
THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION WAS ORGANIZED 108 YEARS AGO, AND NOW ENJOYS A MEMBERSHIP OF SOME 52,000 NATIONAL AND AFFILIATE MEMBERS. APHA HAS HAD AND CONTIVES TO HAVE A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON HEALTH STANDARDS, POLICY, AND LEGISLATION IN THE UNITED STATES -- AND WORLDWIDE THROUGH THE ACTIVITIES OF OUR INTERNATIONAL HEALTH DIVISION. WE HAVE 55 FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES, AND A 1980 BUDGET OF SOME $2.4 MILLION -- BOTH EXCLUSIVE OF INTERNATIONAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES. APHA PUBLISHES 1) THE PRESTIGIOUS AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PUBLIC HEALTH; 2) THE NATION'S HEALTH (A MONTHLY NEWSPAPER REPORTING ON CURRENT HEALTH LEGISLATION AND POLICY ISSUES); AND 3) THE WASHINGTON NEWSLETTER, WHICH PROVIDES THE LATEST SUMMARY OF HEALTH-RELATED LEGISLATION AND ACTIVITIES DIRECT FROM THE NATION'S CAPITOL AND FEDERAL AGENCIES.

WE HAVE 25 DIFFERENT SECTIONS WHICH RUN THE GAMUT OF ALL PUBLIC HEALTH CONCERNS AND PROVIDE FORUMS FOR DIVERSE INTERESTS AND DISCUSSIONS.
THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION SECTION ON ENVIRONMENT IS ONE OF THE OLDEST COMPONENTS OF THE ASSOCIATION AND HAS HAD A SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH STANDARDS AND POLICIES THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES FOR MANY YEARS. APHA PUBLISHES A VARIETY OF BOOKS, SUCH AS "CONTROL OF COMMUNICABLE DISEASE IN MAN", "STANDARDS FOR HEALTH SERVICES IN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS", "STANDARD METHODS", AND MANY OTHERS.

MORE THAN 12,000 INDIVIDUALS ATTENDED OUR 1979 ANNUAL MEETING AND APPROXIMATELY 9,000 ATTENDED THE 1980 ANNUAL MEETING IN DETROIT. THE 1981 ANNUAL MEETING WILL BE HELD IN LOS ANGELES, ON NOVEMBER 1-6.

THE PURPOSE OF THE APHA IS TO PROTECT AND PROMOTE PERSONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH, AND THIS IS THE COMMON GOAL AND THREAD FOR THE AFFILIATES AND THE APHA.


THE AMERICAN PUBLIC HEALTH ASSOCIATION HAS ALWAYS GIVEN FULL CONSIDERATION TO POLICY STATEMENTS DEVELOPED AND PROPOSED BY THE
SECTION ON ENVIRONMENT OR THE PREVIOUS SECTION ON ENGINEERING AND SANITATION. THE APHA POLICY MANUAL IS REPLETE WITH ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH STATEMENTS RANGING FROM AIR POLLUTION, RADIATION PROTECTION, NOISE POLLUTION CONTROL, SAFE DRINKING WATER, SOLID WASTES, HAZARDOUS WASTES, ISSUES OF FOOD PROTECTION, MILK SANITATION, INSECT AND RODENT CONTROL, OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY, AND MANY OTHERS. MANY OF THESE STATEMENTS MAY NEED UP-DATING, BUT THAT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECTION ON ENVIRONMENT.

I HAVE SERVED ON THE APHA EXECUTIVE BOARD SINCE 1975, AND WAS ON THE GOVERNING COUNCIL SEVERAL YEARS PRIOR TO THAT. I CAN ASSURE THAT MEMBERS OF BOTH BODIES ARE ALWAYS MOST INTERESTED IN, AND SUPPORTIVE OF, SOUND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH MEASURES. I HAPPENED TO BE THE CHIEF SPOKES-PERSON FOR APHA AT THE TIME THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY WAS BEING CONSIDERED AND DESIGNED. I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT APHA HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN ALL MAJOR ISSUES SINCE THEN, SUCH AS THE CLEAN AIR ACT, SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT, THE SUPERFUND, AND SCORES OF OTHERS.

