

able commercially within 5 years. Moreover, we understand that such an engine could be retrofitted to aircraft in the current fleet. It does not now exist because there has been no real insistence upon its development. Quieter jet aircraft hold no economic incentives for the airlines and no local governmental body representing the public interest has effective power to require the development and use of quieter jet engines and aircraft. Only the Federal government can provide that incentive by the development and promulgation of noise standards and by their application to all aircraft through the certification process. This is basically what H.R. 3400 would do.

Many leaders of the aviation industry agree to this, as I am sure you are aware from the testimony before the Subcommittee. They fully recognize that the intensification and proliferation of aircraft noise constitutes the single greatest inhibitor and hazard to the growth of aviation today.

The testimony of Mr. John E. Stephen, General Counsel of the Air Transport Association, before your committee, has suggested that the air carriers have taken the lead in aircraft noise abatement and has catalogued their achievements in noise abatement.

Mr. Stephen's catalogue of achievements is more fictional than factual. Nevertheless, we have had the cooperation of various air carriers in carrying out our rules for the amelioration of neighborhood noise. On the other hand, there have been vigorous objections by certain air carriers and these terms and conditions have been the subject of litigation on more than one occasion. The present preferential runway system and various noise abatement procedures at our airports were first and foremost instituted by the Port Authority; in some instances over the strenuous objections of airlines. The airlines continue to be unhappy about any of these procedures to the extent that they believe that any restrictions involve economic penalties.

I do not believe that the fan-jet engine was developed for the primary purpose of noise abatement. It was in fact purchased because of its great economy in operation (it is about 20 per cent more efficient in terms of fuel consumption) and, luckily, has succeeded in operating with less takeoff noise than its predecessors. However, the fan-jet has not, because of its characteristic high pitched noise during landing, aided in a solution of the landing noise portion of the overall problem. We consider that landing noise is about 80% of our problem in New York.

Mr. Stephen's objections to H.R. 3400 appear to be consistent with long established ATA objectives: to make the treatment of aircraft noise solely a local problem to be solved locally through "compatible land use" programs. It is well known throughout the industry that the ATA policy for years has been one of opposition to any Federal intervention in aircraft noise abatement or even to participation by the Federal government in land purchases for purposes of noise abatement. Rather, it is the ATA's policy that aircraft noise is a local problem to be decided by the courts on a case-by-case basis.

The ATA advocates that the local government should purchase all noise-affected land and convert its use to other than residential purposes. Such a policy is impossible of fulfillment in our urban society. Airports already take 5,000 to 10,000 acres each of highly valuable land, and many metropolitan areas now require two, three and sometimes four major airports. Can we now acquire substantial additional acres for noise abatement? In the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan area, for example, densely populated communities seriously affected by aircraft noise stretch five miles or more from the airport, and large communities more than ten miles from the airport are disturbed by jet aircraft noise. The suggestion that these hundreds of thousands of people be removed from such large areas and that the land be redeveloped for industrial purposes is politically, socially and economically impossible.

Mr. Stephen states that "certification (of aircraft) can yield no more than technology can produce. This result would probably follow without legislation." In the absence of legislation technology has produced no significant solutions to the jet aircraft noise problem during the past 20 years. Nor will technology produce significant and desperately needed noise abatement in the next 20 years without government insistence and encouragement that can only be secured from new legislation.

Mr. Stephen further states that only a few major airports have a noise problem and to design aircraft to them would unduly penalize an air transport system. In fact, 70 per cent of all United States air commerce is conducted at twenty-two