; where children may be playing, and where young people may be operating the machines.

Mr. President, self-regulation in the power lawn mower industry appears to have lagged seriously behind the need for it. I have instructed the Commerce Committee staff to monitor the progress of the industry in raising safety standards. Should the alarming volume of