THIS YEAR, THE NO. 1 LEGISLATIVE PRIORITY FOR THE APHA IS THE RE-AUTHORIZATION OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT. I WAS ONE OF THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR RECOMMENDING THE APPOINTMENT OF DR. JOHN W. HERNANDEZ TO PRESIDENT REAGAN'S ENVIRONMENTAL transition TEAM. WE WERE ACTIVE IN OPPOSING THE CONFIRMATION OF ONE JAMES GAIUS WATT AS SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR. WE ARE CURRENTLY MAKING IT WELL KNOWN THAT WE OPPOSE THE CONFIRMATION OF ANNE GORSUCH AS ADMINISTRATOR OF EPA ON THE GROUNDS THAT SHE HAS NO MANAGERIAL OR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH BACKGROUND AND WOULD, IN FACT, BE ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF THE "FOX IN THE HEN HOUSE". ABOUT A MONTH AGO I WROTE TO KEY MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES OPPOSING THE SELECTION OF
DR. C. EVERETT KOOP, A PEDIATRIC SURGEON, ON THE GROUNDS THAT HE HAS NOT QUALIFIED IN TERMS OF INTEREST, EDUCATION, OR EXPERIENCE, TO BE THE SURGEON GENERAL -- THE CHIEF PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER OF THIS NATION -- THE CHIEF OF THE COMMISSIONED CORP OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, AND THE CHIEF NATIONAL SPOKESPERSON ON HEALTH ISSUES. WE HAVE GAINED CONSIDERABLE BACKING ON THE OPPOSITION TO DR. KOOP FROM THE WASHINGTON POST, EDITORIAL SUPPORT FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, NEWS INTEREST FROM NBC TELEVISION, AND VERY SIGNIFICANT INTEREST FROM THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. WE MIGHT ACTUALLY WIN THAT ONE.

I SHOULD GIVE PARTICULAR CREDIT TO KATHERINE McCARTER, THE ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR GOVERNMENT RELATIONS. KATHERINE IS A ENVIRONMENTALIST FIRST, A KNOWLEDGEABLE LOBBYIST, A PERSON WHO HAS EXCELLENT RAPPORT AND CONTACTS WITH KEY CONGRESSIONAL STAFF MEMBERS, AND A PERSON WHO IS HIGHLY RESPECTED NOT ONLY "ON THE HILL", BUT BY OTHER HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS IN THE WASHINGTON AREA.

PERHAPS THAT IS ENOUGH FOR NOW ABOUT THE INTEREST AND ROLE OF THE APHA IN ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH ISSUES. I WOULD BE GLAD TO DISCUSS ANY SPECIFIC POINTS IF THERE ARE QUESTIONS LATER. I DO, HOWEVER, WANT TO SPEND SOME MORE TIME DEALING WITH THE ISSUES OF PREVENTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH IN A MORE GENERAL SENSE.

MANY OF US OLD-TIME PUBLIC HEALTHERS HAVE NEVER LOST SIGHT OF THE NEED FOR PREVENTION, THE VALUE OF PREVENTION, AND THE COST-BENEFIT DESIRABILITY OF PREVENTION. WE HAVE WATCHED WITH FRUSTRATION AND DISMAY WHILE STAGGERING BILLIONS HAVE BEEN POURED INTO THE SICKNESS TREATMENT SYSTEM OF OUR COMMUNITIES, STATES AND NATION, WITH UNSATISFACTORY (THOUGH EXPENSIVE) ATTENDANT IMPACT ON THE
HEALTH STATUS OF OUR CITIZENS. IT WAS ERRONEOUSLY CONCLUDED THAT TREATING HEALTH PROBLEMS WAS ALONE SUFFICIENT TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH STATUS OF OUR CITIZENS. OUR CITIZENS AND POLITICAL LEADERS ARE NOW SEEING THAT THE SICKNESS TREATMENT METHODOLOGY AND EXPENSES HAVE NOT BEEN SUFFICIENTLY EFFECTIVE.

DURING THE LAST TEN TO TWENTY YEARS, SICKNESS TREATMENT COSTS HAVE ESCALATED AND SKYROCKETED TO THE END THAT SUCH COSTS HAVE BECOME A SERIOUS ECONOMIC PROBLEM WHICH HAS BECOME A PRIORITY ISSUE FOR OUR HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS, OUR POLITICAL LEADERS, HEALTH CARE OFFICIALS, AND OUR HEALTH PLANNING GROUPS. WITHIN THE PAST FEW YEARS, OUR POLITICAL LEADERS HAVE FINALLY REALIZED THAT CONTROLLING HEALTH COSTS DEPENDS ON KEEPING PEOPLE HEALTHY. THEY HAVE REALIZED THAT WE MUST BUILD A CONSCIENCE FOR DISEASE PREVENTION, HEALTH PROMOTION, AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY. THEY HAVE BEEN ADVISED THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE SPENDING INCREASING PILES OF SICKNESS TREATMENT DOLLARS WITH LITTLE OVERALL IMPACT ON HEALTH STATUS UNLESS WE IMPROVE OUR PREVENTION EFFORTS. THEY ARE INCREASINGLY RECOGNIZING THAT ANY NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM WILL BE DOOMED TO FAILURE AND SPIRALLING COSTS WITHOUT MORE EFFECTIVE DISEASE PREVENTION AND HEALTH PROMOTION MEASURES AS A PRE-REQUISITE. OUR LEADERS KNOW THAT NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT SUCH MEASURES WILL BE ANOTHER EXPENSIVE EXPERIMENT IN THE MATTER OF MISPLACED PRIORITIES AND IMPROPER TIMING. AND OUR CITIZENS ARE FINALLY RECOGNIZING THAT WE MUST STOP EXPECTING MEDICINE TO BAIL US OUT FROM THE CONSEQUENCES OF OUR OWN FOOLISHNESS, AND THAT WE MUST STOP WAITING FOR TRAGEDY BEFORE TAKING ACTION. HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES SECRETARY RICHARD SCHWEIKER HAS STATED THAT "HE'D LIKE TO BE KNOWN AS THE PERSON WHO PUT 'PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE AND PREVENTIVE MEDICINE' AT THE TOP OF
THE FEDERAL HEALTH AGENDA. He also emphasizes better health education.

