

LINDA HALL DASCHLE
FAA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
TALKING POINTS: CHILD RESTRAINT SYSTEMS
JUNE 8, 1995

We're here today to make sure that parents clearly understand the best way to enhance the safety of their young children when they travel by air -- specifically children under age 2. Airlines currently allow parents to hold children under 2 on their laps instead of purchasing a separate ticket.

Recent debates over FAA regulations, airline policies and the effectiveness of various child restraint systems have left many families confused about the best way to protect young children aboard aircraft. The recommendations that the FAA is making today will give families clear guidelines for air travel with infants and toddlers.

Aviation is absolutely the safest way for families to travel. No one disputes that. The FAA's goal is to enhance air safety for children by educating families and promoting the use of effective child restraint systems that are approved for aircraft.

Simply stated, the FAA position is this: **we want to get children off the laps and into the straps.** We believe that every child on an airplane should be protected by an approved child restraint system. Our specific recommendations are as follows:

- children under 20 pounds should be restrained in an approved rear-facing child safety seat;
- children weighing 20-40 pounds should use an approved forward-facing child safety seat (there are still some performance problems with forward-facing seats -- and the FAA is working with manufacturers and other federal agencies to address those problems -- but they are currently the best and safest alternative available for children in this weight range);
- children over 40 pounds should use the standard lap belt that is attached to all airline seats.

Anyone who wants a complete list of FAA child safety recommendations can request a copy by calling our toll-free consumer hotline at 1-800-FAA-SURE, that's 1-800-322-7873. We're also making this information available on the Internet. You'll find the access code at the bottom of the safety recommendations sheet in your press kit.

These recommendations are based on the results of extensive tests conducted by the FAA on several types of child restraint systems at the Civil Aeromedical Institute in Oklahoma City. That research also showed that booster seats, harness and vest restraints, and "belly

belts" do not provide adequate protection for young children who are traveling by air. As a result, the FAA has issued today a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, proposing to ban the use of these devices on aircraft.

A companion NPRM was issued today by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, which is responsible for developing design standards used by manufacturers of child restraint systems and for approving child restraints for both automobile and aviation use.

Essentially, NHTSA's proposal would complement the FAA rule by requiring manufacturers to label booster seats and harness restraint systems as "not certified" for use in aircraft. Currently, child restraint systems that are highly effective in cars may be less so when used on airplanes, because of differences in the way those particular systems fit automobile and aircraft seats.

We believe that these new rules will make the world's safest mode of transportation even safer.

As I said earlier, there has been a lot of debate lately over various aspects of this issue. Some of that debate has centered on the FAA decision not to mandate the use of child safety seats by means of a federal regulation that could cost families as much as \$1 billion over the next 10 years and actually result in more infant deaths and injuries by forcing families to choose a less expensive -- but far less safe -- way to travel.

Some critics have suggested that the research on which we have based that decision is flawed. We are releasing a Report to Congress today, which has updated economic studies that factor in new information and new considerations but reach the same conclusion: a mandated rule would kill more children than it would save.

On this issue, **we need to educate, not regulate**. The FAA is developing a nationwide public education campaign to promote the use of child restraints and to advocate programs that help us achieve our goal of enhancing child safety.

We're asking airlines to develop individual strategies and incentives that will encourage families with young children to use approved child restraint systems when they are traveling by air.

The FAA is continuing to research the effectiveness of various child restraint systems, and we are providing that information to designers, manufacturers and the public. We are also working closely with several designers and manufacturers who are trying to develop child restraint systems designed specifically for use on aircraft.

Safety is a shared responsibility, and we all must do our part: government, industry and individuals. Parents are responsible for the safety of their children; airlines are responsible for the safety of their passengers; and agencies like the Federal Aviation

Administration and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration are responsible for achieving and maintaining a high standard of safety for the American people. Today's recommendations and proposed rules will help us fulfill that responsibility.

Thank you. I'll be happy to take your questions now.

