

distinguished in almost all other documents, as well as in this one, by their absence. It may well be that the Panel chose to disregard these two problems as outside their purview.

On the more positive side, one should underline the three recommendations:

B-26—Efforts be increased to establish the scientific bases upon which standards of environmental quality can be set.

C-1—The establishment by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council of an "Environmental Pollution Board."

D—The establishment of baseline measurement programs.

Mr. DADDARIO. And I would also like unanimous consent that a statement I had prepared to close these hearings also be placed in the record. If there is no objection, that will be done.

(The statement referred to follows:)

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN EMILIO Q. DADDARIO AT CONCLUDING HEARING IN WASHINGTON ON SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT ON POLLUTION ABATEMENT TECHNOLOGY

Today's testimony concludes this phase of the subcommittee's inquiry. I believe these hearings have accomplished our objective of illuminating the level of development in pollution abatement technology. I appreciate the contributions of our many excellent witnesses and the interest and diligence of subcommittee members.

The record requires careful and thoughtful study as to its implications for further research and development and also as to the time table for installation of presently available processes and equipment. Certain preliminary conclusions are apparent to me at this time.

First, we have heard that the lack of information on complex relationship among living things with their demandings makes it extremely difficult to set goals for the quality of the environment. In many cases, the risk to our welfare, if not also to our health, cannot be adequately evaluated in comparison to the benefits of using air and waterways for waste disposal.

These uncertainties are barriers to progress in pollution abatement and increased knowledge through research could do much to remove them.

Second, the cost of catching up in pollution abatement, and of keeping waste management up to date, will be in the order of \$100 billion spread over the next 10 to 20 years. Continuing costs of operating treatment plants and devices will run to several billion dollars each year. We have seen a recognition and acceptance of these costs which have been absent before in the United States.

These large expenses suggest an immediate opportunity for research and development on a more economical means of abatement. The need for more efficient technology is urgent because in many instances we cannot and should not delay in corrective action. To some extent, it may be wise to divert a portion of expenditures from implementation of present technology to the development of better technology.

Third, the science and engineering resources of private industry will be necessary in developing new and improved technical approaches to pollution control; both to solve internal waste management problems and to serve a growing market for abatement equipment. The private sector laboratories are more likely to contribute meaningful and timely results if the Government can move forward in setting realistic criteria for air and water quality. But we see that this leads us in a full circle back to the ecological uncertainties which I mentioned as a first point.

Thus, it is clear that the present research effort in environmental pollution is inadequate. To guide us beyond the immediate abatement of gross and obvious contamination, we must seek every means of accelerating the acquisition of more knowledge.

It seems to me that our national goal is really twofold. These closely related objectives are concisely phrased in the titles of the landmark reports which we