Within the past 10 to 15 years, Congress and state and local governing bodies have enacted numerous laws designed to protect human health by managing the environment. Many of these laws have gone even further and have dealt with such related issues as visibility, water clarity, property damage, and plant and animal life. All these laws were enacted in response to the evident public clamor for a healthy environment. The struggle for a quality environment takes place in many arenas, and after the legislative arena, the confrontations have shifted to the regulation promulgation arena where those interests which failed to win legislative battles are looking for another opportunity to weaken or undermine environmental health programs.

Some of these pollution interests would have us choose a course which not only sacrifices the public’s right to good health, but has the ultimate effect of increasing medical, hospital, and insurance bills. Now, some of the official inflation fighters have targeted environmental and occupational measures for their criticism while admitting that they really have no cost data on environmental and occupational diseases. Since these economic experts don’t know the costs, they won’t consider them in a cost-benefit equation. And still worse, they seem to reject any responsibility for gathering the data on the effects of environmental disease and disability, inefficiency, morale, comfort, quality of life, life-span, absenteeism, insurance rates, Medicaid and Medicare budgets, and other health care costs. It does seem reasonable, however, that we should be able to save some portion of the annual more-than-$100 billion cancer, heart, and lung disease bill by controlling the environmental causes of these diseases.
WE HAVE A LONG WAY TO GO IN SHARPENING AND UTILIZING THE TOOLS OF ENVIRONMENTAL EPIDEMIOLOGY TO BETTER IDENTIFY THE HEALTH EFFECTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHEMICALS AND STRESSES.

OUR POLITICAL LEADERS LARGELY IGNORE THE ISSUE OF POPULATION STABILIZATION, WHICH (AND WHILE FREQUENTLY AN EMOTIONAL ISSUE) IS AN ABSOLUTE NECESSITY FOR THE HUMAN ANIMAL TO THRIVE IN BALANCE WITH THE RESOURCES OF HIS ENVIRONMENT -- INCLUDING ENERGY SUPPLIES. THE HUMAN SPECIES, EITHER THROUGH RATIONAL BEHAVIOR OR ENVIRONMENTAL LIMITATION, MUST AND WILL BE LIMITED. THE PLAGUE OF OUR ENERGY ADDICTED AND STARVED SOCIETY MAY WELL PORTRAY A SYSTEM THAT HAS FILLED ITS "ECOLOGICAL NICHE". THE SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF OVER-PopULATION ARE EVIDENT DAILY.

RECENT PUBLIC OPINION SURVEYS HAVE CONTINUED TO INDICATE THAT AMERICANS FAVOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION EVEN AT A PRICE.

THE MAJORITY OF AMERICANS SAY THEY FAVOR EFFORTS TO CONTROL POLLUTION AND PROTECT ENDANGERED SPECIES DESPITE CONCERNS OVER THE ECONOMY AND ENERGY SUPPLY, ACCORDING TO A 1980 SURVEY COMMISSIONED BY THE PRESIDENT'S COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND THREE OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES. THE POLL FOUND THAT 55% OF THOSE SURVEYED SAID THEIR VIEWS WERE SYMPATHETIC TOWARD THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT, WHILE 7% WERE ACTIVE IN IT. 83% SAID THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD SCREEN NEW CHEMICALS FOR SAFETY BEFORE THEY ARE ALLOWED TO GO ON THE MARKET EVEN IF DOING SO MIGHT KEEP POTENTIALLY USEFUL CHEMICALS AWAY FROM THE PUBLIC. SOLAR ENERGY WAS CHOSEN BY 61% OF THE POPULATION AS THE ENERGY SOURCE ON WHICH THE NATION SHOULD PLAN FOR THE FUTURE. AND THE POLL ALSO
INDICATED THAT THE NATION SHOULD NOT PLAN FOR ANY NEW NUCLEAR PLANTS, BUT CONTINUE USING THOSE IN OPERATION OR CURRENTLY UNDER CONSTRUCTION. 73% SAID THAT AN ENDANGERED SPECIES MUST BE PROTECTED EVEN AT THE EXPENSE OF COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES. 61% OF THOSE POLLED FELT THAT WE SHOULD CONCENTRATE THE MOST ON DEVELOPMENT OF SOLAR ENERGY, WHILE ONLY 23% THOUGHT WE SHOULD CONCENTRATE THE MOST ON NUCLEAR ENERGY. FURTHER, MOST OF THOSE POLLED THOUGHT SOLAR ENERGY WOULD TAKE LESS EFFORT TO DEVELOP THAN NUCLEAR ENERGY.

