

talk about chemicals, this is one thing, and chemicals do not necessarily mean the chemical industry per se.

I would disagree with your opinion that the chemical industry as such has been a major or the major contributor to pollution. We do have serious problems, however, no question about it.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Logan, let me challenge another one of your statements and then hear your comments.

On page 8 of your testimony, you state:

Except in programs of giant proportions such as space exploration, it is our impression that greater opportunities for industry to engage in research supported by Government contract would not generally be a substantial stimulus to progress.

Now, I am under the impression that most pollution is chemical in its nature. It would seem to me that within the chemical industry there would be great scientific talent which the Government could look to in its attempt to solve this problem and perhaps through this type of arrangement arrive at solutions which would benefit this country of ours. I don't understand why you would make this statement.

Mr. LOGAN. Let me see if I can clarify that point. I agree with you that—and I believe this was your remark—that most wastes or most pollution is chemical. Actually, all things are chemical and we must distinguish the chemical industry and chemical things. You and I are chemical. This glass is a chemical. The industry is basically, therefore, fundamental to all other industries, and it is fundamental to all aspects of the solution of the pollution problems. The industry has a number of companies, a number of the members of MCA where the chief business, the primary business of these companies is in the treatment of water for various purposes.

Sometimes it is the treatment of boiler feed water or it is the treatment of municipal wastes, but there is a large segment of the chemical industry that is devoting 100 percent of its attention to problems of water.

There is a vast supply of technical ability in our industry that can be directed to the solution of these problems. The specific statement we made tried to convey the fact that we do not believe the best approach is to engage a specific member of industry or a specific section of the industry in a Government program. We do feel that the industry, through the MCA or through the technical groups of the industry should be allowed to contribute, should be allowed to review and participate in the formulation of programs designed to minimize waste disposal problems. This was not a statement that we did not wish to do so. It meant to imply that we did not think research engaged in under Government supervision in a specific plant or company was the best approach to the problem.

Now, maybe I have not answered your question. Maybe I have confused you.

Mr. ROUSH. I understand that this response is based on an apparent conservative philosophy concerning Government participation and Government solution of problems. That's the way I would view it. I believe that's all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Vivian?