

indicated that they do not have enough controllers and they may have to curtail services if the FAA appropriations request suffers any significant cutbacks.

How this great additional workload would be absorbed in centers, towers, and flight service stations we have not yet heard from the proponents of these informal proposals in the FAA.

We prefer, Mr. Chairman, that the collision-avoidance proposals be aimed at measures which will help the pilot help himself. We can't put everything on the ground to lead each pilot around by the hand. We must provide the pilots with better means so that they can see out of the cockpit better, so that they have radar advisories on a more timely basis, so that other aircraft are easier to see, so that there are reasonable speeds at the lower airspace, just as we have speed limits on the highways.

We think this is a better approach and it certainly is one that will be less costly to the Federal Government and the taxpayer, not only for operating cost, but also from the viewpoint of liability. This latter point is not to be lightly dismissed. As of April 30, 1967, there were 433 suits outstanding against the Government for claims totaling \$203 million as a result of aviation accidents. That was prior to the last unfortunate incident.

Almost \$16 million was paid out to settle such claims in the preceding 9 years, prior to the rash of suits that came about as a result of the New York collisions, and so on.

We also have several other recommendations, Mr. Chairman, which begin on page 15, that are not directed to the prevention of collisions, but they are related to aviation safety.

The first of those is to improve the quality, quantity, and scope of the aviation weather program. A little-known fact is that the Federal Aviation Administration is responsible for providing aviation weather requirements to the Environmental Science Services Administration, which includes the U.S. Weather Bureau.

General aviation spokesmen have been trying, without success, to convince the FAA and the Weather Bureau that the present aviation weather services are inadequate to safely fulfill the needs of general aviation. We need regular weather observations from more locations, with greater frequency.

I say that because some locations have only a few observations a day as required to get one or two airline schedules in or out of that particular airport.

We need greatly improved forecasting. The latter is particularly critical since much of the forecasting now is done by computer on a probability basis, and the hapless pilot all too often finds that the actual conditions encountered in flight have no relation to what was forecast before he took off.

With that, our next recommendation goes hand in glove. That is to provide better accessibility to weather information, both to pilots in flight and to pilots on the ground for flight planning purposes.

As it now stands, the pilot has direct contact available with the Weather Bureau station and its trained meteorologists at all-too-few locations. Pilots obtain most of their aviation weather information from FAA flight service stations, and even these are insufficient in number to adequately service all areas where needed.