THERE IS NO DOUBT THAT ENVIRONMENTAL MEASURES CONTRIBUTE TO INFLATION, BUT ONLY MODERATELY. A 1978 CHASE ECONOMETRICS STUDY CONCLUDED THAT EPA PROGRAMS ADD AN AVERAGE OF BETWEEN 0.3 AND 0.4 PERCENT ANNUALLY TO THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.

WHATEVER PUBLIC BACKLASH HAS DEVELOPED AGAINST ENVIRONMENTAL MEASURES WOULD APPEAR TO BE AIMED MORE TOWARD QUESTIONABLE REGULATORY METHODS THAN AGAINST THE BASIC STATUTES AND THE GOAL OF A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT. THIS BEHOOVES REGULATION PROMULGATING AUTHORITIES TO UTILIZE RATIONAL AND ACCEPTABLE METHODS AND STRICTLY FOLLOW THE STATUTORY INTENT. BUT THOSE PROTESTING REGULATIONS MUST BE REMINDED THAT REGULATIONS ARE MANDATED NOT BY BUREAUCRATS, BUT BY CONGRESSMEN AND LEGISLATORS ELECTED BY THE CITIZENRY.

U. S. Senator Gary Hart, of Colorado, recently noted that, "PUBLIC SUPPORT OF AIR QUALITY IS STRONGER THAN EVER BEFORE, BUT PUBLIC FRUSTRATION WITH GOVERNMENT REGULATION IS ALSO STRONGER. A MAJOR CHALLENGE BEFORE US IS TO SATISFY BOTH OF THESE POPULAR DEMANDS: CLEANER AIR AND LESS BURDENSOME REGULATIONS." PERHAPS GREATER UTILIZATION OF ECONOMIC INCENTIVES SUCH AS A "POLLUTION TAX" SHOULD BE EFFECTED. THIS IS A METHODOLOGY WHICH HAS NOT BEEN WELL-UTILIZED.
However, limited experience in the Delaware River Basin has indicated that taxes could reduce water pollution as much as current regulations, but at only half the cost.

It has become increasingly important, but perhaps not more common, for environmental health agencies to have their own economists to study cost-benefits of existing and proposed requirements and to counter as necessary some of the ridiculous economic claims of those interests opposed to environmental controls. A November, 1979 abstract of a paper entitled, "Putting Environmental Economics in Perspective: Case Study of Four Corners Power Plant, New Mexico", by John R. Bartlit, D.Ch.E., published in the American Journal of Public Health, states that, "Environmental control costs can be made to appear much larger in impact than they actually are by placing costs in misleading contexts or failing to provide perspective. It is essential for continued public support of environmental health programs that this practice be countered by more meaningful presentations of economic data. As an example, analytic methods appropriate to the case of a large coal-fired power plant in northwestern New Mexico are developed and discussed. Pollution control expenditures at the Four Corners Power Plant were presented as costing $82 million annually. Although this figure may be the correct one, data were collected and analyzed to show that this cost represented an increase of only 5 to 60 cents on a $100 electricity bill for the consumer of electricity".

