I would prefer to act on little knowledge and err on the side of caution in protecting human health and welfare. My plea here is not to avoid action until we have perfected our ability to develop criteria and set standards.

I would like to turn now for a moment to applied technology.

A useful applied technology program means involving industry. To a minor extent, this is being done. Much more involvement is required.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should be using industry as Defense and NASA have used it. And the Congress should write a basic procurement law to cover HEW's needs to use industry.

We ought to be spending at least $1 billion a year on contracts with industry to develop the hardware necessary to control and prevent environmental deterioration. But the Department now can't do this. It lacks from the Congress a clear indication of public policy in this area. That policy must cover patent problems. It must deal with sole-source procurement. It must deal with research competition. It must deal with marketing problems.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare certainly is different from Defense and NASA in that HEW is not the ultimate consumer of a mass product for environmental protection.

Nevertheless, the Department alone can provide the leadership to bring about the technological advances necessary to maintain a high-quality environment and allow for economic expansion.

But we must face the reality that it is going to cost money, for nothing is free—neither air nor water, and certainly not soil or space.

We cannot now measure the cost of using resources for waste assimilation, because we don't know the true effects; nor can we correct it properly, because we are not creating the technology. We had better do both now.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Linton, you say that HEW differs from Defense and NASA and that you could not be the ultimate consumer of the mass product for environmental protection.

Isn't this one of the selling arguments that you have, that in this instance the public would be the consumer?

Mr. LINTON. That is correct.

Mr. DADDARIO. It fits within our competitive economic system.

Mr. LINTON. That is correct.

Mr. DADDARIO. The $1 billion could generate a great deal of activity which could in the final analysis run into billions of dollars.

Mr. LINTON. Absolutely. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I feel it possible to devise the means involving Government and industry development to the point where the investment by the Government would eventually be returned by the economic activity which is created protecting the environment.

I think some direction in this effort has been made by FAA, and that is simply that where the Government provides the research funds to develop new technology, which is then disposed of on an open market, that it receives off the top the amount it put into the direct research, which could then be used in a continuing fund for advancing the state of the art and evolving new technology.

We could conceivably reach a point where it required very little additional congressional appropriations to maintain this fund and keep moving technology ahead.