

and positive results rather than going on a punitive expedition. We hope that that will somehow produce the desirable results. I think we are going to make a great forward step in a very difficult problem.

To oversimplify, no one knows to this day how you adequately remove the oil, no matter how innocently the cause may be, or wherever the accident may be.

I call this to your attention, I am personally more interested in research work the industry may be doing or different industries wherever they may be, jointly or individually, on dispersants, homogenization of chemicals, use of chemicals.

I know there is substantial progress being made, because I am one who is a strong advocate of encouraging this type of research work, not only by the Federal Government in grants to universities, but also working with and through the industries involved, whether they be paper, synthetic fibers, chemicals, fuel, and certainly in your case. I think some breakthrough perhaps may be reached. Some indications look very encouraging, very attractive. We will need more information on that, which we will appreciate very much.

Mr. GAMMELGARD. We will do that.

Mr. BLATNIK. Do you have any brief comments, or comments from any members with you? I appreciate the members standing by.

Mr. Wright?

COVERAGE OF SHORE INSTALLATIONS

Mr. WRIGHT. Very briefly, the central thrust of this testimony directs itself to the shore installations in the first place, and Congress decided in the 1966 act this should not be included in the community provision of the act. There are thousands of rivers related and unrelated to the oil industry. Your position and those with you are already thoroughly covered under the existing law in regard to the States and the applied standards.

Mr. GAMMELGARD. I haven't seen a single one of the 25-or-so-odd State laws that have come to my attention that do not give a pretty strict definition of what is permitted in the way of an oil discharge. Mr. Oeming's statement yesterday defined it as "no visible film of oil, gasoline or related materials, no globules of grease." This is typical of other States' requirements and to meet this is going to take some real control facilities on shore installations; but we are going to do it.

Mr. WRIGHT. Well, really, there is more sense in taking oil discharges and putting them under an entirely different administration than in, like the pickling liquors coming from pickle factories or acids coming from steel mills or from some other operations, or chemicals coming from chemical plants, any of the other pollutants. I am sure you cannot obviously do that with States, where vessels are moving around and some vessels are obviously doing that.

Mr. GAMMELGARD. Exactly the way we feel.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Pittman, do you have a separate statement?

Mr. PITTMAN. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. BLATNIK. You join the chairman in his presentation?

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Cramer?