

than electric utilities and in this case, VEPCO and PEPCO are principally using coal because at the present time it's the most economical fuel. To adopt a blanket endorsement of one percent to me under the present state of the art, is entirely inappropriate.

Yesterday the Surgeon General of the United States testified before the committee which is in session right now, hearing Secretary Gardner, with respect to sulphur oxide, said even though they have issued criteria, criteria on which the so called one percent is based, nevertheless they have subsequently found that the technology has not yet caught up. Nor has there been an evaluation of the economic impact of the imposition of an inflexible one percent limitation. In addition S. 780 calls for a re-evaluation of existing criteria because of the many days of hearings that were held and the testimony that was given before the Senate Committee. It became quite obvious that the information available on which to base the sulphur standards are very nebulous and inconclusive principally because there hasn't been this relationship between the actual specific injury that occurs due to the amount of SO_2 in the air and whether or not it is of sufficient injurious effect that it should be completely wiped out of the atmosphere regardless of cost. So there is a new approach by the Public Health Service as announced by Dr. Steuart, the Surgeon General yesterday that they are re-evaluating; and they are going to look at when technical feasibility is going to catch up. Mr. Gude has made reference to the research and studies that are going on, it calls for tremendous amounts of money to get this research.

With the respect to the profile of the ambient air, that is the air that surrounds us here in Washington, there is not sufficient information which has been made of this to you gentlemen at the present time, as Mr. Griswold testified on the tenth of August. They are conducting studies and they have additional measuring stations so they can get a more meaningful profile of just what the condition of the atmosphere is in the Metropolitan district, and then they will have an abatement proceeding at which time we may then have a proper springboard from which to develop adequate regulations.

Just in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think New York City is a perfect example where local law 14 was passed during a time when there was quite a political situation. There was voting time, Councilman Lowe is the author of local law 14. In that law they were talking about how they were going to bear down on Consolidated Edison, they must put in ninety nine percent efficiency precipitators the law also limits incinerator emissions, eight thousand of which had to have scrubbers on them by 1967. And that was the Council passing this legislation. Austin Heller, your Air Pollution Controlman, on May 20th says to the people, well you've got to close down. Your sanitation man says, we can't possibly handle all that garbage and debris.

So when legislative bodies who—and I respectfully represent are not significantly knowledgeable of the techniques and complexity of air pollution—try to write legislation, it puts the whole community in a strait jacket. Therefore I respectfully suggest that HR 12232 be considered but also perhaps it could be expanded to include the provision in S 1941 so there are the sufficient safeguards.

Mr. MULTER. A good question. Is it agreed amongst most people who study the problem and most agencies that the principal air pollutant from burning of fuels is sulphur dioxide?