

to join me in congratulating Sylvia McLaughlin on the occasion of her retirement after thirty-eight years of service to The Save San Francisco Bay Association and its Board of Directors, and recognizing her for her many years of dedicated public service.

In 1962 Sylvia McLaughlin was one of three founders of The Save San Francisco Bay Association, now called Save the Bay, which has worked for nearly four decades to protect and restore the Bay and Delta and to improve public access along its shoreline. The San Francisco Bay is one of the natural wonders of the world, where saltwater meets freshwater from the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers to form the largest estuarine system on the West Coast of North America. The Bay and Delta have suffered from 150 years of hydraulic mining, fresh water diversion, pollution, fill and shoreline development. For four decades Save the Bay has worked to reverse this trend, to keep the Bay alive and make it healthier. The Bay-Delta defines our region and contributes greatly to the San Francisco Bay's high quality of life, providing economic benefits as well as drinking water for more than two-thirds of California's population and irrigation for hundreds of crops.

Sylvia's work led to the creation of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission in 1965 and the adoption of the Bay Plan in 1969, inspiring several generations of grassroots conservationists. Sylvia has received international recognition for her efforts to protect and restore the San Francisco-Bay Delta and its shoreline—a rich web of natural life where hundreds of species of fish, birds, and other animals make their homes. Save the Bay is rededicating itself to a Century of Renewal as the year 2000 begins, restoring water quality, habitat, fisheries and public enjoyment of the Bay for generations to come.

Sylvia is retiring after thirty-eight years of service to Save the Bay and its Board of Directors. I know I speak for all the Members when I wish Sylvia McLaughlin a very happy and healthy retirement, and when I thank her for her unparalleled contributions to environmental protection and for her tireless efforts on behalf of the Bay and its residents.

INTERNATIONAL POPULATION ASSISTANCE

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, soon we will be debating one of the most important foreign policy questions to come before the House this session—international population assistance.

This is a very important matter that will directly affect the quality of life of individuals and families around the world. It deserves careful attention by all Members. A recent issue of the magazine *Insight* included an article by Warner Fornos, the President of the Population Institute, that discusses this issue. The Population Institute is a nonprofit organization that seeks to bring the world's population into balance with our resource base and environment through equitable and voluntary means.

I believe the article by Mr. Fornos makes points that should be considered in the up-

coming appropriations debates. As a result, I am including it in the RECORD for the benefit of all Members.

[From the *Insight* magazine, Jan. 31, 2000]

QUESTION: SHOULD POPULATION CONTROL BE A PRIORITY FOR THE THIRD WORLD?

YES: VANISHING FORESTS AND WIDESPREAD FAMINES ARE SIGNS OF CRISIS IN MANY NATIONS

(By Warner Fornos)

The term "population control" has an unfortunate and misleading connotation. "Control" seems to infer force and coercion, which I categorically oppose on moral and ethical grounds. My opposition goes beyond mere semantics. There are those who would have us believe that all population and family-planning programs are rooted in force and coercion; that simply is untrue. At least some of those who peddle that particular bill of goods are snake-oil salesmen who know better or should.

Fertility rates have declined during the last 40 years, from six children per woman to slightly less than three. Anyone who honestly thinks that this is the result of force and coercion simply does not understand human nature of the limitations on the ability of governments to make people do—or, perhaps in this case, not do—something against their will. The magnitude of the power that would have to be exercised to influence the most personal of decisions so successfully during the last four decades simply defies the imagination.

Voluntary family-planning information, education and services should be universally available and accessible. According to the United Nations, there are some 350 million couples throughout the world who lack access to, or the means to acquire, modern contraceptives. An estimated 120 million of those couples would use safe and effective family-planning methods immediately if they were available. The Population Institute strives for universal access to a variety of family-planning methods.

In the last year, world population surpassed the 6 billion mark. World population is growing annually by nearly 80 million the equivalent of the population of Germany. Ninety-five percent of that growth takes place in the developing world, by definition the poorest countries in the world. There are 62 countries with populations on course to double in 30 years or less and 84 countries whose governments officially have stated that their birth rates are high.

There are a number of environmentalists who can produce voluminous scientific data to demonstrate that our planet already has exceeded its sustainable limits. Just for starters, they point to such chilling statistics as the following: 1.3 billion people live in absolute poverty on the equivalent of one U.S. dollar or less per day, 1.5 billion people lack access to an adequate supply of clean water and 790 million people go to bed hungry every night.

There are those who say that poverty, hunger and water issues really are social, economic, technological and political problems—not population problems. Certainly politics, economics and technology all fit into the poverty/hunger/misery equation, but when you see abandoned children begging for a scrap of bread in the streets of Lagos, Nigeria, or Lahore, India, or Lima, Peru, can anyone deny that these are children whose parents were unable to care for them? And think back to the 350 million couples who are unable to regulate their own fertility because they lack access to, or the means to obtain, family-planning information, education and services.

