

Dr. ECKARDT. This is just natural lead. This is not added to coal. And it is Dr. Kehoe's belief, now I don't know whether he has absolute proof, that it has been the reduction in coal burning in the Cincinnati area that has reduced the lead concentration in that city and even though the automobile population has tripled in that city, the air concentration is going down.

Mr. GAMMELGARD. I would like to make one point, Mr. Chairman.

We have a research problem to determine for the industry the incremental cost of making today's quality gasoline without lead. At the Public Health Service sponsored symposium on lead in December last year, two companies outside of the petroleum industry gave data. One indicated 1.1 cent per gallon, and the other gave 2.9 cents as the additional cost of making unleaded gasoline. We made the statement that we would develop our own study for the industry which certainly seems reasonable and logical. (This study is underway.)

I would like to point out that there are some 70 billion gallons of automotive gasoline sold in the United States in a year. A 1 cent per gallon increase is \$700 million added annual cost to the motoring public. Two cents is \$1,400 million, and the 3 cent figure which one of the companies gave would be over \$2 billion. These are costs that we do not want to pass on to the public unless there is good solid reason for doing it. And I also would like to make this statement. I drive a great deal, I drive on tollways, freeways, and in city traffic where the concentration of cars is heaviest. I am not personally the least bit concerned about the level of lead in the atmosphere today. If in our opinion the health of the people is truly involved—as Dr. Eckardt said there is no question what we would do, but we don't think we should go ahead and make this move without a thoroughly good case for it because it would cost the public huge sums of money.

Thank you, sir, for the time.

Mr. DADDARIO. Gentlemen, because we have two further witnesses, I would like to send you further questions for the record. (Additional questions and answers for the record may be found in vol. II.)

Mr. GAMMELGARD. Thank you.

(The complete prepared statement of Dr. Robert E. Eckardt follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT E. ECKARDT, M.D.

I am Dr. Robert E. Eckardt, medical adviser of the Committee for Air and Water Conservation of the American Petroleum Institute. I appreciate the opportunity to appear here today to outline for you some of the work which the petroleum industry has been sponsoring in the area of medical research concerning air pollution.

By its very nature, air is a complex substance, and since we have until recently been attuned to the habit of taking for granted the air we breathe, we have devoted little attention to investigating this resource and its effect upon the health of humans.

Together with others in industry and in government, we are now attempting to rectify this lack of knowledge, and a portion of the API's \$2 million research budget is devoted to medical research. Some of the projects are being conducted in universities, government agencies, and in private research institutions.

As with any medical research of value, various safeguards and controls have been established that explain our reluctance to accept quick answers and snap judgments. But certainly our increasing knowledge of health effects will influence the future course of technology for pollution abatement, and hopefully might influence the establishment of priorities. To indicate how this might be