Many of us remember the "olden" days when the vast majority of environmental health programs were organized within the framework of the then traditional state public health departments, but with emphasis on consumer protection, comprehensive programming, organizational visibility, importance of citizen input and participation,
AND EFFECTIVE REGULATORY ACTIONS, THE ORGANIZATIONAL PICTURE HAS
CHANGED RADICALLY WITHIN THE PAST DECADE. PUBLIC AND POLITICAL
CLAMOR, AND CONCERN OVER THE RAPIDLY DETERIORATING ENVIRONMENT
IN THE LATE 1960s CAUSED A WIDESPREAD RE-EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH PROBLEMS, PROGRAM GOALS, PROGRAM SUPPORT, PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS,
AS WELL AS ORGANIZATIONAL SETTINGS. PROGRAMS WERE SHIFTED TO NEW
AND/OR DIFFERENT AGENCIES FOR A VARIETY OF REASONS -- SOME VALID,
AND SOME QUESTIONABLE. EAGER CITIZEN ENVIRONMENTALISTS AND CITIZEN
ACTION GROUPS SOMETIMES CONFUSED CHANGE WITH PROGRESS. PUBLIC
HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICIALS GENERALLY EXHIBITED A
HIGH DEGREE OF TERRITORIAL DEFENSE AND RELATIVELY LOW TITER OF
ORGANIZATIONAL PROGRAM MANAGEMENT KNOWLEDGE. POWERFUL POLLUTER
LOYBYISTS DELIGHTED IN THE OPPORTUNITY TO RETARD AND CONFUSE ENVIRON-
MENTAL HEALTH MEASURES THROUGH REPEATED REORGANIZATIONS AND BY
PLACING HEALTH PERSONNEL AND PROGRAMS IN POSITIONS OF GREATER "POLITICAL
RESPONSIVENESS".

REGARDLESS OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL PLACEMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH, THE GOAL SHOULD BE TO INSURE AN ENVIRONMENT THAT WILL CONFER
OPTIMAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ON THIS AND FUTURE GENERATIONS. THE
MISSION SHOULD BE ONE OF CITIZEN AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION RATHER
_THAN ENVIRONMENTAL UTILIZATION AND DEVELOPMENT. SOME ENVIRONMENTAL
HEALTH AGENCIES HAVE NOT FULLY DEVELOPED THE CONCEPT OF MISSION
AND HAVE BEEN READY PREY FOR THOSE POLLUTERS AND OTHERS THEY ARE
CHARGED WITH REGULATING. THIS HAS SOMETIMES RESULTED IN THE ENVIRON-
MENTAL HEALTH AGENCIES PROTECTING OR PROMOTING THE INTERESTS OF
THOSE THEY ARE CHARGED WITH REGULATING.
IT IS INCREASINGLY IMPORTANT TO REALIZE THAT THE CONCERN OF ENVIRONMENTALISTS WITH WILDLIFE AND THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IS A SOUND MANIFESTATION OF INTEREST IN THE ENTIRE NATURAL SYSTEM OF WHICH THE HUMAN ANIMAL IS A PART, AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS ON WILDLIFE SERVE AS AN "EARLY WARNING" OR "PREVIEW OF COMING ATTRACTIONS" IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE KNOWN AND PROVEN ECOLOGICAL MAXIM THAT "EVERYTHING IS CONNECTED TO EVERYTHING ELSE". AND CITIZENS ARE LEARNING THAT SOUND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH MEASURES MUST BE FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW -- NOT JUST TOMORROW.


HEALTH PROFESSIONALS SHOULD SUPPORT SPECIFIC NATIONAL AND GLOBAL ACTIONS AND AGREEMENTS TO STABILIZE HUMAN POPULATION LEVELS THROUGH SUCH MECHANISMS AS EDUCATION, RACIAL JUSTICE, SEXUAL EQUALITY, TECHNOLOGICAL SHARING, BIRTH CONTROL, RE-ORIENTATION OF SOCIAL VALUES AND ATTITUDES, DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH AND PLANNING, AND ECONOMIC AND FISCAL POLICIES AND INCENTIVES.

ENERGY FOR HOMES, INDUSTRIES, AND TRANSPORTATION FROM NON-POLLUTING, RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES IS THE FINAL MAJOR ISSUE HAVING AN IMPACT
ON ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROBLEMS. FOR A NUMBER OF REASONS INCLUDING INDUSTRY MONOPOLIES, UNION AGREEMENTS, AND GOVERNMENT CONFLICTS-OF-INTEREST, THE NATION HAS NOT MADE EVEN A GOOD TOKEN COMMITMENT TO SOLAR RESOURCES.

UNDERLYING THE PREVIOUSLY-MENTIONED ISSUES ARE IGNORANCE AND POVERTY WHICH MUST BE ADDRESSED AND SOLVED FOR THERE TO BE SUBSTANTIAL, PERMANENT, LONG-RANGE PROGRESS TOWARD OUR GOAL OF "AN ENVIRONMENT THAT WILL CONFER OPTIMAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ON THIS AND FUTURE GENERATIONS", OR FOR PEOPLE TO DIE YOUNG AS LATE IN LIFE AS POSSIBLE.

