

On the subject of poisons such as the pesticides, a reversal of typical attitudes might be helpful. Instead of comforting the public with statements to the effect that "there is no evidence that these pollutants have unfavorable effects upon humans," let's see some evidence that they are definitely not harmful. Sometimes the background to the statements which begin "there is no evidence that * * *" really is that there is simply no evidence whatsoever. One way or the other.

I submit that there should be less dialog on pesticides and more facts. Establishing how much poison an animal species can withstand by killing specimens off by varying their exposure to it, is still basically the same old how-much-can-we-get-away-with approach. We should know how poisons kill, the mechanism by which they work, and then we could evaluate their long-range effect more intelligently. And, perhaps decide that some of them should no longer ever be used at all.

Others have testified before you or will testify to additional areas where new technology is needed, on incentives of one sort or another, standards, and on policy in pollution abatement. My thesis is that pollution abatement philosophy should be to clean up all wastes and effluents to the maximum extent possible now, and with known means, while new science is being obtained. The goal should be to improve upon these methods to make them more economic and increasingly more effective. The aim should be to reduce the pollution loads on our waters, land, and atmosphere, not to force them to accept more. The standards should be fresh air, pleasant vistas, and clear, clean waters. The activity should be to put newly developed methods into use just as soon as they become available, and to do whatever is necessary to speed the development of improvements in these methods to make them increasingly more effective and economical.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. DADDARIO. Thank you. As we have proceeded with these hearings, Mr. Raynes, I can't remember anyone who has disagreed with your basic thesis that everything possible should be done now with what is available to us. We must also seek new methods of abatement. But I do think that even though we accept this thesis, there may be differing opinions as to how to get there. I wonder how you apply that to your own feeling about the wrong approach to the situation. On page 3 of your statement you say the goal must not be to find out how much filth a stream can be made to accept. Some people appear before us and say that we should apply standards and that we ought to find out what a river contains and what it can stand. Are they wrong in accumulating information of that kind so that they can develop a program which takes into consideration the situation around them. Isn't it true that you could not possibly begin to solve the problem unless you knew where you stood, how much time you had to correct it, and what the pressure of the environment around you was at that particular time? Don't you oversimplify the issue by saying that this is not something that ought to be done?

Mr. RAYNES. That approach is one that I do not agree with, sir.

Mr. DADDARIO. How do you get around it since it exists, sir?

Mr. RAYNES. Well, I would suggest cleaning up the effluents and seeing what happens to that river. Instead of surveying and then