

The desirable thing is to keep them at a level where they will do no harm. I feel that in this instance we have to keep our eyes on the desired goal, which is to protect the quality of the environment and as long as that can be maintained, it may be desirable for many reasons to admit certain wastes into these natural resources, under controlled conditions and in controlled amounts. Because ultimately we must dispose of all waste into some natural resource.

Mr. DADDARIO. I believe Mr. Fulton has a question that falls in this category.

Mr. FULTON. The question comes up as to what the environment originally was. To me it is a natural resource. Your philosophy does not accept this as a starting point and I think this injurious point that we are speaking of is along this line. For example, on page 2 of your statement, you speak of injuries to the very purposes and normal desirable life patterns which should be sustained. We can look at it from a conservation point of view and feel that we must maintain a happy, pleasant environment that keeps the natural resources, land, water, and air that we have inherited. Now, your organization looks at it the other way. It is the laissez-faire approach. For example, on page 3, you say that pollution abatement means reducing the injury after it has occurred and that prevention means keeping the injury in control.

My position is different from that. I think we should have the control to keep it to the minimum. The capacity of our environment to accept waste is an extraordinary valuable natural resource. But, you say it is the firm conviction of the chemical industry that society cannot afford the cost of control. Maybe your industry can't but society or this Government should. You see, it is a different concept.

One last point: You say that many of our most objectionable environmental conditions are not health matters. This may be true, but they may be depriving us of something that we originally had that we want. I don't make the distinction solely on the basis that it does not harm my health and, therefore, I will let every industry admit all the waste into the atmosphere, the lakes, the rivers, the streams and the oceans that they will hold.

The last part of this question is this: On page 5 of your testimony you state that:

Although we shall always be interested in decreasing the cost, this is much more likely to come about gradually by evolutionary development from a combination of operating experience and constant research attention than by massive research effort scattered along a broad front.

I disagree with that strongly because that is saying, "Go as far as you can and then gradually cut down the waste when it becomes injurious." And in the next sentence, of course, you want to set interim objectives at conservative levels with subsequent tightening.

That means to me after the damage has occurred. As scientific and expert opinion provides justification, why not set the controls and enforce the abatement for everybody with uniform rules?

Mr. DADDARIO. Keeping that question in mind, I think probably we should have Mr. Bell ask another question.

Mr. FULTON. Put it in the record.

(This material may be found in vol. II.)