benefits which our foreign aid program—given a peaceful setting—could achieve.

The 50 members who have joined me in introduction of legislation appropriating funds for the Joint United States-French Concorde plant are Mrs. ABZUG, Messrs. ADAMS, ANDERSON of Illinois, BINGHAM, BOLAND, BRASCO, CLEVELAND, CONYERS, COLLINS of Illinois, DELLUMS, DRINAN, ASHLEY, FRENZEL, FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. GRASSO, Messrs. HALPERN, HARRINGTON, HATHAWAY, KOCH, KYROS, LENT, MINVA, POWELL, RANGEL, REES, ROSENTHAL, SARBANES, SCHEUER, VANIK, and WALDIE.

PCB'S AND POULTRY CONTAMINATION

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I brought to the attention of this body the fact that a significant proportion of poultry in a 12-State area have been contaminated with a potentially deadly chemical—polychlorinated biphenyl—PCB.

The results of that contamination are now becoming tragically apparent. A report in this afternoon's Washington Evening Star states that one of the Nation's largest chicken producers—Holly Farms of Wilkesboro, N.C.—has already had to destroy 77,000 chickens due to PCB contamination, and that millions of other chickens have been contaminated.

At this time there is no way of fully knowing the extent of this contamination nor the total number of poultry and hogs that have been subjected to it. But the potential danger is staggering.

The real tragedy of this occurrence, however, is that it was *totally* preventable. For the past 2 years I have been attempting to get the appropriate Federal agencies to take the necessary steps to protect the public from the hazards of PCB's. Yet, in an almost unprecedented display of disregard for the public health and welfare, that administrative action has not been forthcoming.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation—H.R. 10035—to insure that our health and welfare are safeguarded from the menace of this dangerous chemical. That legislation would prohibit the distribution or introduction for distribution of interstate commerce of PCB.

Hopefully, the Congress will now act to prevent a recurrence of the present tragedy inflicted by PCB's. Given the unconscionable failure of Federal agencies to live up to their responsibilities to protect the health of our citizens, we have no other choice.

At this point I include in the RECORD an article from the July 28 Washington *Evening Star*, detailing the necessary slaughter of PCB-contaminated chickens in North Carolina:

MILLIONS OF CHICKENS ARE TAINTED—FEED RECALLED—U.S. CHECKING HOGS, TURKEYS

(By James Welsh and John Fialka)

Because of one leaky piece of equipment at a processing plant in North Carolina, millions of chickens raised and marketed in the Eastern United States apparently have been contaminated by an industrial chemical.

Department of Agriculture officials are hurrying tests at chicken slaughter houses in the Southeast that regularly process to the market some 28 million broilers a week.

They are conducting the same kind of tests at 25 to 30 swine slaughter houses suspected of marketing animals raised on feed that was contaminated. And they are afraid that other fowl, such as turkeys, may also be affected.

The chemical is polychlorinated biphenyl, called PCB. Similar in some respects to DDT, it carries no immediate danger to human beings. But, in experiments on mice, repeated dosage has shown PCB to cause birth defects and liver damage.

Fish meal, used in chicken feed and containing high levels of PCB, was distributed over a period of 2½ months to some 65 firms throughout the Southeast, including Virginia.

These firms, and the tests now being conducted, are confined to a 10-state area. But Agriculture officials are aware that some of the contaminated fish meal may have been retailed beyond that area and that the animals raised on food made with the meal were marketed and sold well beyond that.

Under supervision of the Food and Drug Administration, much of this fish meal is now being recalled.

Up to 800,000 tons of chicken feed could be affected.

If half of it was used, it would be enough to *feed 350 million chickens* through their entire growing period.

But according to FDA and Department of Agriculture officials, hundreds of thousands of tons of chicken feed including the contaminated fish meal probably already has been used for chickens and apparently swine.

KILLED 77,000

Holly Farms, the nation's largest chicken producer, destroyed 77,000 broilers after finding higher than tolerable levels of PCB in its chickens.