Almost from the inception of the development of national family-planning programs

some 40 to 45 years ago, the argument surfaced that there must first be economic stability before there can be a smaller-family-size norm. And, generally speaking, industrialized countries do tend to have fertility rates that are lower than those in less-developed countries.

I am a strong believer in the free-market system, though I have never been convinced that capitalism is the best contraceptive. But those who believe development must precede fertility reductions nearly always haul out the examples of Singapore and Hong Kong, two islands of capitalism in a less-developed region that have lowered their fertility rates. A little more homework reveals that both of those states were among the first to adopt family-planning programs back in the 1950s and 1960s. Meanwhile, Thailand, Indonesia and Sri Lanka are examples of countries where there have been considerable fertility declines before the advent of industrialization.

Pronatalists seem to view the Earth through a peculiar prism that blocks out human activity as a factor in forests vanishing, water scarcity, topsoil erosion, desert expansion, unprecedented global climate change and diminishing finite resources.

There is, however, a preponderance of solid evidence to refute claims that population growth no longer is a significant issue. For example, while world population climbed by 75 percent in the 20th century, an estimated 75 percent of global forested area was lost—much of it for living space, farmland and firewood, which still is the leading source of cooking and heating fuel in the developing world. In addition:

Nearly half a billion people around the world face water shortages and, by 2025, the number is expected to grow to 2.8 billion—35 percent of the projected world population of 8 billion for that year.

The 15 warmest years on record have occurred during the last 21 years and all major scientific bodies acknowledge that climate change now is under way. According to the International Panel on Climate Change, a two-thirds reduction in global carbon-dioxide emissions would be required to avoid a doubling of atmospheric concentrations that may jeopardize food production, the Earth's biodiversity and entire ecosystems, as well as human health.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture notes that since the mid-20th century the world's population has soared by 132 percent, while the world's cropland has increased by only 19 percent.

Complications relating to pregnancy and childbirth are among the leading causes of mortality among reproductive-age women in many parts of the developing world. Nearly 600,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes—about one every minute—99 percent of them in developing countries.

An estimated 160 million children today are considered to be malnourished. A recent report by the International Food Policy Research Institute estimates that 20 years from now the number of malnourished will decline to 135 million—a decrease of only 15 percent.

Ten million children died before reaching their fifth birthday in 1998, and nearly 8 million of them did not reach their first birthday. About 98 percent of child deaths occurred in developing countries, with the least-developed countries accounting for a third of all deaths under age 5.

Thirty million new jobs must be found each year for the next 50 years in order to keep pace with projected population growth, according to a special report by the Worldwatch Institute.

At the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development, or ICPD, 179 nations approved the Cairo Program of Action, a blueprint for preventing world population from doubling again as it has in the

last 40 years. To achieve a sustainable future, it is important to implement the Cairo document—especially in the areas of ensuring universal access to family planning; achieving greater male responsibility in sexual and reproductive behavior and parenthood; and eradicating female illiteracy and increasing employment opportunities for women, both of which would lead to gender equality and smaller family size.

The key to implementing the ICPD Program for Action is the mobilization of resources for population and family planning programs. It appears unlikely that the ICPD goal of raising \$17 billion for reproductive-health and family-planning activities by this year will be reached. According to a report by the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health, the consequences of the failure to meet this goal include: an estimated additional 42 million unintended pregnancies, 17 million induced abortions and 90,000 maternal deaths.

By cutting back on its international population assistance from nearly \$600 million in fiscal 1995 to \$385 million in the current fiscal year, the U.S. government has ill-served the cause of stabilizing world population. As the world's only remaining superpower, the United States has abrogated its leadership in one of the most crucial issues of our time. The result has been a domino effect, with other nations choosing to follow the U.S. lead and reduce their population-assistance budgets. There is a ray of hope that the situation will change. The White House has signaled that it will seek to restore U.S. International population spending to its fiscal 1995 level of nearly \$600 million. Additionally, Congress, after failing to appropriate any contribution at all to the U.N. Fund for Population Activities in fiscal 1999, has voted to contribute \$25 million to the fund in fiscal 2000 and again in fiscal 2001.

In the final analysis, it is the childbearing decisions of 3 billion young people—who will reach their reproductive years within the next generation—that ultimately will determine whether world population will level off at the lowest possible figure that can be reached through voluntary family planning and humane interventions. At stake will be the kind of world they want for themselves and their children.

MEDICARE BOARD—HISTORY SHOWS IT'S A BAD IDEA

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 21, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, S. 1895, the Premium Support Medicare reform bill being pushed by PhRMA, many HMOs and private insurers proposes a revolutionary change in the administration of the program. It proposes to set up a seven-person board to administer the program and to control the existing Medicare Program within the Department of Health and Human Services. Presumably many of the people pushing the idea expect to be on the board, as part of a plan to turn Medicare over to private interests.

Guess what? A Board of seven people doing the job now done by one administrator will not be as efficient or cheap as the current program.

Who says? History.

Following is a portion of a memo from the Library of Congress's Congressional Research Service that describes our Nation's experience

with a Social Security board between 1935 and 1937. As the memo reports,

* * * The board system led to indecision, delay, and guerrilla warfare among certain of the top staff and their followers within the bureau.

