

With Sir Charles Snow and Don Price was the highlight of this series. Secondly, I am persuaded that these hearings, the report of the advisory panel on which they are based, and what will follow from these hearings, will constitute a significant step toward the development of a national, well-conceived set of national policies for dealing with environmental problems. Because of the availability of a great deal of literature on pollution and the comprehensive listing of the issues in our report, I would restrict my comments to five points. The first two are very general and the last three are specific.

First—a very general comment—so obvious that the only reason for bringing it up is that it is so easily and so frequently overlooked. Amidst all the discussion of technological capabilities and inadequacies, priorities, and strategies in scientific research, economic analysis of costs and benefits and institutional aspects, let us never forget that the problem we are discussing is—simply and fundamentally—a human problem. Human intolerance of dirtiness; human desire for cleanliness. Instincts so deeply ingrained in the fabric of our American culture that there is a rising chorus of voices across the country, demanding that the human mastery over energy and matter which has soiled our air and water, while bringing within reach the good things of life, now be put to work to restore some reasonable degree of cleanliness to our environment. From some firsthand experience with the grassroots human demands for clean water in Connecticut, I can assure you that they will not be denied—even at a cost that would have constituted a significant impediment a few years ago. In answer to a question raised by Congressman Miller, these costs will be borne in two ways: An increased cost for the goods and services produced by a proposal which entails control of pollution and second—as we have proposed in Connecticut—a major bond issue.

My second comment is concerned with the report of your Research Management Advisory Panel. It is a superbly succinct and perceptive document—and unerringly zeroes in on inadequacies in the technology for—

- Treatment of mine drainage or nitrogen oxide emissions;
- Removal of sulfur dioxide from stack gases;
- Control of the effluents from automobile exhausts.

Emphasis on the need for basic and applied research is appropriate and timely and I would like to associate myself with the panel, without reservation, in their identification of the urgency and importance of the three examples cited. One might hope, however, that in the definitive report that may be presumed to follow this excellent exposition of issues for the purposes of discussion the litany of inadequacies in technology will be accompanied by a listing of those pollution abatement problems for which the technology is adequate (for example, the control of the emission of particulate matter in stack gases). Mr. Chairman, I flew across New York this morning at a distance of about 20 miles—you have done the same thing I know many times—and I couldn't even see Manhattan. This need not be. This is not a consequence of a technological inadequacy. It is the result of what your report called "artificial barriers to application" in this particular instance. There are other problems where the technology does have to be developed, and it would be a pity if any of the measures that are