

THE ADEQUACY OF TECHNOLOGY FOR POLLUTION ABATEMENT

THURSDAY, JULY 28, 1966

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to adjournment, at 10:08 a.m., in room 2325, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Hon. Emilio Q. Daddario (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DADDARIO. This meeting will come to order.

Our first witness this morning is Mr. Bertram C. Raynes, vice president for applied research, Rand Development Corp.

Would you please come forward, Mr. Raynes?

We are pleased to have you here this morning, Mr. Raynes, and we want both to apologize for not having you here yesterday and to thank you for being kind enough to stay over for this morning's meeting.

Mr. RAYNES. It was a pleasant evening for me yesterday.

Mr. DADDARIO. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF BERTRAM C. RAYNES, VICE PRESIDENT FOR APPLIED RESEARCH, RAND DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Mr. RAYNES. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, thank you.

It is an honor to be invited to make a statement before this committee and to speak on the subject of the adequacy of present technology for pollution abatement. My remarks are more personal than corporate, but they are, I believe and I hope, professional.

To the question: Is presently available science and technology adequate for pollution abatement? My answer is: No. The technology—the application of scientific knowledge to practical purposes—is obviously not adequate, for if it were, there would be less compelling reasons for these hearings. Even where adequate science is easily available as it is for many kinds of contamination, it is not being applied, or is being applied only partially. Of course, more and better science is needed, especially in the handling of certain contaminants, but the best science remains academic without aggressive application.

To the further question: What do we need to do to combat environmental pollution? My answer is: Apply now what science is known to remove those contaminants which can be removed and handled, while simultaneously improving the technology and discovering the new science needed.

In answering this way, I find myself somewhat at odds with—as only one example—the report of the Research Management Advisory