

such as selectively higher toll charges during the morning and evening rush hours; higher parking charges; greater gasoline taxes; or mileage meters like taximeters, which would have to be used in particular zones of the city which were most crowded or most polluted. Such meters would be designed to register the number of miles traveled by the vehicle; they would have to be used in certain prescribed downtown areas; and would in effect be computing the bill for the driver who wanted to take his car (or truck) downtown. Similar discriminatory taxing and pricing measures designed to decrease the concentration of automobiles in crowded downtown areas are entirely conceivable.

They are, of course, not likely to be terribly popular, Mr. Chairman, with the traveling public, but this is one of the things I think we have to face if we want to talk about how we control pollution. One of the ways to control pollution is to price it out of the market.

I would like to note in this connection that the results that I have reported on the Chicago study of commuters are based on the assumption that the common carrier, the competitive common carrier transportation would not be substantially improved over what it presently is. Now, of course, the results would change if there were more rapid, more convenient, more attractive somehow, more competitive common carrier transport for at least Chicago, and indeed other major cities.

Let me move on now, Mr. Chairman, and turn to the contribution I think that the social sciences can make in the assessment of popular understanding of the causes and results of pollution, and popular reaction to measures proposed for the relief of pollution. Public opinion polling techniques can be used to get the answers to such questions as:

Does the public at large know the extent of and the nature of pollution in its various forms now?

Do people understand the causes of pollution or have theories about its causes or prevention? Sometimes people do have clear, but not always correct, ideas of causes and consequences. It is wise to know about these "vested ideas," which sometimes have to be corrected before effective action can be taken.

How much do people care about various kinds of pollution? Do they worry about health, about the appearance of the environment? What kinds of pollution bother people most? Perhaps the popular appreciation of water pollution or air pollution is much less than the understanding of it is in Congress or among scientists and engineers.

Do people worry about the effects of pollution on health? Are they concerned about costs and other economic effects of pollution or of measures for abatement? How much popular support is there for moves to eliminate or modify any sort of pollution?

Leaders in Congress and the scientific and engineering professions may not always accurately reflect the opinion of the majority of the population in the appreciation of the importance, or the size and seriousness of pollution problems. I would say in fact, it is quite likely that the leadership of the Nation is way out ahead of popular understanding and appreciation of these problems. That is, after all, the job of leadership.