Those who don't learn from history are condemned to repeat the mistakes of the past. A board is a bad idea of a way to run a \$220 billion government agency.

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD AS CASE STUDY

The Social Security program is unusual in that throughout its more than half century of existence it has been administered by a full-time, three member board and by a single administrator. It has enjoyed a status as an independent agency, as that term is used in this report, a unit within an independent agency, and finally, an agency within an executive department. It is also unusual in that there is a study available on the administrative history of its brief period being managed by a full-time board, a situation not unlike that being proposed in S. 1895. What follows briefly outlines the complex of events and decisions related to its early organization and operations.

During the 73rd Congress, the first of the New Deal, various pension and unemployment bills were introduced. President Franklin Roosevelt, in response to this interest, established (by Executive Order 6757) a Committee on Economic Security (CES). The Committee consisted of federal officials and was chaired by the Secretary of Labor, Frances Perkins. The Committee was supported by a Technical Board headed by Arthur Altmeyer, and an Advisory Council consisting of 23 labor, employer, and public representatives. Both the Technical Board and the Advisory Council had subcommittees. The CES had a research staff, headed by Edwin Witte, that was used jointly by the full committee, the Technical Board, and the Advisory Council.¹⁸

The CES and its support groups met for six months and submitted its report to the President.¹⁹ While not all the recommendations of the CES were ultimately to be included in the Social Security Act, the Act did incorporate the basic recommendations of the Committee.

The bulk of CES's discussion and its report was concerned with substantive matters respecting old-age insurance and unemployment compensation. Relatively little discussion was forthcoming on administrative organization. On the administration of the Social Security program, the CES recommended the following to the President.

The creation of a social insurance board within the Department of Labor, to be appointed by the President and with terms to insure continuity of administration, is recommended to administer the Federal unemployment compensation act and the system of federal contributory old age annuities.

Full responsibility for the safeguarding and investment of all social insurance funds, we recommend, should be vested in the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Federal Emergency Relief Administration is recommended as the most appropriate existing agency for the administration of non-contributory old-age pensions and grants-in-aid to dependent children. If this agency should be abolished, the President should designate the distribution of its work.

¹⁸For a discussion and diagram of the organization of the Committee on Economic Security, consult: Mary Trackett Reynolds, Interdepartmental Committees in the National Administration (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), pp. 28-43.

¹⁹U.S. Committee on Economic Security, Report to the President (Washington: GPO, 1935).

It is recommended that all social welfare activities of the Federal Government be coordinated and systematized.²⁰

The President submitted a bill to Congress in January 1935, and it was given immediate consideration. When the bill emerged from the House Ways and Means Committee, there had been major alterations. As related in Paul Douglas's extended legislative history:

The administrative responsibilities were, in certain vital respects, altered. The Social Security Board was removed from the Department of Labor and was given independent powers of appointing and fixing the compensation of members of its staff. This was, of course, a defeat for the secretary of Labor. The administration of the grants for old age pensions, or old age assistance, was taken from the Federal Relief Administration, as was originally proposed, and was given instead to the Social Security Board. This board was also entrusted with the work of supervising and directing the systems of old age insurance and unemployment insurance. A relative unification of social insurance functions in an independent body was, therefore, proposed. The Board's powers were also increased by giving to it, rather than the Relief Administration, the administration of the allowances for dependent children, and the so-called mother's pensions. The Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor, however, was still kept in charge of grants for the health care of mothers and infants and of those for crippled children.²¹

When the bill was considered by the Senate Finance Committee, the Social Security Board was again placed under the Department of Labor instead of being independent. Justification for this switch was that in most other nations the administration of old age insurance was under a labor department and because administrative costs would be less under a department. The Committee was opposed to creating new, independent agencies with functions closely related to those of an existing department.²²

In conference committee, the location of the agency was shifted once again, this time to an independent status, a status that remained in the finally approved bill. The Social Security Board (Board) was outlined in Title VII of the Social Security Act (49 Stat. 620). The Board consisted of three members, not more than two were to be from the same political party. They were to be full-time officers of the federal government. Their staggered terms were to be six years in duration. The chairman of the Board was to be appointed by the President. The Board was to organize its own staff and fix necessary compensation.

The CES stated, in its backup papers, that:

The advantages of an independent board were considered numerous and important. The membership of the board should include outstanding persons in the field of social insurance administration whose services could be procured with difficulty if they were offered positions as lesser officials in any department. In the interests of the insured population, both in the formulation of regulations and in the development of new policies and practices, the board should be a non-political organization, protected as far as possible from political influence, even such as might arise from an executive department under a politically minded administration.²³

²⁰Ibid., p. 7.

²¹Paul E. Douglas, *Social Security in the United States: An Analysis and Appraisal of the Federal Social Security Act* (New York: Whittlesey House, 1936), pp. 105-06.

²²Ibid., p. 114.

²³U.S. Social Security Board [for the Committee on Economic Security]. *Social Security in America: The Factual Background of the Social Security as*