###

**Remarks Delivered by
Linda Hall Daschle
Deputy Administrator,
Federal Aviation Administration
Professional Airways Systems Specialists
June 26, 1995**

I am honored to be here to participate in this Professional Airways Systems Specialists convention.

I want to start by saying, "thank you," to PASS and every one of its members. Without your help and support, the FAA would not be able to do the outstanding job I think we do.

I want you to know how important we think your contributions are to making the U. S. aviation system the safest and finest transportation system in the world

Every day, you install, repair, maintain, operate and certify all the electronic, electro-mechanical, and environmental systems used in air traffic control. You oversee and inspect every aspect of the commercial and general aviation industry. You maintain the national airspace system through flight inspection, flight procedures development, flight data collection and navigational systems quality analysis.

Without a doubt, the safety critical tasks that you perform are absolutely invaluable to both the FAA and DoD. In fact, perhaps you should change what the "PASS" acronym stands for.

To me, and to the FAA, it stands for "Perfection -- Always Superior Service!"

I'm also proud of the relationship that FAA and PASS have forged together. Approximately 10,000 FAA employees are members of PASS, and under Jack Johnson's leadership, we have one of the best labor-management partnerships in government.

You have helped Monte Belger, Archie Archilla, and Tony Broderick build an excellent team dedicated to ensuring aviation safety and maintaining public trust.

But all of us in this partnership need to be concerned about the changes that are happening in Washington today. You probably wonder what they ultimately mean for you as members of PASS and employees of the FAA.

You know the aviation system. So it won't surprise you when I say that the demands on the FAA are greater today than ever before.

We spend the majority of our resources operating an air traffic control system that handles an average of two flights per second, every minute, every hour, 365 days a year. With our help, today, June 26, 1995, the U. S. commercial aviation industry will move approximately 1.5 million passengers safely to their destination. Our safety, security, and airport professionals will conduct nearly 1,000 inspections on an average day.

Since 1991, almost 2900 facilities have been added to the National Airspace System. New ASR-9 and ASD-3 radars...a brand new TRACON in Southern California...the Voice Switching and Control System at Seattle and Salt Lake City...Denver International Airport.

We have 900 fewer employees than in 1991, yet every day, 30,000 pieces of equipment at airports and FAA facilities operate with almost perfect reliability: 99.4 percent.

That record says volumes about the outstanding dedication and proficiency with which airway facilities technicians do their jobs. That level of reliability is what helps keep the system safe. And of course, safety is our top priority. It permeates everything we do.

But safety is a shared responsibility.

We have the safest system in the world because you, the men and women of the FAA, are some of the most dedicated, hard-working safety professionals I have ever seen.

We have the safest system in the world because the aircraft manufacturers' CEOs, the airline CEOs, the airport directors and all their employees have worked hard to make it so.

We've come a long way with this transportation system of ours. In fact, someone told me recently that if we applied the accident rate from 30 years ago to today's volume of traffic, we should average an airplane accident every two days.

Instead, we have a system where accidents are so rare that they make headlines when they do happen. We have a system that functions for hundreds of thousands of hours each year -- and its outages are measured in minutes.

So, despite what the cynics say and the critics do and the headlines read, they simply can't dispute one fact: America's aviation system is the best in the world.

The question is: Can it be even better? Absolutely. To retain this world record of accomplishment, we must do more.

We have established a new safety goal of zero accidents. We are taking aggressive steps to reach that goal as quickly as possible.

Here is where our real challenge as FAA employees lies. We are pursuing the "zero accidents" goal at a time when the FAA, like other federal agencies, is being asked to do more with less -- and do it better.

We've already shown we're up to the challenge. While air traffic has grown more than 6 percent over the last two years, we've seen the FAA budget experience a real decline for the first time in more than a decade. A six percent drop. Six hundred million dollars.

We've managed by eliminating technology programs that are no longer warranted. we've overhauled other projects that were going to cost too much. And we've reduced our work force by 5,000 employees.

But there comes a time when we must say, "Enough is enough!" A point at which cutting makes us less-- not more -- efficient. A time when, to maintain our world aviation leadership, we must have enough resources to ensure a well-trained, fairly compensated work force.

