

ess. Is this the sort of thing that you are trying to point to here? Do you find any sympathy with what I am saying?

Dr. ECKARDT. I am not sure that there is an immunity developed to air pollutants in the sense that we know of immunity to bacterial agents. This is a different process to me. I am not convinced that you could develop an immunity to air pollutants. I do know one small piece of information that was told to me by a man who has been working with lead, who was doing tissue culture. This happens to be Dr. Leonard Goldwater, now on leave of absence from Columbia Medical School. He said he had a tissue culture individual working for him. That person used extremely pure ingredients in the culture medium and they would not grow until they added miniscule quantities of lead to the culture material. Then the tissue cultures grew. This type of thing suggests that there may be some—and I am certainly not advocating this—but there may be some level of pollutant that is not necessarily bad for us. I would not want to try to put my finger on this level right now, certainly.

Mr. BROWN. The thing that strikes me from what you have said and for many other reasons, a much broader research concept than we probably have is envisioned so far for this whole problem. I think we need extensive monitoring systems and extensive reporting systems on the incidence of disease throughout this country and in areas where there are no pollutants, for example, merely to set standards by.

Dr. ECKARDT. I agree with this.

Mr. DADDARIO. Of course, Dr. Eckardt, we have been defining this as against man. We must add plant and animal life to our determinations as criteria are established, because this is an important aspect of this whole thing. If in fact we can, one way or the other, establish that there are certain causes and effects in these areas and can prove it in a way so that confidence can be developed, our programs would be better supported. There is concern that there is danger to health. There is question as to whether there is or is not. Because we are in this ambivalent position, we are not really able to get these kinds of programs going as soon as we should. Those dumps you were talking about could have been cleared up a long time earlier if in some way action could have been focused, and probably should have been. We ought not to wait until you finally reach the point where it gets overwhelming. We in this committee feel a great responsibility in the legislative process of seeing if we can anticipate these problems, taking into consideration the very great danger that can come, and see if we can then be of help in solving them sooner rather than later.

Dr. ECKARDT. I agree. I think we will clean up our cities. I do not think there is any doubt of this.

Mr. DADDARIO. The hour has gone by again. This is a subject which could keep us going throughout the balance of the day, but we will be in touch. We will see if we can take you up on your invitation some time, Dr. MacFarland.

Dr. MACFARLAND. It was meant seriously.

Mr. DADDARIO. I understand that. Thank you.

This committee will adjourn until Wednesday, January 31, at 10 o'clock, in this place.

(Whereupon, at 12:14 p.m., the subcommittee recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, January 31, 1968.)