WITH REGARD TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE ECONOMY, LET US NOT BE MISLED INTO A PROCESS OF "VERSUS" OR "EITHER-OR". A QUALITY ENVIRONMENT AND HEALTHY ECONOMY ARE NOT CONTRADICTORY EXPECTATIONS, AND, IN FACT, ARE MUTUALLY INTERDEPENDENT. WE CAN'T HAVE AN ECONOMY WITHOUT AN ENVIRONMENT. "ECOLOGY" AND "ECONOMY" ARE BOTH DERIVATIVES OF THE GREEK WORD "ECOS" (OIKOS) WHICH MEANS HOUSE. AN ECONOMIST WAS A KEEPER OF THE HOUSE, AND AN ECOLOGIST IS A KEEPER OF THE BIG HOUSE IN WHICH WE ALL LIVE -- OR OUR ENVIRONMENT -- THE PLACE IN WHICH WE ARE ALL GOING TO SPEND THE REST OF OUR LIVES.

IT IS A MATTER OF SERIOUS CONCERN THAT THE HUMAN ANIMAL SOMETIMES SEEMS MORE WILLING TO SUFFER THE HEALTH, SOCIAL, AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF DISEASE AND POLLUTION THAN TO PAY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH FOR THIS AND FUTURE GENERATIONS. PERHAPS THE HUMAN ANIMAL CAN SLIGHTLY ADAPT TO SOME DEGREE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DEGRADATION, BUT IT IS INDEED ALARMING THAT THE HUMAN ANIMAL MIGHT ATTEMPT TO MERELY SURVIVE THROUGH ADAPTATION RATHER THAN THRIVE THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.
IT WOULD BE INAPPROPRIATE TO INTERPRET THE RECENT ELECTION AS A MANDATE TO REPEAL CERTAIN OF OUR HARD-WON ENVIRONMENTAL AND PERSONAL HEALTH MEASURES AND PROGRAMS. NATIONAL SURVEYS HAVE CONTINUED TO INDICATE THAT THE MAJORITY OF OUR CITIZENS STILL FAVOR EFFECTIVE POLLUTION CONTROL MEASURES. 1980 ELECTION-DAY RESULTS THROUGHOUT THE NATION INDICATED VOTER APPROVAL OF LOCAL BOND ISSUES, MOST OF WHICH WERE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION FACILITIES RELATING TO WATER POLLUTION CONTROL AND WASTE DISPOSAL. NO TURN TO THE RIGHT OR TURNING BACK THE CLOCK HERE!

THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION HAS NOW BEEN IN POWER FOR ALMOST FOUR MONTHS AND WE NOW HAVE A GOOD IDEA OF WHAT THEY PROPOSE TO DO REGARDING HEALTH FUNDING PROGRAMS AND POLICIES. IN A NUTSHELL, WE IN THE APHA BELIEVE THAT IT CAN ONLY BE LABELLED AS "DISASTROUS". IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING LAST FALL'S ELECTION, SOME OF US MISTAKENLY HOPEd THAT REAGAN'S CAMPAIGN RHETORIC WAS MORE CONSERVATIVE AND HARD-LINED THAN HIS ACTUAL POLICIES WOULD BE. NOW WE ARE FORCED TO ADMIT THAT WE WERE MISTAKEN, AND THAT THE OPPOSITE IS TRUE. WE FEEL HE PROPOSES TO LITERALLY "GUT" HEALTH PROGRAMS THROUGHOUT THE NATION. HIS ABSURD RECOMMENDATIONS RANGE FROM FAMILY PLANNING, COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS, CUTS IN EPA AND OSHA, THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE GROUPS, THROUGH PHASING OUT HEALTH PLANNING, SUPPORT FOR PSROs, HEALTH MAINTENANCE ORGANIZATIONS, AND ON TO A 20% REDUCTION IN THE HAZARDOUS WASTE SUPER-FUND, A 27% REDUCTION IN SURFACE MINING INSPECTIONS, SLASHES IN THE WASTEWATER TREATMENT GRANT PROGRAM, ATTACKS ON THE CLEAN AIR ACT, TO DE-FUNDING THE VERY INCUBATORS OF PUBLIC HEALTH PROFESSIONALS -- OUR SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH.

IT IS IRONIC AND INTERESTING TO NOTE THAT PRESIDENT REAGAN PROBABLY WOULD NOT HAVE SURVIVED THE RECENT ASSASSINATION ATTEMPT HAD IT
NOT BEEN FOR A MEDICAL SYSTEM AT GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY IN
WASHINGTON, D.C., BUILT TO A LARGE EXTENT WITH FEDERAL FUNDS.
THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SYSTEMS PROGRAM WHICH HELPED ORGANIZE GEORGE
WASHINGTON'S "LEVEL I TRAUMA CENTER", WOULD BE ENDED, AND SIMILAR
PROGRAMS IN OTHER STATES MIGHT BE DISCONTINUED WITH LIMITED FEDERAL
BLOCK GRANT FUNDS, UNDER REAGAN'S COST-CUTTING PROGRAM. THE ADMIN-
ISTRATION'S BLOCK GRANT PROPOSALS ARE ALSO DISASTROUS. (FURTHER
DISCUSSION HERE).

