lowing is a representative comparison between train, bus and air travel times and costs: o menti firrikan diredi ali suca

TRAIN

		l-way fare (coach)	Approximate time
Chicago-Miami Washington, D.CLos Angeles		\$48.32 108.14	31 hours. 53½ hours plus 6 hours connecting time=59½ hours. 62½ hours plus 6 hours connecting time=68½ hours.
New York-San Francisco	andernasia (nasi Majaja Kasas Salak	114.55	
	BUS	e in the filler in the	
	January No. 194	1-way fare	Approximate time
Chicago-Miami Washington, D.CLos Angeles New York-San Francisco		\$42, 90 84, 65 88, 35	35 hours. 73 hours. 73 hours.
	AIR	Carl Strains	en inglose de la companya del companya del companya de la companya
	and the state of	1-way (jet coach)	Approximate time
Chicago-Miami Washington, D.CLos Angeles New York-San Francisco		\$78, 44 144, 11 152, 36	2½ hours. 4 hours 48 minutes. 5 hours 37 minutes.

International surface transportation has lost its attraction for passengers who are turning to flying as witness the fact that the Cunard Line is removing the Queen Mary and Queen Elizabeth from passenger service by the end of this year.

Air freight likewise faces a rapid growth because many items that in times past were normally warehoused are now shipped by air with overnight delivery in many cases. As the aircraft manufacturers develop aircraft that are more attractive from a ton mile cost standpoint, the growth of air freight can be expected to multiply at a rapidly increasing rate.

This all boils down to the fact that an explosive growth in air transportation is not something that is still on the horizon, but is something that we must recognize as being with us now. If this nation is to continue its progress, we must gear our services to the demand which is already an accepted fact,

AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

The billion is beautiful

Air traffic control is the second aspect in this over-all requirement for expansion of services if any acceptable semblance of air safety is to be maintained. The noise abatement procedures are still with us around certain airports and contribute materially to the problems of air traffic control. Only recently have the Federal Aviation Administration, the Air Transport Association and the Air Line Pilots Association reached tentative agreement on a standardized noise abatement take-off procedure calculated to produce the least possible amount of objectionable noise to communities on the ground, It will, however, probably create some problems in the air traffic control system in terms of routing flexibilities and the efficient utilization of limited airspace.

Present requirements for 5,000 feet minimum separation between parallel runways where simultaneous instrument approaches and landings are occurring create certain restrictions from an air traffic control standpoint, but this too is the best that can be done at the present time. This all means that the location of airports must be geographically compatible with airspace limitations and navigational facilities for aircraft using that specific airport as well as those over flying it.

Much research and development has been done but much more will be required if we are to attain an efficient and safer air traffic control system.

With the advent of total radar coverage, the enroute portion of the air traffic control system has shown some improvement over the past few years. However, in many areas of the country this system is now reaching its peak load capacity

นไม้ เกิดเล่าใหญ่ ใหญ่สำเหมือนในเทิดเล่า เป็นเป็นการ