

Mr. DADDARIO. Is there a conflict between your statements as to your activities and those of the Department of HEW and the fact that motorists will be spending about \$50 for antipollution devices for cars which, when multiplied by 10 million cars, amounts to one-half billion dollars? You say that while many of the compounds present in automobile exhaust are relatively inactive, only a few of these constituents of the exhaust are the primary cause of pollution. Are we just doing this because it creates a positive psychological effect in the minds of people that something is being done when, in fact, we are spending all of this money just to get rid of a few of the constituents of exhaust?

Dr. HIBBARD. The problem is particularly with the unburned hydrocarbons which come out of an engine as automobile exhaust. There is a wide variety of these, and we are systematically—and when I say “we,” I mean the Federal Government as a whole—analyzing these compounds to find which of them are the harmful ones and which are not.

The problems are so complex and so numerous that at the particular moment we don't know which of these are of most importance—well, we do know certain of them are bad actors, but we don't know that all of them are bad actors; and we haven't yet sorted out the harmful ones from the nonharmful ones.

In addition, as you know, there is still a controversy, even with respect to smog—whether this comes from the interaction of the nitrogen oxides with hydrocarbons—and how important this is to the smog abatement problem.

We really don't know at the moment as much as we should about the characteristics of the engine exhaust effluents and their interaction with the variables of the fuel and the engine parameters of the automobiles itself.

These are the first things which we must obtain. HEW is proceeding to get this kind of information; we are too.

Mr. DADDARIO. Do we know enough about it so that we should impose on the public the burden of paying for this \$50 device? Is it worth it, or should we revise our thinking about this situation and divert these expenditures so that they will be more effective?

Dr. HIBBARD. I believe that anyone who has been in the Los Angeles-San Francisco area during the time when smog has been particularly bad—and I have been there in those times—I firmly believe that there is too much air pollution from engine exhaust.

The kind of regulation which is now taking place is reducing this and I certainly believe it should be reduced.

I don't think we are ready yet to say precisely to what extent it should be reduced and precisely how it should be reduced, but I think the kind of regulation we have is good.

Mr. DADDARIO. This seems to fit into a category of problems about which we are usually given the following advice. You can spend a billion dollars, let's say, and it will achieve some benefits, but it will not obtain all of the benefits. There is some question that after you have spent all this money the situation hasn't gone beyond the point where it was when you originally started only because you didn't know enough about it in order to impose this obligation such as the \$50