

Dr. HORNIG. I do not think there is much overt conflict but I think there is considerable divergence among a number of the reports we have, in the relative degree of emphasis on various problems.

Mr. DADDARIO. You were referring only to conflicts of that kind?

Dr. HORNIG. Yes. I am referring to conflicts in the assessment of what the problems, and the urgency of problems are, and what the nature of the problems is. You mentioned one, for example, in the CO₂ problem. The Tukey committee, for example, noted that at the present rate of burning fossil fuels we can expect our environmental carbon dioxide concentration to rise by 25 percent by the end of the century, and they raised very serious questions as to what the effect of that increase in carbon dioxide concentration would be since it would increase the absorption of solar energy.

Other people have pointed out that they did not adequately take into account the absorption of carbon dioxide by rocks as opposed to the oceans, that there were other factors which might go in the other direction, such as the increasing concentration of dust, ice crystals, and so on, in the atmosphere which would obscure solar radiation, and that we did not know enough, in any case, about the circulation pattern in the atmosphere to predict the consequences. So that this is one question, for instance, which needs to be resolved before we undertake any major programs. No one has any intention of shutting down the burning of oil and coal on account of that recommendation yet.

Mr. DADDARIO. I thought you might include under instances of conflict the problem that might arise from the number of agencies involved and the obvious conflict in bringing them all together and having them work smoothly in a coordinated way over the jurisdictional problems. You must run into this from time to time.

Dr. HORNIG. Well, Mr. Chairman, this does pose problems, in fact sometimes very difficult ones. By and large, I think it is a sound way to do business because the fact is that this is not a homogeneous area. One should surely group, coordinate, and put under common leadership those things which can be pulled together into single programs, but I would not think it would make any sense, for example, to pull together under single leadership the studies on human health, where the expertise and knowledge is in the Department of HEW and NIH, and the problems of radioactive waste disposal, which are also potentially big environmental problems as we build a big nuclear power industry, where the expertise resides in the Atomic Energy Commission. I think it is quite proper that the central focus on these very divergent areas be separated, and the focus established where we have the essential competence and interest in the Government. I think what is important, however, is to maintain a good general overview of these very diverse activities.

Doing this for the President is the job of my office. The rather elaborate committee structure I am describing is how we are trying to see what the entirety consists of. As the work of the committee progresses I may have firmer views with regard to your question, because, as I said, this area spreads over so very many things. What you call environmental quality for one purpose may be connected with weather forecasting on the other. It is not clear at the moment what the best eventual division of effort will be.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Fulton.