USDA is trying to mount a testing program at dozens of other chicken-producing firms in addition to the swine slaughter houses.

"Chances are that the (chicken) contamination is very widespread," Dr. Clayton Yeutter, chief of Agriculture's Consumer and Marketing Survey, said today.

The number of chickens affected, he said, "is bound to be in the millions."

He said that no chickens are now being sent to market without first being tested.

But no one is able to assess the extent of contamination of chickens sold and consumed in recent weeks, he said.

CONSUMERS NOT TOLD

The Agriculture Department has known of the problem for at least a week. It decided not to warn consumers to avoid buying chicken.

This would have been "unfair" and would have been "a quick way to invite lawsuits," said Yeutter.

He noted the quick turnover of poultry in stores and supermarkets, adding that it would have been impossible to determine *quickly which stores* were handling chicken suspected of contamination.

Agriculture officials were told of the problem by FDA, which learned of it late on Friday, July 16, from Monsanto Chemical Co., the nation's sole producer of PCB.

FDA ran tests that weekend at the processing plant, East Coast Terminal, in Winnington, N.C.

It discovered that the fish meal ready to be shipped contained 15 to 20 parts per million of PCB. The FDA level of safe consumption for the chemical is 5 parts per million.

The plant then was closed down. The next week, officials of its parent firm, South Pacific Proteins, of Darien, Conn., began recalling shipments.

SIXTEEN TONS GOT OUT

According to R. E. Duggan, deputy assistant commissioner for consumer affairs, FDA, the industrial chemical had been confined from a heat exchanger into the processing fishmeal at East Coast Terminal, during a period from April 30 to mid-July.

During that time, he said, some 16,000 tons of the meal, which is imported from Peru, had been produced and sold.

Generally, said Duggan, fish meal makes up 2 percent of chicken feed.

This means that the contaminated product could have become part of some 800 tons of chicken feed.

Exactly how much of the meal went into chicken feed and how much of that chicken feed was used is still under study, said Duggan.

The fish meal went to firms, some of them big poultry producers like Holly Farms. Other customers for the fish meal were feed mills and brokers who in turn retailed it to other customers.

"It's a very complex situation," said Duggan.

"One of the unknowns is the amount of leakage over the 2½-month period. We don't know whether it was continuous.

"The contamination could have been much lower, or much higher, than what we found in the fish meal ready for shipment 10 days ago."

The extent of possible contamination in the Washington area was not clear.

Holly Farms, which turns out more than 1 million chickens a week, is the supplier for both Safeway and Consumers Cooperative in the Washington area.

These stores may well have sold chicken containing higher than advised levels of PCB. But Agriculture staffers said today that because of stringent measures taken in recent days by Holly Farms, the poultry now sold in these stores is safe for consumption.

Most of the chickens shipped to the Washington area come from other Maryland's Eastern Shore, or producing areas in Southern Virginia and North Carolina.

A spokesman for Perdue Foods, Inc., of Salisbury, Md., one of the shore's larger producers, said that most of the Maryland area get their fish meal from a Baltimore plant and not from the Washington plant where the PCB leakage occurred.

WE WERE LUCKY

George Heitz, general manager of the Rockingham Poultry Marketing Cooperative in Broadway, Va., said that his firm received one shipment of the tainted feed before switching to another feed outlet.

"Our problem was that some of the eggs didn't hatch, that's all. In some of our flocks it knocked the hatch down 5 or 10 percent, in some it was a little more than that. But that was all the damage we had. We were pretty lucky," Heitz said.

His problem—egg production—is what led others to discover the PCB.

According to Agriculture's Yeutter, the problem still might be going undetected were it not for tests conducted by Holly Farms.

"They're the good guys in this story," he said.

Yeutter said Holly Farms, located in Wilkesboro, N.C., discovered something wrong with the way its chickens were laying.

The firm's researchers traced the problem to the feed and eventually to the fish meal plant.

