

effects of smoking upon human performance over the years, without ever discerning a straight forward effect. Or Bernstein reasons that the effect may be a subtle one which is real but elusive. He is using a memorizing and recognition task (the Sternberg paradigm) in such a way as to be able to partial out the contributions to overall performance of (1) attention, (2) memory efficiency, (3) rate of memory formation and (4) retrieval efficiency. As a last item, we are finally moving forward on the study of nonobtrusive monitoring of smoke inhalation. Since Neil Nunnally joined us last year, he has taken over the instrumentation problem and brought us to a near on-line state.

The device is based upon the proposition that circumferential changes in the chest and the abdomen can be converted to a good estimate of inspired volume.

We have good evidence that when the circumference changes are small, volume is a linear function. The average total lung capacity of 6 liters, the average smoke inspiration is one liter.

Considering all the ways to measure, the mercury strain gauge was selected, but there were problems.

The solution was to minimize the current flow-developed circuitry that provides a 100 M amplification, and a sophisticated method of summing the two inputs to yield a signal that is almost linearly related to volume.

There is another candidate transducer (inductance changes in coils about the chest and abdomen) already incorporated into a commercially available device. On order, due to arrive by March 1.

We will be running comparative tests of these two units, select the better one and proceed to solving the remaining problems:

- (a) tagging the smoke-laden inhalation.
- (b) incorporating a recorder into the system.

When the entire assembly is ready, I will begin a series of studies, all designed to determine the degree to which the smoker accommodates his intake to 1) smoke composition and 2) need.

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE
UNIVERSITY,
DEPARTMENT OF BIOBEHAVIORAL
HEALTH,
University Park, PA, July 28, 1995.

Hon. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. WAXMAN: I have reviewed the attached data on Benson & Hedges Filtered Cigarettes (70 mm) using standard assumptions of inferential statistics.

The average Nicotine/Tar Ratio for the 17 measurements from 1968 to 1985 (not including the 3 measurements for 1981 SP, 1981 HP, 1983 HP) is .066 (minimum=.058, maximum=.088, Standard Deviation=.00738). A score of 0.20 (as was observed in 1981) is very unlikely to come from the same population. The probability of sampling a score at least as large as 0.20 is considerably less than 1 in 100,000 (z=18.16). Even the ratio observed in 1983 (0.11) has a probability less than 1 in 100,000 of coming from the same population (z=12.19).

If one looks only at the years when this brand was in the 1 mg tar range (from 1978 to 1985), the average ratio for the 4 years (not including those years at issue) is 0.075 (minimum=.058, maximum=.088, Standard Deviation=.0126). The probability of sampling a score at least as large as 0.20 is considerably less than 1 in 100,000 (z=10.28). The probability of sampling a score at least as large as 0.11 is less than 4 in 1,000 of coming from the same population (z=3.13).

These analyses support the interpretation that the Nicotine/Tar Ratios were much

larger in 1981 and 1983 than in the other years and confirm what is readily apparent to the naked eye when looking at the attached plot of ratios.

Sincerely,

LYNN T. KOZLOWSKI, Ph.D.,
PROFESSOR AND HEAD,
Department of Biobehavioral Health.

REGULAR-LENGTH (70 MM) BENSON & HEDGES FILTERED
CIGARETTES

Year	Tar	(+/-)	Nicotine	(+/-)	Ratio
10-68	21.0	(0.5)	1.29	(0.06)	0.061
2-69	20.1	(.5)	1.38	(.03)	.069
10-70	18.7	(.4)	1.35	(.03)	.072
8-71	18.4	(.3)	1.30	(.02)	.071
7-72	12.2	(1.1)	0.86	(.09)	.070
1-73	9.9	(.3)	.68	(.03)	.069
8-73	9.8	(.4)	.66	(.03)	.067
3-74	9.4	(.4)	.61	(.03)	.065
9-74	9.1	(.4)	.56	(.03)	.062
3-75	9.1	(.3)	.53	(.02)	.058
9-75	9.3	(.4)	.55	(.02)	.059
4-76	9.2	(.3)	.53	(.02)	.058
6-77	9.8	(.2)	.64	(.02)	.065
5-78	0.9	(.1)	.06	(.01)	.067
12-79	.8	(.1)	.07	(.01)	.088
3-81	.6	(.1)	.12	(.01)	.200
12-81	(.1)	(.1)	.10	(.02)	.200
3-83	.9	(.2)	.10	(.01)	.111
2-84	1.3	(.2)	.09	(.01)	.069
1-85	1.2	(.1)	.07	(.01)	.058

(1) Below the sensitivity of the method (i.e., <0.5)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

POLITICAL ADVOCACY REPORTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to return for a few minutes to this 13-page piece of legislation that is buried in the Labor, Health, and Education appropriation bill that the House will be taking up shortly. It is labeled political advocacy, and it is really an incredible effort at speech control and reporting, all at the hands of this new majority that made such a big deal out of wanting a less intrusive Government.

Well, let me just ask my colleagues to go through the painful exercise of actually reading this legislative provision in an appropriations bill. It is an absolutely chilling experience when you realize that this Rube Goldberg contraption that has been invented in order to get at the question of Federal funds being used to persuade Congress about public policy, how vast and really incredibly intrusive into civil liberties a proposal this is.

I spent some time yesterday explaining some of the people who would be covered as, quote, grantees under this legislative provision in the appropriations bill. I hope you will pay some attention to this; your constituents are absolutely going to hate this bill if it were to become law.

For instance, disaster victims getting emergency aid from FEMA would be a grantee, and I will tell you in a minute what grantees have to go

through, researchers getting NSF research grants, probably because the definitions are so broad including anything of value coming from the Federal Government, a farmer getting emergency livestock feed in a major snowstorm, irrigators receiving subsidized Bureau of Reclamation water, and it probably even includes intangibles, so a broadcaster getting an FCC license would probably be a grantee under the provisions of this proposal, as, for instance, would many organizations, maybe your local church or YMCA, YWCA, if you are running a low-income child care program. With a Federal grant you would be brought into the provisions of this incredible proposal.

Now what happens to those who are covered? Let me just take a minute to walk you through what would happen to one very typical, if hypothetical, example, namely a pregnant woman or nursing woman getting food vouchers under the Women, Infants and Children's program. Let us just consider the example:

We will call her Sally. She will be required to follow "generally accepted accounting principles in keeping books and records," about the number and the value of the assistance that she is receiving under the WIC program. She would be required to file with the Department of Agriculture by the end of each calendar year a certified report on a standard form provided by your friendly Federal Government with her name and her ID number, description of the purposes that she put her WIC grant to, a list of all the Federal, State or local government agencies involved in administering the WIC program, and here is the real hooker in this, a description of her acts of, "political advocacy," which is defined all encompassingly to include, for instance, any attempt to influence any Federal, State, or local government action, including any attempt to affect the opinions of the general public or any part of the public about any government action. This would include, for instance, Sally's coming to one of your town meetings and talking with her congressman or congresswoman, writing a letter to the editor about some issue of public policy pending in her community.

This political advocacy activity would also include "participating in any political campaign of any candidate for public office," Federal, State, or local. So, marching in a candidate's parade, for instance, would be a political advocacy activity that a WIC grantee would have to report to the Department of Agriculture.

□ 1715

It goes on and on and on. This would create, in some computer in Washington, DC, a master list of all political advocacy activities carried on by all Federal grantees around the country. Each Department would have to get these reports annually certified, subject to audit, subject to challenge,