health point of view, because of a small amount of information that lead may affect weather, and possible future needs for catalytic devices to produce lower auto emissions, we decided that the risk of a futher increase in atmospheric lead content was too high to be tolerated at this time. But our technical experts are of the unanimous opinion there is no catalytic device which will operate on a muffler as to today, which will operate in the presence of lead.

Again, trying to anticipate technology ahead, because of the massive current number of autos, we ought to do something, not wait until the problem becomes insoluble. Because of all of these reasons, we felt that HEW should obtain better quantitave data on the health aspects of lead, and we should in fact stop increasing the lead in the air now. That is a matter of judgment. You can say we ought to cut it 20 percent or we ought to forget it, but with all these factors involved it was the considered judgment of our people, that we just could not take the risk of increasing lead every year. Ten years from now we would be at another hearing, we would look back, and say, "Gosh, I wish we had done it then."

Mr. DADDARIO. How are you affected by people who have come to their judgment on these things as a result of their participation in the situation as in Los Angeles?

As we look at these things, Dr. Goldsmith is on your panel, he is also on the panel in California. The language in both instances, seemed to be almost the same. The reference to the need in California, and the standards you have set there, are understandable. What kind of judgment goes into determining how you apply this to the whole country? And should it in fact be applied to the whole country?

Dr. MORSE. You are still discussing lead?

Mr. DADDARIO. Yes.

Dr. MORSE. I want to make it clear our deliberation with respect to lead paid little attention to the California problem. Atmospheric pollution in California is quite different from New York. The smog problem is not aggravated by lead. There is no established association between lead and smog. So that really was not a consideration. The question of lead, from a health point of view, comes up in those instances where you have let's say garage mechanics working near an auto, you have policemen associated in heavy traffic conditions, not California.

One of the major automobile manufacturers, for technical reasons, not health reasons, was very interested in making a substantial reduction in the tetraethyl lead content of gasoline. They felt this eased their problem of designing an engine and control devices to meet the characteristics which they can anticipate in the future. This was a technical economic consideration, not a health consideration.

Another automotive executive didn't agree with this viewpoint. That is where the deliberation and judgment factor of our panel came in. We had a very strong recommendation from one of the major auto people that they would like to see lead reduced substantially, and in addition the octane rating of gasoline reduced, and the compression ratio. If you in fact reduce the octane rating of gasoline and the compression ratio of our engine, then it may not cost more money to use nonleaded gasoline.