

Taking this industry back to the day when Morse Code was used as the communications medium, imagine, if you will what would have been the state of things if it hadn't been replaced by voice communications. If we were still obliged to conduct our communications by Morse Code, we could not accommodate one-tenth of the traffic that is now being handled. Relatively speaking, we're about at the stage we were when Morse Code became automated only now it is voice communications which are becoming too laborious and slow. It is, therefore, obvious that imagination, associated with serious research and development, must be used immediately.

WEATHER MINIMUMS

ALPA representatives and All-Weather Flying Committee have worked diligently over the years with industry to help establish safe procedures for establishing lower minimums.

We strongly recommend that approving operations to the lowest Category II minimums be delayed until the interim CAT II minimums of 150' ceiling 1600 RVR have been in effect for an extended period of time to gain service experience. The present FAA minimum required period of six months is considered totally inadequate. A more realistic requirement would be approximately two years—or more. In this way public safety would be served. At its Fourteenth Air Safety Forum ALPA safety representatives adopted this resolution:

Whereas several air carriers have been approved for operations as low as a decision height of 150 feet and an RVR 1600 feet for over a year; and

Whereas the number of actual approaches at these minima have been very few, and little practical exposure and operational experience has been gained in this low visibility environment; and

Whereas these carriers contemplate further reduction of these minima as low as a decision height of 100 feet and RVR 1200 feet; and

Whereas, in addition to flight operation problems, there exist many serious unsolved problems, such as ATC, training, communications, simulation, human factors, etc., Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the consensus of the delegates to the Fourteenth ALPA Air Safety Forum, that landing operations with less than a decision height of 150 feet and an RVR of 1600 feet would be premature at this time; therefore be it further

Resolved, That the delegates to this Forum strongly recommend that no ALPA member shall conduct any approach to minima lower than a decision height of 150' and an RVR at 1600 feet, at this time.

There are extreme hazards associated with premature operations at low minimums which makes it prudent not to hurry the acceptance of lower minimums until everyone is entirely comfortable, confident, and ready to use them. This will assure progress while the use of the available improved aids at present weather minimums for an extended period of time will assure safety and schedule reliability.

Probing into the Category II area must be done with *more* safety than heretofore, not less. We must have *fewer*, not more, missed approaches in Category II weather. If equipment and aids will not provide this safety factor, we should not be conducting the approaches.

PILOT TRAINING

ALPA has long stressed the concept of "training to proficiency rather than checking for proficiency". Apparently we are not in accord on this matter with the FAA who regards recurrent assessment of an airline pilot's proficiency as being in the public interest and essential to the proper discharge of FAA's statutory responsibility. We do not disagree with this in principle, but rather in the manner it is implemented. FAA's function is to assure safety in the public interest and this can be assured by spot-checking and monitoring of the airlines' flight and ground school training programs. We contend that this is the FAA and the air carriers' responsibility by regulation.

Most professional people in a certain field of endeavor attend formal academic courses in preparation for their final examination or "check", and successful completion will terminate their exposure to any additional type of "checking" during the remainder of their professional career. They are never *required* to again demonstrate the level of knowledge and skill which they had attained at the completion of their training. The professional pilot is unique in that he is constantly *required*, by current regulatory language, to successfully complete the equivalent of another "check" or final examination every 6 months for the