Monsanto, the PCB supplier, was then consulted, after which the giant chemical firm notified FDA.

So far, said FDA officials, about 1,000 tons of the fish meal has been returned from the North Carolina plant, and more is on the way.

But they estimated that probably most of

MONS 030660

the 16,000 tons of contaminated fish meal shipped out over the ten-week period, less than half will be found unused.

One large customer of the plant reported that of 15 rail carloads of the meal he had purchased during that period, only two remained for recall.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. SIKES'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AMERICA IS A GROWING COUNTRY

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, Fred Smith is an associate of Laurance Rockefeller, is a well known and effective worker in the fields of conservation and outdoor recreation. He has given of his many talents and served on Presidential, legislative, conservation boards, and commissions. Recently he has released an article which is so meaningful in its treatments of the needs of our country and its people in today's world that I recommend its ready and careful study to my colleagues.

P. I. Prentice, former president and publisher of Time, director of the National Pollution Control Foundation, and many other well-known organizations dedicated to the well-being of our citizens, has this to say of Fred Smith, the author of "America Is a Growing Country":

> Long before environmentalism became fashionable and long before the ecology became a household word Fred Smith earned wide recognition as a pioneer in the war for conservation.
>
> His long leadership in the crusade to end pollution makes this eloquent plea for a little more caution and a lot more common sense doubly significant.
>
> Protecting the ecology requires realism as well as enthusiasm, intelligence as well as devotion. No people can live on air, water, and scenery alone; no nation ever grew great by not making good use of its natural resources.
>
> Today's problems are tomorrow's opportunities. Protecting the environment and minimizing the enormous waste caused by pollution brings us far more than the burden of enormous costs; it brings us also the challenge to meet those costs in a way that will create savings even greater than the costs.
>
> This is the challenge Fred Smith presents in the pages that follow—a challenge to make our response relevant to the realities of America's unstoppable growth.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Smith's article follows:

AMERICA IS A GROWING COUNTRY

Twenty years ago Harold J. Laski, the famous British political scientist wrote a book about America and the Americans.

He described us as an ambitious, determined, optimistic clan. "They might be poor," he wrote, "they would not remain so. They might be out of work; a job was waiting around the corner. They might be half-literate; their children would go to college. They might be foreign-born; in the truest sense of the term their children born in America would inherit the tradition in all its amplitude." Laski epitomized us by referring to "the majestic figure of Abraham Lincoln, lonely, aloof, tragic, who grows from the illiteracy of a home where there is little but failure and poverty to impose himself not merely on the mind of America, but on the mind of all civilization."

Gunnar Myrdal, the Swedish economist, who is as able an authority on Americans as anyone, says the average American is "a believer and a defender of the faith in humanity . . . It is a relatively important matter to him to be true to his own ideas and carry them out in actual life."

The Philosopher George Santayana suggested that "to be an American is of itself almost a moral condition, an education and a career."

William James, the most American of Americans, was convinced that Americans can work together effectively to solve any problem, to eliminate war, pestilence, illness, and all the other evils humanity has permitted to develop. Three other thorough and wise observers—Tocqueville, Bryce and Brogan—each delineating the American character at fifty-year intervals, arrived at essentially the same general description.

It is founded upon a philosophy that there will always be a better tomorrow, that progress is inevitable and eminently to be desired, that achievement is in our blood, that in strength there is freedom, that teamwork solves everything, that prejudice is sinful, that all people are created equal, and anybody can grow up to be President—either of the United States or of a corporation like General Motors. It is a dream of sorts, etched deeply by time and tradition into the consciousness of every generation. More important, it represents the ultimate in Common Sense as the American sees it, and, as William James has said, "Only the minds debauched by learning . . . ever suspect common sense of not being absolutely true."

At various times and in many places, there have been mavericks, to be sure, and sometimes the mavericks temporarily take over. Cataclysmic events and passing public passions have caused men to lose faith in the Dream and inspired them to look elsewhere for something to cling to. But these are temporary aberrations.

