

ucts to the market, and that means that you are largely related to the ocean, to the gulf and the main river bodies.

Mr. VIVIAN. As you have pointed out, that tends to be the gulf coast, the east coast, and the Great Lakes. I'm omitting the west coast because there does not seem to be a dispute there. No one has yet succeeded in saturating the gulf or the Atlantic coasts that we know of, but the Great Lakes are being saturated and that has occurred in the last generation. Therefore there is a trend toward plants moving away from the Great Lakes. I happen to have a district on the Great Lakes which has something to do with my question. Now, the question I have is: "If we set industry-by-industry standards on effluent control, why would this be dangerous to industry?" You say that it intermixes with other factors in the market equation and could cause plant relocations. Presumably it would cost unfair amounts at some seacoast locations. That's the only interpretation I can place on your statement.

Mr. LOGAN. Not in most cases I think, and I'm not familiar with the specific plants in your locality, although I know some of them pretty well, I think in many cases if the decision regarding plant locations were made today, those people would not have put the plants where they have put them in your territory.

Mr. VIVIAN. That's another worry. Go ahead.

Mr. LOGAN. That is right. So, a part of the problem is related to that factor and is not at all a reflection of waste disposal problems. We talked about organic chemicals a few moments ago. Actually the organic chemical business is based on hydrocarbon raw materials, gas or oil. These are essentially gulf coast or port based situations. This is largely why you have the tremendous development along the gulf coast. It is a matter of raw material and fuel. It is not related to pollution per se.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wilkenfeld would like to comment on one of Mr. Roush's remarks with respect to the situation in New York State.

Mr. WILKENFELD. I think you will be very interested in what developed after the Rochester hearing in which the question was raised about the quantity of biochemical oxygen demands being discharged by one of our Hooker plants. At that time the report which Congressman Jones had indicated there was 22,000 pounds per day being discharged. He felt this was an extremely large figure and questioned it, and I said I would go back and investigate it further. I discussed the matter with the Director of the Federal Water Pollution Study on Lake Ontario immediately afterward. He agreed that he would find out the basis for this number. He didn't know offhand and I have written him formally requesting this, and haven't had a reply yet. I also went back and checked on some data developed on samples taken by the Federal water pollution agencies for the International Joint Commission in the spring or late winter last year. I think it was December or January. Their results indicated that there were only 1,600 pounds a day of biochemical oxygen demand, not 22,000, and the concentration—which I tried to indicate was an important fact, not just total pounds—at two discharge points to the river was 2 and 15 parts per million, which are well within what the Federal water pollution agency has indicated they felt discharges to the Great Lakes and