

Mr. DADDARIO. The criteria that went into the DC-3 was known. We knew what it would do.

Do we know what is going into this criteria and will it, in fact, fly?

Dr. HARRIS. Well, my answer to that, as stated in my original statement is the need for more valid information, not only in terms of technology but also in terms of economics and social relationships. For example, one would not want to put industries out of business and destroy our economy. These are all interrelated in a very complicated way.

But most of all, I think what we need is meaningful technical information on which to base standards.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would agree with you.

I am not placing obstacles in the path of getting these things done because it seems to me we ought to get people thinking about them. If they aren't prepared, they will begin establishing governmental agencies as they develop a competence of one kind or another.

I feel because this is a problem we ought to get your advice about it.

For example, in New York City, Commissioner Heller has already begun to back off from the 3 percent sulfur in coal for 1969 and 1970.

Once you say to an industry, this is what we expect, they begin preparing plans, and in some case even construction, to meet those requirements. You run into a tremendous economic disruption. This can be extremely harmful to the financial structure of a whole industry.

Dr. COOKE. Mr. Chairman, may I speak rather bluntly to the point you are raising, to tell you what travail we have experienced in attempting to pick a course between these two points.

To provide a purely scientific document may take 3, 4, or 5 years, to issue as firmed up a possible, versus replying or responding to situations that might arise before the report issues.

Let us go back to the meeting with Dr. Hornig and an admonition from him that is quite pertinent. Dr. Hornig said that, one of the worst things that could happen would be for this report to appear to issue from chemical industry.

Now you just mentioned the problem with regard to 3 percent sulfur. We have felt under a gun here. If our first reply, or statement in the area of environmental quality, is negative, that is, critical of an agency recommendation, we would really pull the rug from under the effectiveness of our future contributions, unless we really have an overwhelming mass of data to support our criticism.

This is not to say we are not aware of the problem and the potential, but we feel strongly that what we finally provide you, the agencies, and the scientific community, must be of a caliber immediately recognizable as of high caliber and usefulness, and that it has no taint of vested interest. This report must represent a scientific response to the problem so clearly and so credibly that we can then be of maximum use to you and to other agencies as new situations arise in the future. After that has occurred we may then be able to make recommendations earlier, with less data, and with indications of data still to come.

This has been the major constraint, you might say, under which we felt we must operate. I think we are saying that, we may have tied ourselves down too much. But that is a tricky question to answer, too.