4. To assure the fitness and appropriateness in the use of the industry's products by:

(*a*) research and study aimed at broader and deeper scientific knowledge of the handling, application, and ultimate fate of chemical products;

(*b*) education of those who sell, handle, and use chemical products by clear instruction in all aspects of handling, use, and disposal, recognizing the need for change with the accumulation of further knowledge.

5. To promote a high degree of intra-industry cooperation, beginning with the promotion of full and free interchange, within lawful limits, of information and technology pertinent to environmental health.

6. To promote cooperation with all other segments of society in mutual effort toward solution of the total problem of environmental health, by:

(*a*) offering knowledge and technology for application wherever it may apply to the problem;

(*b*) accepting leadership responsibility in those aspects and areas where the chemical industry's experience may be of value;

(*c*) encouraging action by others throughout society, particularly in industry;

(*d*) cooperating as may be appropriate in any study or action undertaken by others in the scientific community, in academic circles, in public agencies and elsewhere.

Adopted by the Board of Directors, Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., September 15, 1964.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Brown?

Mr. BROWN. No questions.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Mosher?

Mr. MOSHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Logan, on page 4 of your testimony you stated that although administrative convenience might be served by having uniform requirements on discharges, et cetera, this would be economically wasteful as a general policy.

Would you cite one or two practical examples that would illustrate this philosophy?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes, I think I can, Mr. Mosher.

From my own experience in our company, we operate a plant which manufactures certain products. There are about 15 similar plants in the country operated by 6 or 7 other companies.

A uniform set of standards applicable to the discharge from these plants would create a chaotic condition in the industry and in the supply picture, because the conditions under which discharges from these plants are made are so totally different, one from the other. This is the essence of what I am getting at.

So a specific standard applied across the industry might be less than desirable in one location, but force another location completely out of operation.

Mr. MOSHER. To go a little further, can you say why? Can you give some specific illustrations?

Mr. LOGAN. Yes. The specific problem I am relating this to is well known in the industry and governmental circles. We have a plant on the Holston River in Virginia. This, in effect, competes with plants on the Ohio and the Mississippi, for example.

Now, the problem of discharging 1 ton of waste on the North Fork of the Holston River is very substantially different than it is on the Mississippi or the Ohio. And in the one case, the requirements——

Mr. MOSHER. You mean because of the volume of water?

Mr. LOGAN. That is right. Therefore, in the one case a standard might require little or no effort on the part of one plant facility where