

Mr. Chairman, you have intimated to several of the witnesses that you may invite them to pay a return visit to this committee. May I, on my part, extend to you and the members of the committee, taken singly or in mixture, an invitation to visit at your convenience the Inhalation Division of Hazleton Laboratories to see the programs I have described in progress.

Mr. DADDARIO. Considering the fact that you are looking for human subjects, that might be an ominous invitation.

Mr. Brown, do you have some questions of Dr. MacFarland?

Mr. BROWN. No.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Eckardt, your last statement indicates to me that there is some question about the quality of air we should be striving to achieve. When you relate diseases to the effect that air quality may have in the initiation of these diseases, or the effect that they could have on the diseases already existing, I wonder if you have any view or theory about this? How do you, in fact, separate it? Or should it in fact be separated, recognizing that emphysema most likely does arise in a multitude of ways and recognizing, too, as I understand the New York Times article, it does not indicate that industrialization's pollutants cause emphysema but that it has a greater effect on those already having it? Then that gets us to the development of a capability to get air quality to the highest possible level we can, regardless of our lack of ability, lack of knowledge about the causes, effects and initiation.

Dr. ECKARDT. I am not sure just what the implication of this study is, not having read the original one, but I personally feel that air pollution is going to be controlled; it should be controlled, but it probably will not be controlled on the basis of health. I often like to make the example of the use of the sanitary toilet and sanitary sewers. This primarily arose because people got sick and tired of the stench of human excrement in the streets and they wanted to do something else with it, put it some place else. I personally think air pollution has a stench at times, it looks bad, and I think we are going to control it on this basis. I like to go back to when I was a boy traveling between Long Island and New York City past what now is the old New York World's Fair site and La Guardia Airport. Both of these areas were huge burning garbage dumps. As we used to go through Flushing at that time, we invariably as children used to go through holding our nose because it stench so bad. This has been cleared up and not because it was a health effect, but because people apparently got sick and tired of this stench. I think basically we are going to clean up our cities, unrelated to health effects, and even before we find out whether or not there are health effects, other than the acute episodic health effects. I think we are going to clear them up, every city, to a certain degree, but I am concerned that this is going to have no effect on the health of the people of the United States even though we do clear them up, because I am not convinced, other than the episodic area, that health effects have clearly been demonstrated for low level, long-term air pollution levels.

This does not mean to say you do not clear it up for other reasons. I think you can clear up air pollution as a public nuisance. I think, for instance, in my town they have decided that they do not want people to burn leaves.