The first is concerned with the evaluation of the effects on human health and well-being of the contaminants of the environment. Both industry and government are actively engaged in such studies, but we think that both would benefit from an independent evaluation. We have formulated a proposal for such a study, which would involve both long-range effects of small amounts of contaminants and the effects of high concentrations for short periods. We will need financial support from both government and industry for this study.

We would then propose to use these data in combination with engineering and economic data to put forth clearly the feasibility and cost of achieving various levels of contaminant reduction. This would then provide a rational basis for setting allowable or desirable levels of contamination on a risk-cost-benefit basis.

Our ad hoc engineering committees are already engaged in the collection of the available factual data which are essential to these studies.

We look upon the combination of the medical and engineering-economic aspects of the problem as essential to the optimum solutions. We think that joint industry-government financial support of this work would emphasize and insure the impartial character of the review. We have already received an assurance of support for part of the work from the Automobile Manufacturers Association, and are approaching other industries for support as well, but we find difficulty in identifying the appropriate agency of the Federal Government which should be interested in supporting this work. The wide scope of the study transcends the interests of the Public Health Service. The inclusion of water as well as air brings in a multiplicity of Federal agencies with separate responsibilities for separate parts of the problem. There is no overall coordinating or integrating body to examine the kinds of policy questions which inevitably arise when one considers the problem of pollution as a whole.

The second case which we have had a similar problem in is in attempting to discuss a project concerning the evaluation of energy resources not only in terms of their availability and nominal cost but with respect to their potential contribution to environmental pollution. Again, there is no body or agency within the Government that has that broad scope of interest or responsibility.

Mr. DADDARIO. You don't believe your relationship with the Federal Council on Science and Technology allows you to look at it in this way?

Dr. GERSHINOWITZ. It allows us to look at the technological interactions of programs. It does not allow us to look at policymaking problems or problems in which one has to make choices, or choose alternatives in deciding criteria.

Mr. DADDARIO. You see this as sort of a vacuum which needs to be covered?

Dr. GERSHINOWITZ. We do, and I conclude my paper by reading that statement.

It is the consensus of the ESB and its committees that one of the most urgent and critical problems in environmental pollution is that of definition of standards and criteria. These standards and criteria should be developed from economic and technological bases as well as public health considerations. Because of the potentially controversial