Administrator Hinson and I believe the time is now.

In drawing this line in the budgetary sand, we face unprecedented challenges. We are making our claim when indiscriminate cutting of government is in vogue. In fact, as we meet, the House and Senate are close to agreeing on their respective plans to achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002.

This is truly a high-stakes poker game -- and we cannot afford to lose. The magnitude of the proposed cuts will devastate aviation and the FAA. We simply cannot manage cuts of this magnitude without substantially reducing our services to the American public.

The Senate budget is particularly troubling. It assumes privatization of the ATC system, and that the traveling public would be willing to pay \$14 billion more in taxes and fees to get the same level of service offered today.

If the Senate proposal were adopted --and we could not raise the additional fees and taxes -- we might have to reduce the FAA workforce by 21,000 over the next six years, with immediate cuts in FY 1996.

We can't absorb such reductions by just chopping overhead or administrative staff. Our safety work force, which we've been able to protect from the budget ax so far, would undoubtedly be affected.

But that's just the beginning.

We could lose nearly 20 percent in our capital investment accounts, which would seriously delay new safety technology. Every program -- from weather and windshear detection equipment to terminal automation -- would be affected. And there is the very real possibility that the Airport Improvement Program might be eliminated. No more airport grants to upgrade for safety and capacity.

Yes, we've been threatened by such Draconian proposals before, and we've survived. But we can't count on the idea that FAA will somehow survive these cuts in today's political climate.

Anyone who thinks FAA is immune because we are somehow unique, that our mission is so critical, had better think again.

We at the FAA recognize that we will probably never return to the good old days of unlimited budgets and growth. We know that changes have to be made. We must keep reform going to adapt to this new environment.

Let me tell you -- FAA is stepping up to the challenge in a big way.

We've started some bold new safety initiatives that will benefit everyone who boards a civilian aircraft.

We've adopted a whole new way of doing business inside the agency and with our external customers.

And we've taken concrete steps to make sure we include the aviation community as a valued partner in the things that we do.

But despite our efforts, the FAA is faced with modernizing an aging aviation system while customer demands are growing and budgets are shrinking.

Streamlining and reorganizing alone aren't going to solve all our problems.

In the history of the FAA, there have been 25 reorganizations. But, because of federal laws and regulations that have built up over the years, we continue to manage contracts, allocate money and handle personnel as we always have.

It's not a very efficient system.

The FAA today is rather like that old instrument flight rules navigation system. A rigid path has been laid out from which we cannot deviate. It's an inflexible path defined by onerous Federal procurement regulations, personnel rules, and budget restrictions.

We've managed to work within this system for many years. Or, as Secretary Peña has said, "we've learned to work in spite of it."

I don't think I'm being alarmist. We can already see early signs of a potential breakdown in our capacity to handle the expected growth in air traffic. We have to find a way to keep pace with the changing dynamics of the industry.

The Clinton Administration has a solution. It's a not-for-profit, government-owned-and-operated U. S. Air Traffic Services corporation.

A corporation makes good sense. Unlike other FAA functions, air traffic has many of the characteristics of a business. And it should be run like a business -- financing itself through the collection of users' fees.

Free from government procurement and personnel rules, an independent corporation would be able to respond rapidly to changes in the aviation industry. It would have the financial resources to keep pace with -- and take advantage of -- advances in technology.

Most importantly, it will be off-budget, not hostage to the annual budget process, not hostage to the annual appropriations process.

Secretary Peña transmitted proposed legislation to create the United States Air Traffic Service Corporation (USATS) on April 6th. On May 3rd, President Clinton wrote to Senate Republican Leader Dole and House Speaker Gingrich, urging them to enact the USATS legislation now!

The "now" is critical. The budgets we're seeing would have a drastic impact on the services we offer to the American public.

Without USATS or some other creative financing proposal, we will face reductions in our work force -- including our safety work force...cuts in programs to protect against runway incursions at smaller airports...critical delays in weather safety programs.

