

Mr. DADDARIO. I think it would be extremely helpful. This is one of the areas not only of great importance, but one which naturally attracts the thinking of the public. An explanation of it could be extremely helpful to us, Dr. Morse.

Dr. MORSE. In late 1967, the Technical Advisory Board of the Department of Commerce, of which I have been a member since its formation, addressed itself to the question as to whether it would be appropriate for such a body to look at the auto industry air pollution problem. It is fair to say that the stimulation for this action probably came from Senators Muskie and Magnuson who, as you know, have had great concern for our pollution problems and have done a very fine job.

Subsequent to this meeting of T.A.B., the Secretary of Commerce established a Panel of some 16 members and asked me to serve as chairman. Simultaneously with the establishment of this ad hoc study panel by the Department of Commerce, other departments within the executive branch, and Federal agencies, indicated their desire to become associated with the study. This included HEW, Department of the Interior, Department of Defense, Housing, and Urban Development, the Atomic Energy Commission, Post Office, Federal Power Commission, and the Department of Transportation. Each of these organizations supplied a certain amount of money for expenses and staff assistance. People on my committee served without pay.

I would like for a moment to talk about the panel because we have had some talks today about the possibility of establishing a Council of Ecological Advisers. I am personally allergic to committees as I'm sure we all are, unless they are effective and can implement their findings.

This particular panel was an interesting one and followed the pattern of a previous panel of the Department of Commerce—the so-called Sharpie Panel, dealing with innovation and invention.

Within the panel itself we had members drawn from a variety of segments of society with diverse technical, scientific, and industrial backgrounds. We had people from industry, universities, and government.

I think it was important that we had the same approach as the Sharpie Panel, where we had lawyers and scientists, engineers, inventors, business people. It is only by establishing study groups with this kind of a composition that you can get objectivity.

A panel of our type may create some heated dissension, but in the process of the deliberation, it also gets education. In both of these study groups the panel members learned as they went along with their evaluation process. Furthermore, this study dealing with the automobile pollution had representation from more than one department in the executive branch. I think this is also important in attacking a problem, which as mentioned by some of the earlier witnesses, does transcend the responsibility of any one department.

Otherwise, I think we might have turned in a written report—a Commerce report—and then HEW might well say, "That's fine, but let's now set up a committee to look at the report of the committee." Action would be delayed and the usual interdepartmental conflicts would be magnified.