

by air taxis or other general aviation aircraft. He may have business on that airport or near that airport. This may be the only airport in the vicinity that has adequate facilities for servicing, taxis, food, weather, communications, rental cars, and other things of that nature. So we find that quite frequently the general aviation traffic must use the major airport. They have no other choice.

In many cases, this is not so. If there is an adequate airport somewhere else in the vicinity, if it is convenient, I, for one, for example, would prefer to land on that airport where I am not mixed up with the wing tip vortices and turbulence left by the big jet, where the service is tailored to my needs, and so on.

So we have come up with these recommendations and I think, from the discussion I have had, for example, with some of the representatives in the Airline Pilots Association they also support this, that on some of these major airports if we could put a short parallel runway to one side, a general aviation airplane can use it. It only needs about 3,000 feet of runway and it need not be as wide and not as thick as the 12,000 foot concrete runways needed for the jets. This will expedite traffic. It increases the capacity of the airport. It keeps us out of the turbulence and vortices created by the larger aircraft.

Above all, for the taxpayer, it provides full utility and greater advantage for the facilities than the Government has put on that airport in the way of radar, communications, weather services and so on. So there is a great need for this.

Along with it, we would like to see some good satellite airports, such as were put in, I think, around Minneapolis, that will drain off traffic that does not have to use the major airport. We recognize that some have to use it, but you can drain off a considerable amount of it if we have good facilities for those people who do not have to go to the major airport. We are at this time, Mr. Chairman, also about to testify before Senator Monroney's committee on airports. We will see that your committee is provided with copies of our testimony there.

(Statement referred to was subsequently submitted and has been placed in committee files.)

Mr. KAYNE. We have noted that the legislative history of the Federal Airport Act talked at great length about encouraging private flying through a nationwide system of good airports. Over the years, in fact, about 20 years since the Federal Airport Act was first passed, we are just about reaching the dollar volume of expenditure for airports originally envisioned in those earlier sessions of Congress. However, the money has gone for only 2,300 airports instead of some 6,000 as originally talked about back in the legislative history.

Despite all the emphasis on general aviation airports, or private flying, as they termed it then, 83 percent of the total expenditures under the Federal Airport Act have gone to airline airports. This is why we say there needs to be a redirection of emphasis under that program.

One additional point I would like to clarify. On the recommendations I have outlined, because I was summarizing and not reading my text specifically, the first eight recommendations were in the letter that we sent to General McKee on August 23. The additional four