

Dr. Hornig encouraged the American Chemical Society to pursue the proposed program, placing special emphasis on items 1 and 3 above; that is, preparing an analysis of the recommendations of the Tukey report and informing the scientific community of problems faced in improving our environment.

Recruiting of scientists to participate in our task force proceeded smoothly because all were convinced that the program provided a valid opportunity to fill a real need.

The high level of enthusiasm and dedication continued throughout all stages of planning, group study, decisions with regard to assignment of people and topics, and finally providing well-written segments of what was then planned to be the ACS report.

However, at this stage it became apparent that the documents provided had, on the one hand, somewhat exceeded the original limits of the analysis of the recommendations of the Tukey report. On the other hand, that which was provided was not extensive enough to show "what is known and what is needed" to solve environmental problems.

Your subcommittee experienced a somewhat similar situation at about the same time. You were faced with bringing intelligent order out of the wide variety of information contained in the massive 2-volume collection of your hearings in 1966 on environmental pollution. We were much impressed by the monumental task performed by the team headed by Mr. Richard Carpenter of the Library of Congress. We took heart from your success.

We do not believe that science and technology make up a panacea for environmental improvement and control. We do believe that the technical facts should be made fully available in an unprejudiced fashion to those who must make the decisions. We are not yet certain that we have found the best way to do this, which is to say that we regard our current effort as experimental. But without experiment we will learn nothing and the one thing that we are convinced of is that we must search out the proper role of a modern scientific and educational society in the context of public affairs. Until we know what that role is, we may be wasting a valuable resource.

We think we are now on the way to meet part of a criticism your report leveled at the scientific community. Your subcommittee has said:

Finally, the hearings indicated that environment quality, with its deep roots in the natural sciences, has not yet attracted sufficient attention from the scientific and engineering community. This is a problem worthy of the very best thinking we can muster.

It should receive a more generous allocation of the scientific resources at our disposal.

Corrective activities involve long-term commitments and high costs which provide clear motivation for additional research, development, and demonstration projects. Technology is available to accomplish some urgent objectives and should be used without delay.

In many other instances, the knowledge is lacking to define objectives and to deal with pollution on a cost-effective basis.

It is our aim to help answer this call.

Thank you.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Cooke, I am pleased that you made note of Mr. Carpenter's tremendous contribution to the work of this subcommittee, and to all, actually, in this field.