

in yesterday's Congressional Record. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The document referred to follows:)

[From the Congressional Record, Aug. 28, 1967]

AIR TRANSPORTATION SAFETY—EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to the excellent outline on air safety sent to me by an outstanding Pittsburgh businessman, Mr. R. W. Mallick. A vice president of the Joseph Horne Co., Associated Dry Goods, Mr. Mallick has flown private aircraft for many years. This long flight experience and his constant civic interest in air safety make his thoughtful suggestions and recommendations valuable to those of us in Congress and in the Federal agencies concerned over air transportation safety. I am glad to place in the Congressional Record Mr. R. W. Mallick's recent letter and the editorial from the Pittsburgh Post Gazette of August 19, 1967:

JOSEPH HORNE CO.,
Pittsburgh, Aug. 22, 1967.

HON. JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FULTON: I am sending to you a copy of an editorial that appeared in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on Saturday, August 19, 1967, captioned "Air Safety Procedures Neglected". I thought you might be interested in reading it as it points a finger at both the F.A.A. and Congress.

As I mentioned in previous letters, I had mentally debated the thought of pursuing the matter any further. However, each day I see more evidence of the gravity of the situation, so I am compelled to belabor the matter further.

Mr. James Ridgeway's comment echoes what I have said repeatedly, i.e., that the F.A.A. is not doing all it can with the facilities and authority it has at its disposal. What is most discouraging is that there is no evidence of an effort on the part of F.A.A. to acknowledge the suggestions to it. Certainly, if there is no merit to them and the persons or organizations making the suggestions were convinced of it, the issue could be closed. Nevertheless, there are volumes of correspondence on the subject, from responsible sources, and it continues to remain unanswered.

It is fully appreciated that the problem is not a simple one, and that there are no readymade, overall solutions. But it will never be solved with the present "head in the sand" attitude. It is far better to do something and risk a failure than *do nothing* in hopes that the problem will cure itself. Apparently, the confusion and complexity is so great that a "wait and see" attitude exists.

To anyone who wishes to delve into the history, he will find that the following suggestions have been submitted. Some involve much time and expenditures to implement, others only a change of attitude and a will to do. I will enumerate several that could start the ball rolling.

1. Immediately provide for *voluntary* controlled visual flight procedures at all low altitudes for cross country flights as previously suggested. Last week I flew from Pittsburgh to Coudersport on a VFR flight plan. Visibility limits were legal for VFR but marginal. I departed Pittsburgh on a special VFR clearance. When I cleared the control zone, I radioed Cleveland Center to advise of my flight route and altitude which was 5,500 feet MSL. The controller asked if I had transponder or DME. When advised negative, he told me he could not give me radar service at that altitude. Yet, 5,500 feet is higher than permissible I.F.R. altitudes. I continued to monitor the radio frequency and know that the controller was not busy.

2. *Discourage* rather than *encourage* more instrument ratings for pilots until such time as the air traffic control can handle more instrument flight plans. The system cannot handle the volume of such potential traffic now.

3. Accelerate a program of new secondary airports in busy areas to handle private, executive, and feeder line and similar aircraft to reduce the load on metropolitan airports. This would not only improve air safety, but would tend to relieve ground transportation congestion. For example, the Pittsburgh area needs a new airport in the northeastern district of Allegheny County or western Westmoreland County to relieve the loads on Greater Pittsburgh and Allegheny