

Mr. FRIEDEL. Of this year?

Mr. STEPHEN. Of this year; yes, sir. The FAA has funded the study at a cost of \$75,000, and it is anticipated that it will lay out essentially a systems approach to the regulation of aircraft noise on a rational basis nationally.

While significant accomplishments in aircraft noise alleviation have thus already been attained without any legal regulation, the airlines industry nevertheless is concerned with the continuing problem and we do accept and we do support the principle of Federal regulation designed to bring about more effective noise alleviation in all fields, and particularly aircraft noise, and alleviation of sonic boom as well.

In this connection, incidentally, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Administrator's forwarding letter states that the view of the Administration is that the term "noise" includes sonic boom in any event. We think that is a highly dubious proposition, both as a matter of law and as a matter of physics.

However, we would agree that, even though sonic boom regulation of civil aircraft at the present time is purely hypothetical, because there are no civil aircraft that create sonic boom, we nevertheless would favor presently giving the Administrator that authority.

We think it is important that Congress, the airport operators, the public, and local governments be aware that a bill such as H.R. 3400 deals with only a very small piece of the aircraft noise problem. It deals, moreover, in a way that cannot possibly afford what has been referred to as a "solution" to the noise problem.

In the first place, the bill deals with only one element of the three elements of the problem, that is to say, reduction of aircraft noise at the source. It has nothing to do with controlling environment on the ground, which is an essential feature of any true solution to the aircraft noise problem.

This has been recognized by the White House Jet Noise Panel in its report; it has been recognized by Secretary Boyd himself in his testimony before this committee last week; it has been recognized to date by the American Bar Association study to which I referred.

You cannot have any true solution to the aircraft noise problem that does not deal with environmental control of land use on the ground as well as noise at the source.

A further limitation of H.R. 3400 is inherent in the legislative approach which it uses. It proposes to amend title VI of the act. Title VI deals with civil aircraft only. Therefore, it does not cover "public" aircraft, including the more than 100 aircraft operated by the FAA itself.

There are many public aircraft, including jet aircraft, which contribute to the noise problem and which are not dealt with by this bill. Among the public aircraft not covered by H.R. 3400 are military aircraft. Military jets are the noisiest of all aircraft and they are substantial contributors to the aircraft noise problem.

We are not suggesting, in fact no one would suggest, that military jets ought to be impaired in any way in carrying out their defense function or as to their defense capability. But it is important to understand that when we do not deal with military aircraft as a prime source of noise we are dealing with only a part of the noise problem in this country.