

Mr. CONABLE. Don't we have some experimental towns going up? What about Reston? This is, of course, a commercial enterprise. Are you implying that it would have to be a governmental experiment?

Dr. SPILHAUS. Reston is a very good experiment as is Columbia. These are two private enterprises. There have also been governmental cities de novo, if you like, like Oakridge and the Advanced Space Center in Houston, but all of these have been rather specific. They haven't been real cities in the sense that they involve the typical cross section of activity that we think of in an American city.

Mr. DADDARIO. If the gentleman would yield. Isn't it your idea that a city such as Reston gives demonstration projects support because it can be more progressive and imaginative than older cities? Take, for example, recycling of water. What sales effect would it have upon the people if they knew that they were going to use reconstituted water? What effect would this have? Would you not need support if it were done through private enterprise?

Dr. SPILHAUS. I have no thought that this city should be built by the Federal Government entirely. It should be stimulated by the Federal Government.

Mr. DADDARIO. With these problems in mind.

Dr. SPILHAUS. And with normal industrial and private participation in its building.

Mr. DADDARIO. Dr. Tukey, you touched on this problem of protection from noise, and you said that the work developed at too late a date for your panel to give it the proper attention. Would you touch on that a bit, considering that the President announced, in his transportation message, that Dr. Hornig would organize an Interdepartmental Committee on Noise and Abatement. The nucleus would be the FAA, and aircraft noises would be given high priority. There is some activity in the Congress, indicated by several bills which have been introduced for the establishment of an Office of Noise Abatement. We also have had some discussion in the House Science and Astronautics Committee on giving more funds for research in the field of noise abatement.

Considering all that, how would this fit into the program? What attention should we give it? Do you think that the action being taken is enough at the present time?

Dr. TUKEY. I think the point I was making about our first approach to the importance of noise in the later phases of the Panel's work was that we did not have a chance to put in the study time in this area that would have been necessary to provide the sort of foundation that I ought to have to answer your question.

And, I think I should not try to answer it. I will merely say that I think that this problem deserves study on a broader basis than crisis reaction to special problems—the aircraft noise problem is a crisis to some people. I do not know of any actually implemented attempt to take a look at noise as a whole. Where does it come from? Which sources of it could be easily reduced? And so on.

Mr. DADDARIO. But, you do bring it up because in considering this field, we must be concerned with the effects of the environment on people, along with the problem of pollution?

Dr. TUKEY. More than that, our first task of the Panel was try to formulate a definition of pollution that we could work with. The one