

4. Disability would not be significantly reduced.
5. Metals would not be corroded and other materials would not be damaged.
6. Fabrics would not be soiled, deteriorated or their colors affected. And
7. National scenery would not be obscured.

I think here, then, you see that these are the kinds of things that we need to be concerned with, and that the criteria are the expression of the pollutant dosage that affects these particular items that we have enumerated. As Mr. Williams has said, it will be up to States to decide the extent to which they will try to prevent these things from occurring.

Mr. FELTON. Where did these seven points come from? Were they in the committee report? In other words, how did you understand this to be your mission?

Dr. MIDDLETON. This document is a document issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It has a foreword on the part of the Secretary. It has a preface from which I read.

Mr. FELTON. No; I mean within the general guidelines of the act—

Dr. MIDDLETON. This is in response to the requirement prior to the Air Quality Act of 1967, that the Department published criteria on.

Mr. FELTON. I am not questioning that. I am just asking, where did the seven points come from? Were they mentioned by the committee in its report or by the chairman during the floor debate?

Dr. MIDDLETON. The seven were exercises of prudent judgment by our organization.

Mr. FELTON. I see.

I assume the criteria that affects No. 1 will be different—or I might put it another way. The concentration, if you will, as it affects No. 1 will be different as it affects No. 7?

Dr. MIDDLETON. I am saying the criteria for the sulfur oxides show the gamut of effects from one through seven. In other words, you may have very different pollutant concentrations with varying periods of times of exposure causing a variety of effects depending, among other factors, upon the nature of the receptor.

Mr. FELTON. Then it would be up to the States to determine standards, and if they felt free to exclude one of your seven, I would assume this would be permissible.

Dr. MIDDLETON. Yes; up to a point. If a State depended rather heavily upon its recreational values as a part of its real economic-social structure, it might wish to adopt standards that would preserve natural beauty. This is a State election, or local option, so to speak.

It is incumbent upon us to state what the dosages are that affect those things. The least a State or community can do is be responsible for the health of its people. It may wish also to be responsible for the health of things, protection of things. These are options that can be worked at different levels.

Mr. FELTON. I had not planned to go into it now, and perhaps it might be better that it be done later, but section 108(k) authorizes you to seek an injunction. I assume you would not seek an injunction for all seven of those reasons?

Dr. MIDDLETON. No. Because persons are not property. Therefore, the criteria that deal with persons, the dosages that affect people may