HE HAS ALSO APPOINTED OR NOMINATED INCREDULOUSLY UNQUALIFIED
PERSONNEL FOR KEY POSITIONS, SUCH AS THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE EPA,
THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY, THE
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AND THE SURGEON GENERAL. WE HAVE GONE
ON RECORD AS OPPOSING MOST OF THESE AND HAVE BEEN PARTICULARLY
ACTIVE IN OPPOSING THE APPOINTMENT OF A PEDIATRIC SURGEON WITH
NO PREVIOUS INTEREST OR EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD OF PUBLIC HEALTH
AS SURGEON GENERAL. WITH REGARD TO THE APPOINTMENT OF THE SURGEON
GENERAL, WE HAVE PICKED UP SERIOUS INTEREST FROM THE WASHINGTON
POST, EDITORIAL SUPPORT FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES, NEWS INTEREST
BY NBC TELEVISION, AND, MORE IMPORTANTLY, THE INTEREST OF THE UNITED
STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. WHILE WE DID NOT PRETEND THAT
WE COULD PREVENT THE APPOINTMENT OF THE OTHER UNQUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS
I MENTIONED, THERE IS SOME SLIGHT CHANCE THAT WE MAY PREVENT THE
APPOINTMENT OF DR. C. EVERETT KOOP, PEDIATRIC SURGEON, AS SURGEON
GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE.

PERHAPS IN CLOSING, IT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE THAT I READ MY
MOST RECENT PRESIDENT'S COLUMN WHICH WILL APPEAR IN THE NATION'S
HEALTH IN A FEW WEEKS.
RECENTLY, FORMER APHA PRESIDENT MILT TERRIS, M.D., SUGGESTED THAT, "REAGAN'S HEALTH BUDGET IS HAZARDOUS TO THE NATION'S HEALTH". ONE DOES NOT NEED AN IN-DEPTH REVIEW TO DETERMINE THAT STATEMENT IS INDEED FACTUAL. CUTS IN BUDGETS AND ATTACKS ON CAREFULLY-DEVELOPED HEALTH AND SAFETY REGULATIONS AND PROGRAMS ARE BEING MADE BY THE REAGAN ADMINISTRATION WITHOUT ANY CONCEPT OF THEIR EFFECTS ON PEOPLE AND THE ENVIRONMENT IN WHICH THEY LIVE. WHEN ONE VIEWS THE ATTACKS PRESIDENT REAGAN AND HIS KEY APPOINTEES ARE MAKING ON BASIC PERSONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAMS AND FUNDING, ONE MUST BE CONVINCED THAT THE PRESIDENT TRULY BELIEVES THAT WE MUST HAVE A SICK ENVIRONMENT TO HAVE A HEALTHY ECONOMY.

WHEN PRESIDENT REAGAN WAS FIRST ELECTED I MISTAKENLY SUGGESTED IN A PRESIDENT'S COLUMN THAT HE MIGHT BE MORE MODERATE THAN HIS CAMPAIGN RHETORIC WOULD HAVE SUGGESTED. JUST THE OPPOSITE HAS BEEN TRUE, AND HIS MEASURES STAND TO SERIOUSLY UNDERCUT AND DAMAGE THE PUBLIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SYSTEMS IN THIS NATION. THE APHA HAS SOME TYPE OF MEMBERSHIP OR AFFILIATED MEMBERSHIP CONTACT WITH SOME 52,000 HEALTH PROFESSIONALS IN THIS NATION. I CANNOT RECOMMEND TOO STRONGLY THAT ALL OF THESE INDIVIDUALS IMMEDIATELY MOBILIZE TO MAKE THEIR CONCERNS KNOWN TO THEIR OWN CONGRESSMEN AND SPECIFIC COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS CHARGED WITH REVIEWING PERSONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH BUDGETS AND LEGISLATION. WHILE A DETAILED KNOWLEDGE OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED DAMAGE IS DESIRABLE, IT WOULD INDEED BE HELPFUL IF LETTERS AND TELEGRAMS TO CONGRESSIONAL LEADERS SIMPLY INDICATED OPINIONS THAT THE BUDGET CUTS ARE INAPPROPRIATE, HARMFUL TO THE NATION'S HEALTH, AND PENNY-WISE AND POUND-FOOLISH IN THE LONG RUN. THE DAMAGES RESULTING
FROM SOME OF THESE CUTS IN PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES SUCH AS THE VARIOUS PREVENTION PROGRAMS MAY BE NOTICEABLE FOR DECADES.