If the legislation is finalized by September, there will be a one-year transition period. USATS would take over operation of the air traffic control system on October 1, 1996, the first day of fiscal year 1997.

The transfer of operating responsibility will not occur until the FAA Administrator determined two things.

First, all essential transition items must have been accomplished. Second, the transfer must be accomplished with no detrimental impact on system safety.

Alternatives are being debated in Congress. I think there is a broad consensus that it's time to change personnel and procurement rules so that the FAA can better manage for results.

But none of the bills introduced in Congress addresses our acute financial situation. They all expect us to do the same job without giving us the necessary funding.

It's a little like trying to fly a 747 using just two of its four engines. You can do it -- but it certainly isn't the best way to fly. And it certainly can't do the job for which it's intended.

We all have a role to play in this debate over the future of American aviation. FAA and PASS. The Clinton Administration and Congress. The industry and the traveling public. And we all share a common goal: to sustain and increase the prosperity of American workers.

You, the members of PASS, can ensure the debate is resolved in favor of American aviation by continuing your tradition of excellence in the workplace.

Thanks to your enthusiasm and professionalism, the public has come to expect the best and safest air transportation system in the world.

I'm confident they won't be willing to settle for anything less.

###

Talking Points
for
Linda Hall Daschle, Deputy Administrator
Federal Aviation Administration
ABC Nightline - June 28, 1995

- The FBI notified us last night of a credible threat to air carrier flights operating out of Los Angeles.
- Upon receipt and analysis of this data, FAA immediately contacted the airports and air carriers affected, and directed them to implement measures contained in their contingency plans to counter the threat.
- At the same time, we also issued a statement to the public which explains what we are doing and why.
- I will not describe exactly what these security measures are in order to protect their integrity, but they were developed to protect the traveling public against the threat described by the FBI.
- Many of them are transparent to the traveling public; others, like measures designed to ensure accurate identification of passengers, will be obvious. All may create some inconvenience, and we urge all passengers to cooperate fully.
- The air carriers and airports responded promptly, and within a very short time, had implemented these additional measures.
- FAA inspectors are monitoring the application of these measures, and we are staying in close contact with the FBI in order to know how long these measures need to be kept in place.
- I am absolutely confident that the security measures now in place will ensure the safety of the traveling public, which is the prime mission of the FAA.

Unabomb Background Information

Wednesday, June 28, 1995

Talking Points

1. We received a credible threat as advised by the FBI.
2. We continue to work closely with the FBI to be aware of any changes in the threat that would require us to adapt or modify the security precautions.
3. We responded with appropriate actions to address this threat.
4. We responded with directives to airlines and airports to implement these measures immediately.
5. These measures, we believe, will provide a effective protection of the aircraft and the flying public against the threat.
6. These measures will remain in effect until the threat has been resolved.
7. We appreciate the cooperation of airlines and airports in their prompt response. And we urge the public to cooperate and assist us in our efforts to ensure their safety.

Questions and answers

Can you describe what actions the FAA has taken in response to the Unabomber threat?

I will not describe exactly what these measures are in order to protect their integrity.

Are these measures safe? Is the public at risk?

The measures are designed to and will protect the public against the threat. The Unabomber's track record shows that the American public must take these threats seriously, which we do.

Are these measures enough? Is the risk greater?

The threat is serious. The measures that we have put in place are designed to counter that threat and ensure the safety of the flying public.

For our listeners in the Los Angeles area, can you guarantee the safety of the flying public in California?

We believe these measures are appropriate and effective. We also have gone the extra length to let the public know that there is a threat.

The Unabomber is fiendishly adept. How do you know these measures are sufficient?

We rely on the combined resources of the FBI, which has a task force studying the Unabomber, based on that knowledge, we seek to anticipate the possibilities of threat and design/use measures to defend against each one of those possibilities.

What are those possibilities?

We must take the Unabomber very seriously when he mentions an airport. But we are putting into place measures that cover a wider scope to be increasingly cautious. It would not serve the interest of security to make that public.

Have we ever done this before?

Yes. To prevent the threat of attack against aircraft in Asia earlier this year. The alleged leaders of this conspiracy are now in custody.

