

If you go up to the River Rouge, which flows through the main manufacturing area of Detroit, you would find that it wouldn't make any difference there because there is no public interest left in the River Rouge other than to get as far away from it as possible. The public interest could be served by dumping waste material into the River Rouge, but the River Rouge dumps it into the Detroit River; and the Detroit River dumps it into my district, and we do not go for that. We also have industries that threaten to move away from my district if we enforce pollution standards. We do not look upon this as favorable, particularly when they move to some other portion of the State where the laws are not as tight as ours. They pollute some other river and eventually it goes into the sea. It would seem to me that we do have a hazard. If we begin to enforce reasonably tight pollution standards, we will cause factories to move to the ocean shores, where many have already moved, and they will proceed to dump into the oceans where there is no one downstream to argue with them.

Now, I regard that as a pretty insensible approach to the problem.

Mr. LOGAN. Let me come back to your question. I agree with much of what you said and I have no doubt that there may be plants in the chemical industry that should be shut down and moved. But these situations generally involve factors other than the matter of waste disposal.

I have been, in my discussions, suggesting the movement of plants for other reasons. To close down and move a plant today with all the problems you get into is a pretty tough proposition. I think there are some plants, where that needs to be carefully considered, but this should involve the area or the locality, and some method of analysis which takes into account factors other than purely the problem of the plant itself.

Mr. VIVIAN. Earlier, I got you to agree that you were spending about 1 percent of your sales volume on pollution abatement. Then I find plants saying they are going to move if we enforce the laws. Now, what that means to me is that these plants possess a wonderful club to use on local communities, but one which is not necessarily valid if viewed by an economist dealing with the total product cost.

Mr. LOGAN. You are averaging out. The 1 percent might be 25 or 50 percent in one case and zero in a number of others. You cannot average that out.

Mr. VIVIAN. I agree.

Mr. LOGAN. Now, let's get back to the point of moving to the oceans.

Mr. VIVIAN. Go ahead.

Mr. LOGAN. If you plotted the weight of the chemical industry throughout the country, I think you would find that it is heavily located along the gulf or coastal areas or on navigable waters. This is not brought about by the desire to avoid pollution control. It is brought about by raw materials, transportation, and markets. There may be the isolated case where the waste disposal problem is a contributing factor in the decision, but basically the chemical industry is located on the navigable waterways. This facilitates the movement of raw materials. Also it facilitates the movement of finished prod-