treble damages will not be sufficient incentive for a direct purchaser to sue.

Private antitrust enforcement will be left primarily to consumer class actions, subject to the difficulties of initiating and pursuing such suits. Thus, any losses or hardships of the suit and the difficulties of ascertaining the actual damages suffered by individual consumers will create a lawyer's bonanza while reducing the award collected by the consumer to a negligible level. The consumer will lose the benefit derived from the deterrent effect of direct purchaser suits and gain close to nothing in its place.

In my opinion, the two major objectives of antitrust law are the maintenance of our competitive free market system and protection of the consumer. By removing the incentives for effective private antitrust enforcement, both the free market system and the consumer will suffer.

Finally, our judicial system entitles every defendant to plead his case of the case. The expenses of litigation already are approach the prohibitive level. While I agree with the bill's enforcement framework, its principal liability principles will make the bill unworkable. Our system of justice suffers when a defendant settles a suit out of court rather than raise what it regards as legitimate defenses because it cannot afford to litigate. The bill will not prevent multiple suits. Our system of justice suffers when a defendant settles a suit out of court rather than raise what it regards as legitimate defenses because it cannot afford to litigate. The bill will not prevent multiple suits.

Our system of justice suffers when a defendant settles a suit out of court rather than raise what it regards as legitimate defenses because it cannot afford to litigate. The bill will not prevent multiple suits.

I had planned to make my decision on this legislation following Judiciary Committee action on it on April 23. Although the committee did not act on the bill at that time, I do not anticipate any changes that the committee could make that would change my position on the bill. I oppose the legislation.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN EGYPT AND ISRAEL

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on March 27, 1979, President Sadat of Egypt stated his economic development goals at a meeting of the Egypt-United States Business Council. He made an eloquent case for greater foreign investment in Egypt, a plea that should bring a favorable response in view of Egypt's determination to foster a good investment climate.

For 30 years I have encouraged investment in Israel to help that nation develop its economy. I am now hopeful that we can encourage both Israel and Egypt, the two nations which have taken significant risks to achieve peace and which are committed to raising the living standards of their peoples.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of President Sadat's speech be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

SPEECH BY PRESIDENT SADAT

I am very pleased to be with you tonight. Only yesterday, we laid the foundation for a comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

It is thanks to the tireless efforts and dedication of my dear friend, President Carter, that we have achieved this moment. It was a giant step that should be followed by other steps in the near future in order to consolidate the peace process which we started some years back. The peace process is not just for economic reasons, but for economic and strategic reasons. We have confronted many problems in the peace process, and I appreciate the help we have received from the United States.

The dynamics of peace will create new realities for the benefit of all the peoples of the Middle East. The peace process has opened up new opportunities for economic cooperation.

We have a number of positive elements which exist today and will continue to produce their constructive impact.

The dynamics of peace will create new realities for the benefit of all the peoples of the region. We have a number of positive elements which exist today and will continue to produce their constructive impact.

DEMystifying ENERGY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, a sound U.S. energy policy depends upon the broad and knowledgeable participation of the American people. Unfortunately, the lack of a universal unit of energy measurement makes it difficult for Americans to understand how much energy they are actually using.

How many Americans are able to compare the energy value of a kilowatt-hour of electricity with the energy contained in a gallon of gasoline or a cubic foot of natural gas? And how do all of these relate to the "quads" of energy which Secretary Schlesinger and others refer to when discussing our Nation's overall energy needs?

David Morris has pinpointed the problem in a recent New York Times op-ed piece:

The baffling array breeds the dangerous illusion that there are many different kinds of energy... It tends to thwart the curious citizen.

For several years now, Mr. Morris and his organization, the Institute for Local Self-Reliance, have sought to give local communities more direct control over the resources they produce and consume. Sharing this commitment, I have just introduced a bill designed to strengthen locally controlled energy systems. The Small Communities Energy Act of 1979 (S. 931) focuses specifically on local efforts to stimulate energy conservation and the development of renewable energy resources.

Mr. Morris' discussion of the need for more straightforward means of measuring energy consumption deserves our serious consideration. I ask unanimous consent that his article, "Putting It Into B.T.U.'s."

WASHINGToN—How can we expect Americans to participate knowledgeably in debate about our energy future if we have no common frame of reference? In my own work with Government officials, community organizations, and planners, the hardest problem in energy planning occurs right at the beginning, with the language we use. Our fragmented units of measuring energy confuse and paralyze rather than inform and catalyze.