

Committee on Air and Water Pollution Abatement. I am past chairman of the Steel Industry Action Committee of the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitary Commission.

While I appear before you today as a representative of United States Steel Corp., I have been authorized by various other member companies of the American Iron & Steel Institute to make the present statement in their behalf as well. These combined member companies represent approximately 97 percent of the 1965 domestic steel production. I am submitting a list of these companies (see p. 342).

The July 1, 1966, publication of this subcommittee was reviewed in preparing this discussion on the adequacy of technology for pollution abatement, with special reference to the steel industry. The subcommittee is to be congratulated on the breadth of understanding of the pollution abatement field.

Your report, which succinctly expressed many of the views held by the steel industry on the need for new technology, states that:

Pollution abatement, and indeed waste disposal, costs are a net loss to the gross national product. Greater economy and cost-benefit improvement will often be desirable, even after methods are found which make initial treatment efforts acceptable or economically feasible.

Pollution abatement research and development can also reveal cheaper methods of waste disposal.

Industrial and consumer product recycles, which are developed to lessen pollution, will be important steps in conserving natural resources.

Pollution abatement research and development require an interdisciplinary approach.

Industrial research and development laboratories have already made significant contributions in remedying internal pollution problems.

We also concur that there are areas where additional technology will be required. Your report mentions the gross treatment of mine drainage, control of nitrogen oxide emissions, and sulfur dioxide removal from stack gases.

Research and development efforts have been carried out by individual companies, by groups of companies who find they have a common goal in an area of control, and by sponsorship of the American Iron and Steel Institute. While I will stress the research sponsored by the AISI, due credit must be given to the individual steel companies which have been active in the development and evaluation of new and improved processes for pollution control for many years.

Mr. DADDARIO. Is there any effort being made to combine the work in this field rather than to have it dispersed to individual companies?

Dr. BISHOP. Yes; we have always had very good liaison in the steel industry on our pollution abatement matters, not only in meetings but additionally there is a good deal of visiting back and forth between various steel people. We see each other, I would say on the average of at least once a month throughout the year, and I can assure you that by working together this way we have managed to save ourselves a good deal of time.

Mr. DADDARIO. The reason I ask the question is both because of your statement and because, as I understand it, there is a difference of opinion among steel producers on how to handle pollution. The Fontana plant in California and other independent plants seem to be going down different roads. Is this because they are satisfied that they have the solution, or do they feel they accomplish more this way?