and I will be glad to supply you with my comments to my board on this subject.

I think radar would have prevented this thing from happening but after a while you reach a point where you have to ask how much money can we expend, how much can the Federal Government put into this to assure people that there are not going to be accidents. And will it assure them? I don't think so. We have had accidents under positive control, under instrument flight plans. There is no assurance particularly if the weather is good enough for one airplane to see another. This is a problem we have to consider.

The last thing, of course, was the hooker that was just thrown about user charges. There is a move afoot I think to make people think that general aviation is not paying its own way and that the airlines are. The airlines are not. They don't pay any gas taxes on the kerosene they use to power their turbine equipment and only, incidentally, 46 percent are pure jets, and 54 percent are still propeller-driven airplanes in the airlines. The kerosene burners don't pay any fuel taxes. They don't pay any taxes at all, as a matter of fact.

You realize that the passenger ticket tax is what pays their portion of what they call the user charges. If you take the local service carriers, the 395 airplanes of the local service carriers were subsidized by the United States Government as of last year to the extent of $140,000 per airplane per year and they don't pay any user charges, the passengers pay them.

I think these facts should be known. I think that a lot of the things that have been said here today about air traffic safety, about the integration of general aviation and of the airlines, you have to get down to bedrock and understand what the problems are. Sure, we have 102,000 airplanes in the general aviation fleet; 40,000 of those are flown by professionals or semiprofessionals. We have jets. We have highly equipped airplanes. These airplanes cost anywhere from two and a half million dollars right on down to $40,000 for a single-engine business airplane. They are not toys, they are business tools. They are well-built airplanes. You cannot equip those 40,000 airplanes flying in the air that don't go to big airports. They can use the 7,500 airports that are available, many of which we are losing fast because of land development and so forth. These are the things you have to realize.

I recognize there is a shortness of time. I could spend hours on this subject. Obviously I am full of the subject. But I do think, sir, that the record of this committee should show that before any considerations are made of some of these pie-in-the-sky plans about having radar and towers at every airport that there should be some consideration of the actual fact and the pragmatic aspects should be examined very thoroughly.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Smith, I want to assure you that not only the subcommittee but the full committee knows the importance of general aviation. Just because you heard certain testimony don't think for one minute that there is any idea of putting out general aviation. I think you were a little perturbed because you heard other testimony.

I am glad you are going to submit your statement for the record. I can assure you again that we are taking all aspects. The one thing we want to do is provide safety for pilots, for the passengers and for the people on the ground. We are not going to put anybody out of business.