So we think that this concept of the restricted climb corridor for high-performance aircraft is one that should be studied and established by the FAA without delay.

As far as our kind of traffic, general aviation slow traffic going through these corridors, we would use the same procedure we now use with the military climb corridors, where a simple call to controller on the radio will give you permission to transit the corridor if it is clear. Otherwise, we would avoid it.

This may, Mr. Chairman, cause some comment from some general aviation pilots, but we think this is all to the good. It has been recommended to our staff here by a number of our members throughout the country.

Our next recommendation is to assign a high priority to improved conspicuity of aircraft. In other words, let's speed up this process of making airplanes easier to see.

When you know traffic is near sometimes, even when the radar controller tells you you have traffic in a certain direction, it is difficult to see, and sometimes it is so high or so low you can't see it. But we think we need increased effort on reflective paints, distinctive painting schemes, high-intensity lighting, and any other means of enhancement that can be devised to make aircraft more visible to the naked eye.

Some of these ideas have been explored partially in the past, but the emphasis seems to have fallen by the wayside. We would like to see that revitalized.

Our next recommendation is to increase the availability of radar advisories from FAA facilities for the benefit of all traffic.

Right now most general aviation pilots know that they can get radar advisories in a terminal area where radar coverage is available. Most of them do not know that they also can get radar advisories while they are en route under certain conditions. We hope that the FAA will make this service available to more aircraft and a greater part of the time.

Our eighth recommendation was to assign high priority to the development of a proximity warning indicator that is operationally and economically suitable for use by general aviation aircraft.

There was quite a bit of discussion here this morning on the matter of a collision avoidance system with Captain Ruby, and it brought out that this is more or less a sophisticated, high-priced system, and it takes equipment in both airplanes, what we call a cooperative system—I think he termed it a compatible system—before it will work.

We think there is a legitimate requirement for that sophisticated system, particularly in the airline aircraft, because we are coming up now with stretched jets, 747's, SST's, and two of these airplanes with 400 or 500 people each aboard certainly need some kind of a backup device, you might say, to protect them from themselves.

From our point of view, we also need a simple device that will warn us at least of the proximity of another airplane to us, if someone is in our vicinity, a kind of heads up, alert device, so that the pilot will be extra sharp in looking for other traffic.

There is pretty ample evidence over the years that some of the collisions that have occurred have been in clear weather, or at least where the two pilots could have seen each other, and one or the other of the pilots possibly, in most cases, most certainly could have seen the other airplane.