

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the very difficult matter of the development of criteria and standards applicable to regulation.

As we have ventured into a more exact approach to these problems, we have come to realize the profound need for better physiological and toxicological data on the long-range effects of low doses of pollutants on man and other components of the environment. We have had forcibly brought home to us the fact that even the acute effects of most pollutants are so poorly characterized that criteria of health alone cannot be utilized in many cases to set precise limits and that a combination of the best available information, the best available opinion, a knowledge of what is technically possible and an understanding of the economic and social implications of regulatory actions are all required before action can be taken.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Bennett, recently Dr. Lawrence E. Hinkle of Cornell University Medical College stated at a recent program in Congressman Ryan's district:

At the present time I believe that there is no really clear cut evidence that pollutants, other than microbial agents, at the levels at which they occur ordinarily in the air or water in the U.S., are responsible for any significant amount of disease in our population

He goes on to say:

We have every reason to believe that sooner or later some of these substances, alone or in combinations, may have profoundly bad effects upon the health of our population.

And finally he says:

At the present time we have no good laboratory or experimental methods for detecting the pollutants in our environment that may be the most important causes of future ill health.

What are we doing to unravel this medical quandary as expressed in these typical statements from the profession? What do they add to in present Federal policy? How can we avoid vague fears of unscrupulous alarmists, and hasty inefficient action—in the absence of facts?

Dr. BENNETT. That is a rather all-encompassing question. I would like to say first—

Mr. DADDARIO. It is all encompassing but at the same time when we begin to discuss the question of criteria and health, and we put it in such vague terms—we slide all around the problem—the fact remains that there are conflicts. Because the question of health is so important, we should come to some definite understanding as to what the dangers to our health might be. Until we do, it seems to me to be quite difficult for us to develop the importance in comparison with other needs. Is society ready to assimilate and pay? How can we come to answers to these questions unless the people really know whether or not there is something to one side of this conflict or another? Do the pollutants in the air really affect our health or don't they? Some people say that the tendency could lead to an irreversible problem that once reached we could not possibly overcome regardless of what we did. If that is so, shouldn't we be putting our efforts to it more than just assume, as we have now, that we should operate on vague generalities?

Dr. BENNETT. Mr. Daddario, let me say this: The problem is not that we lack evidence that some of these pollutants affect health. We