

to noise pollution but few of these types of complaints are heard about distant Dulles.

Another method being investigated is the rerouting of aircraft to minimize the noise. This is also being tried in Washington with more planes now being required to fly approach and exit patterns over the Potomac River.

But, the real effort in resolving this problem must come from the type of Federal legislation which is being considered by this committee this week. I am hopeful that you will be able to take fast and favorable action in this regard. At the same time we must issue a warning that no legislation, no improvement in procedures or engines, will totally resolve this problem. We will always have noise associated with aircraft. It seems to me that our task now is to do everything we can to minimize that noise discomfort and disruption.

Questions have been raised as to the safety factors involved if, indeed, we are to take steps to control aircraft noise. I can't conceive of the Federal Aviation Administration, which would implement this legislation, developing any plan which would increase air safety hazards. Indeed, Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, in testimony before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics on April 4, 1967, said:

The Department will formulate regulations governing the flight of aircraft based on the principle that noise abatement is second only to safety.

The Secretary also said:

The Department of Transportation assumes and welcomes the leadership and responsibility in the aircraft noise abatement area.

The St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch newspaper, in an editorial of support for this legislation on November 8 said:

Such legislation (as H.R. 11736) would force airlines to adopt available noise suppression techniques. Quieter jet engines have been developed, but they involved added costs which the aviation industry has not been eager to accept. Federal regulations would provide an effective incentive for modernization and greater concern for the public interest.

Of course, the manufacture of a quieter jet engine is feasible, and certainly in this day of advanced technology we can develop a "quiet" engine which would not increase the safety hazards.

The Minneapolis (Minn.) Star also commented on this problem in an editorial on July 14 of this year:

The problem can be attacked successfully only as a problem in aircraft design. And this means action must be taken at the national level.

To be specific: The piston-driven aircraft now going out of service were designed to land at an angle of 6 percent—and thus remain higher above residential areas. The present jets were designed to land at a 3 percent angle—and thus come screaming down much lower over the rooftops. No local operating regulations can change this without creating a serious problem of safety. So they will not be imposed.

New jets, more than twice as big, are coming soon. How they are designed is all-important. The manufacturers could put a part of their greater engine power into noise suppression, rather than into payload. But business considerations argue for payload. And the federal government currently cannot require noise suppression as it can require minimum standards on safety. Legislation is needed.

As I stated earlier, I am confident that the legislation before you this week can and will provide the impetus for the safe reduction of aircraft