We had such a time in the late 20's and early 30's, as many will recall. The great economic machine that monumentalized the American Dream collapsed without warning. Visions of financial security for every family, which seemed so close to realization, lay broken, smashed, and smelling of infamy.

This exploded the Dream, as well it might. There was no place to turn—except to those who had always discounted the validity of the Dream; and for a long stretch of years they, the contemporary infidels, had a field day, led by the propagandists and advisers of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

"None of Roosevelt's speeches caught up more poignantly the intellectual moods of the early depression," Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., reported, "than the one made to the Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. After a brilliant historical account of the background of American democracy, Roosevelt suggested that the age of expansion had come to an end."

John Dewey, the nation's leading intellectual, was quick to jump aboard. Private enterprise, he insisted, never could be "responsible," because social responsibility and "an exclusively pecuniary-profit industry" are incompatible. Reinhold Niebuhr, the eminent theologian, announced categorically that capitalism was dead, and it was good riddance. He saw no hope for the future. "There is nothing," he said, "to support the thesis that a dominant class ever yields its position or its privileges in society because its rule has been convicted of ineptness or injustices."

Roosevelt added fuel to the fire:

"Our industrial plant is built," he said, "the problem now is whether under existing conditions it is not overbuilt. Our last frontier has long since been reached . . ."

Certainly this would sound reasonable enough to those disillusioned men who had no jobs, those whose pay had been cut to five dollars a week, those who sold apples on the street, those who saw nothing, nothing at all up ahead.

"Our task now is . . . the soberer and less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand." Roosevelt continued, "of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting the existing economic organization to the service of the people."

"Prosperity," Mr. Hoover announced from the White House, "is just around the corner." Nobody believed him. He had become a living monument to ruptured ambitions and spent hopes. In his final broadcast appeal before the election he warned against "false gods arrayed in the rainbow colors of promises." He denounced the fragmentation of society which the group action and sectionalism inspired by Roosevelt's propagandists was creating. Nobody listened. Roosevelt had caught the whole population on the rebound, victimized by unrequited love for the dream that had saturated their souls from Day One of the nation. "I have looked into the faces of thousands of Americans," Roosevelt confided to a friend, "they have the frightened look of lost children."

The old American philosophy of stubborn self-determination was in full retreat. Nobody ever said, anymore, that America was a great, growing country filled with opportunity for the alert; that its best years lay ahead of it. Any real inspiration for the future had been undermined; all hope for individual achievement was expunged. The moving, growing, aspiring environment had been washed away in a sea of words.

II

Today we are reliving that old experience; we've been this way before.

Our system has let us down, we are hearing; industry is wrong-headed, worthless, and endlessly damaging to society; and we need to shift gears. Do away with growth, curb technology, they say, or our world will self-destruct in two generations. Obscure scientists bask in front-page publicity by describing disasters that might occur; politicians hail themselves as defenders of the environment against industrial polluters and crafty consumer exploiters, even while the government in their charge remains one of the most pervasive and most immovable polluters of all; and the consumer, as taxpayer, is horrendously exploited. Lawyers, acting in what they choose to call the public interest, indulge in a kind of publicity-rich legal guerilla warfare to put a stop to anything anybody doesn't like, anything that makes a profit and smells of progress. As a result, the confused public is once again ready to believe anything that sounds reasonably logical, especially if it also sounds frightening.

We are scared again. But this time our fears seem to have grown out of a distrust of our affluence, not the threat of starvation. Our consciences rather than our stomachs are giving us a hard time. We are dusting off all the old villains—condemning them this time for giving us what we demanded—more goods, more services, more conveniences at the minimum cost.

It gallops across our destiny on a black horse, a hired killer with a big notch in his gun to memorialize the murder of the unspoiled world we once had.

It is widely held these days by environmentalists and by many frightened by environmentalists, that we've "got to get off

MONS 030661