THE PRESIDENT AND DAVID STOCKMAN MUST BELIEVE THAT POLLUTION IS OUR GROWING NATIONAL RESOURCE WHEN THEY PROPOSE TO CUT THE BUDGET OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY BY 72% AND DISMISS ALL CEQ EMPLOYEES. THEY MUST STRONGLY BELIEVE THAT FUTURE RESEARCH WILL PROVE THAT POLLUTION IS HEALTHFUL, WHEN THEY MAKE THEIR ATTACKS ON THE BASIC SUBSTANCE OF THE CLEAN AIR ACT AND THE PRIMARY HEALTH STANDARDS REQUIRED BY THE ACT. THEY MUST TRULY BELIEVE THAT WE MUST LIVE DANGEROUSLY, BREATHE DEEPLY, WHEN THEY IGNORE POLLS INDICATING THAT THE MAJORITY OF AMERICAN CITIZENS ARE STILL WILLING TO PAY FOR POLLUTION CONTROL, EVEN AT A PRICE. WHEN THEY PROPOSE AN "ADDITIONAL 27 MILLION DOLLARS FOR RESEARCH" AT THREE-MILE ISLAND, PERHAPS THEY BELIEVE IT IS BUSINESS AS USUAL, PENDING ANNIHILATION. THEY SEE TO EXEMPLIFY HOW DENSE MAN CAN GET WHEN THEY OPPOSE FUNDING FOR FAMILY PLANNING AND ADOPTION AND THEIR ATTACKS ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH MEASURES WOULD SUGGEST THAT THEY BELIEVE THAT NO HARMFUL EFFECTS HAVE BEEN SHOWN ON FUTURE GENERATIONS.

INTERIOR SECRETARY JAMES GAIUS WATT CATERS TO THE ELITE MINING, TIMBER, AND OIL INTERESTS WHEN HE PROPOSES DEVELOPMENT IN THOSE MINISCULE FRACTIONS OF OUR NATION, SUCH AS WILDERNESS AREAS AND BREEDING AREAS FOR WHALES. THESE AREAS, PRESERVED AS GIFTS FOR THIS AND FUTURE GENERATIONS, CAN BE IRREVERSIBLY AND PERMANENTLY DAMAGED. BUT, HE DOESN'T SEEM TO CARE WHETHER OUR ENVIRONMENT IS A TREASURE OR A DUMPING GROUND.

I understand James Gaius Watt dislikes Wilderness Areas because he doesn't like to "paddle or walk." That's a great quote from the Nation's chief Conservation Officer.
President Reagan is proposing a 25 percent cut in most of the basic health funding measures such as health education, venereal disease control, rat control, family planning, black lung services, community health centers, migrant health services, MCH services, immunizations, mental health, drug abuse, and alcoholism, to name a few. He is proposing that funding for smoking-cessation activities be decreased from three million dollars to one million, while reluctantly cutting eight million from the 300 million dollar tobacco subsidies. The feeble explanation regarding the need for tobacco subsidies is that tobacco would be cheaper and therefore used more widely without such subsidies. That is so lame an excuse as to be pitiful. If they want to keep the price of tobacco up, or increase the price, they should simply propose a tax thereby increasing federal revenue. No budget cuts were suggested for the Office of Management and Budgets, and the White House is requesting an increase.

There is a need for cuts, and room for cuts, but how about having our allies in Europe help us with the costs of our European defenses and saving 19 billion; abandoning the MX missile system and saving 10 billion; improving administrative measures in the Navy and saving 4 billion; cutting out General Accounting Office identified "fraud, inadequate accounting, and insufficient procedural control" in the Army and saving 0.5 billion; forgetting overlapping computer systems in the Air Force and saving one billion; recovering 11 billion dollars worth of overcharges by major oil companies; stop buying those desks and credenzas which the GAO pegged at 1.7 billion; and giving Synfuels production a shot of free enterprise thereby saving another 4 billion. Another 848 million could be cut from the Army Corps of Engineers.
WATER PROJECTS, AND 568 MILLION SHOULD BE DROPPED FROM THE DEPARTMENT
OF ENERGY'S URANIUM ENRICHMENT SUBSIDIES. I AM SURE THAT ALL OF OUR
MEMBERS COULD IDENTIFY OTHER MORE APPROPRIATE SAVINGS THAN CUTTING
CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS AND ALLOWING FURTHER FOULING OF THE AIR WHICH
WE BREATHE.

I NO LONGER QUOTE POGO FOR I NOW BELIEVE THAT WE HAVE MET THE
ENEMY AND HE IS PRESIDENT REAGAN.

WRITE, TELEGRAM, OR CALL YOUR SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES TODAY
NOW -- NOT TOMORROW! THEY NEED TO KNOW WHAT YOU THINK!

*****