

Federal level to assist the industry in its pollution abatement efforts.

Legislation will not solve problems where solutions are not known. Research grants to find better and more economical solutions must be the primary step. Recognition of the problems which face industry must be a guide for any legislation. Reasonable legislation would consider the particular situation with a variable enforcement pattern geared to technical progress. Enforcement can be best handled at the State and local level since they are most familiar with the individual situation.

*Question 11. Can you give any specific examples of plants that have been forced to move or go out of business, of proposed plants that have not been built in localities that had been selected for other reasons, because of inability to economically meet State-imposed quality standards for the plant?*

Answer: There are some examples of plants that have been forced to go out of business; in fact I know of two instances in New York State, one in which this factor was the principal cause and another in which the pollution abatement requirements were so stringent that a plant was not rebuilt after a disastrous fire. In addition, I am aware of a large company that operates nationally that has shut down at least three mills where the effluent problem was critical, and the correction was great enough to be a factor in the final decision to close them down. Broadly speaking, the liberal application of the guidelines recently proposed for the control of water pollution would unquestionably require some mills, especially older ones, so to modify their operations as to be economically noncompetitive.

There are many locations which are otherwise suitable for pulp and papermaking facilities which can no longer be considered because of the increasing stringency of water and air pollution abatement requirements.