

pass over the roofs of more than 40 schools, thousands of homes, and scores of houses of worship. It has been estimated that \$874,824 in man-hours were lost in the schools along "jet alley" last year.

The injury to health caused by jet noise is the most convincing argument for immediate and drastic action. When a man is in good health, the noise of low-flying aircraft stops the normal activities of living. But when a sick man is involved, aircraft noise can impede recovery and cause aggravation of the problem.

Since taking up the cudgels for those in the path of runway 22L, I have received many unsolicited letters from well-respected physicians telling of the physical injury inflicted by the scream of jet aircraft. Dr. Benjamin Esterman, former president of the medical board at St. Joseph's Hospital in Far Rockaway and director of eye surgery, wrote to me soon after the Elmont hearings last fall. He complained:

"The effect of the jet noise on patients has at times been almost beyond belief and needs to be experienced to be appreciated . . . Sick patients are terribly disturbed, convalescence and recovery are impeded by the frequent roar and screech of the motors and by the impossibility of getting uninterrupted sleep . . . In the pediatric department, small children wake up screaming from the sudden light and fearful noise."

In 1963, St. Joseph's Hospital was visited by representatives of the airline industry, who responded to the staff's complaints by expressing skepticism that the conditions could be as bad as were described, particularly since no records were kept of specific disturbances. For a short time afterward, records were kept of the patients' complaints. Within few days, there were 81 complaints.

Commerce and normal communication are constantly disrupted by aircraft noise. According to studies by the Stanford Research Institute, during takeoff flight operations for a 707-120 jet aircraft, indoor conversation would be interrupted to the extent that 37.5 words would be masked—all along the path of the plane. Landing operations, when the engines are gunned and the aircraft swoops in low for a long gradual descent, would presumably cause even greater disruption.

In France last summer, a laborer began legal proceedings against the French Army for physical injuries caused by aircraft noise. Emile Vecereau is still awaiting satisfaction, his health shattered. This is not atypical, Mr. Speaker, and serves to illustrate the scope of the problem.

It is not confined to isolated far-flung examples, either. On Tuesday, September 28, 1965, a roadworker was crushed to death by a 16-ton steamroller at a construction site at Kennedy Airport. Quintas Prudencio was spreading stone on the bed of a road which had just been oiled when he walked backward into the roller. The report to the Workmen's Compensation Board noted that "jet noise was intense at the time." The workman could not hear the machine coming at him because of the deafening screech of aircraft. The same problem exists for children playing in the street who cannot hear approaching automobiles.

Such is the problem, in an abbreviated form. The tragedy of the aircraft noise melodrama is, however, the buckpassing which seems to be part and parcel of running a Federal agency.

The New York Port Authority maintains it has a right to regulate aircraft noise on takeoff procedures because the plane is on port authority property—that is, the airport. However, the port authority says once the plane is airborne jurisdiction passes to the Federal Aviation Agency which has control over the aircraft until it sets down at another airport, at which time another local regulatory unit takes over control. For this reason, the port authority refuses to prescribe noise restrictions for landing operations. The FAA declines to set engine noise levels for landings, vaguely referring to the jurisdiction of the port authority, the difficulty in obtaining accurate measurements, emergency margins of safety, preferential runways, and structural limitations of aircraft.

Obviously, somebody is mistaken.

I have introduced legislation requiring the FAA to establish restrictions on aircraft noise during landing operations, and hope it will be speedily enacted by Congress. In my opinion, the port authority would be within its rights to impose noise limits on landings as well as takeoffs at Kennedy Airport. To clarify this impasse, I will request opinions from Louis J. Lefkowitz, New York State attorney general, and the U.S. Attorney General. The Port of New York Authority is an interstate compact, which was approved and chartered by the Congress upon the request of New York and New Jersey. These two opinions are, therefore, relevant to the question of the authority's jurisdiction.