

Mr. CONABLE. How about steel, are they also interested in this field?

Mr. GAMMELGARD. I would think that primarily interest would come from the fossil fuel suppliers and main users—big industrial users. Steel does, of course, come under that category. They might wish to contribute something.

The second area of inadequacy to which increased attention is being paid by the oil industry is that of emissions from gasoline engines.

A \$480,000 technical project that we are sponsoring is underway at the Bartlesville, Okla., laboratories of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. DADDARIO. What is the contribution of the Bureau of Mines in this particular project?

Mr. GAMMELGARD. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, our money is essentially financing this project including the payment of salary of Bureau of Mines personnel at their salary rates plus some of their benefits. But things like the buildings and facilities that will be used in this project that are the property of the Bureau of Mines—we are not paying anything for this. This is sort of a contribution in kind that they are making. We would have been perfectly happy if the Bureau of Mines would have had half of the money to contribute as their share of it. We weren't anxious to pay for the entire project. There was no attempt on our part by paying the entire tab to maybe try to control what comes out of this project. In fact, we would be happy to put in a minor share of the money if it would make the Government happy.

Mr. DADDARIO. I am not insinuating that it might be a directed study because you are paying a major share of it. It seems to me that as you have already said, it is the size of the program that is important.

I was trying to determine how much more money over and above the \$480,000 will be provided by other sources. I am certain your study would be objective. Otherwise, I don't know how we could head it under the term of research.

Mr. GAMMELGARD. That is correct. I agree with you. I think there are some that don't share your viewpoint, however.

Mr. DADDARIO. I assure you there is no bias.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, what is this criticism? You have implied that this study has been criticized. Who is criticizing it?

Mr. GAMMELGARD. The Senate Committee on Public Works, in its report accompanying S. 3112, made the comment that this project raised the issue of the propriety, I believe, of industry financed research in Government facilities where the public welfare was involved or the common good. It is pretty difficult to get away from the common good not being involved in a pollution problem so this in our opinion would mean any project in the air and water pollution fields would come under the public welfare or domain. The committee recommended projects such as ours with the Bureau of Mines should be brought to the Congress some 90 days before they might be signed up as an on-going project for review. In my opinion, a procedure like that would effectively build a wall between Government and industry work where industry paid for research in a Government agency. I can see nothing wrong in a case like this where both parties think and believe that this is an excellent project. Budget considerations in our industry association in the past have limited us to projects that will