What did you do in Asia?

Again, we do not want to reveal the measures, but they were effective in dealing with the threat.

But what about the interest of the public in knowing which airports to avoid?

Our safety program provides safety throughout the system. If there was a way to provide this information to the American public without revealing the information to the Unabomber, whocould be watching this program, we would. For obvious reasons, we do not serve the public interest by disclosing these measures.

Israel and Europe have faced these threats over the years. Why haven't you put their security measures in place?

We have learned from our experience in protecting U.S. carriers in Europe. We do apply those techniques and lessons in this crisis. Our contingency plan is based on information dealing with security challenges around the world.

Since Lockerbie, why has the agency been slow to institute greater security measures?

The lessons of Lockerbie have been acted upon and have been incorporated into the FAA's security measures..

Why don't we have positive bag matching?

We do not talk about the specific measures we have in place.

A reporter predicted this threat. How do you respond?

The responsibility for addressing these type of reports is the responsibility of the FBI. The FAA does not engage in threat identification. That's the role of the FBI.

How are we beefing up security?

We're doing it substantially, but I will not describe exactly what these measures are in order to protect their integrity.

Is it safe to fly?

Yes. We believe that the measures we have put in place to address this threat will continue to ensure the safety of the flying public. If we thought it were unsafe, we and the airlines would cancel flights.

Did the FAA prohibit the shipment of mail?

I'm not in the position to disclose specific measures or to discuss reports about them.

There's a report that you've banned the transport of air mail out of L.A. Is it true?

I'm not in the position to disclose specific measures or to discuss reports about them.

How long will the measures last?

Until the threat is resolved.

Has the failure of the FAA to put security measures in place after Lockerbie posed a greater risk to the traveling public today?

The FAA has incorporated in the Airline and airport security program the additional measures learned from the experience at Lockerbie.

Why have you not implemented explosives detection systems to screen checked baggage?

The first explosive detection system passed a rigorous national certification test last December. The FAA is working with airlines to deploy some systems to demonstrate their suitability in the demanding operational environment of airports

What happened in Sydney?

A suspect item was discovered. An alert flight crew took immediate action according to the FAA's precautionary program. The FAA experts were in contact with the airline and the crew throughout the remainder of the flight. The flight landed at Sydney without incident. And the object has found to be harmless.

Is the public at risk?

The threat is serious and the measures put in place provide security to meet that threat.

Nightline Format

1. Introduction
2. Piece on what's happened today in Los Angeles.
3. Commercial break
4. Opening segment with Linda and security expert together for 2 minutes. Focusing on alleviating the concern. How do you give confidence to the American public?
5. minutes on Unabomber
6. Commercial break
7. Ted provides overview
8. Questions to expert and Linda about what threat this poses to the American public.

SAFEGUARDING OUR GAINS
Advancing Women's Careers in an Uncertain Era
LINDA HALL DASCHLE
FAA DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR
TECHNICAL WOMEN'S ORGANIZATION
Washington, D.C.
June 29, 1995

I always look forward to speaking to the T-W-O, because I know that we look at many of the important issues from much the same vantage point.

It's not so much because we're women, but because we share a common commitment to the FAA and its mission.

We share a common commitment, and nowadays we must share a common concern about the future...for our careers, for the agency, and for the future of aviation itself.

As women in aviation, we do have a perspective that is our own -- one shaped by our history and our work experience.

Some of that history was recalled for us earlier this year during the commemorations marking the end of the Second World War.

One of the most fascinating chapters of that history is the story of the WASP's -- the Women Airforce Service Pilots.

More than 18 hundred women trained to fly every kind of plane the Army Air Force put in the sky -- everything from small primary trainers to the B-29 Superfortress.

Walt Disney designed the insignia that the women wore on their flying jackets. It was a cute little gremlin named Fifi-nella, who was all dressed up in a yellow helmet, red shirt, red boots, and blue-rimmed goggles. Sort of Minnie Mouse with wings.

But there was nothing cute about the job the WASPs had to do. They ferried planes through storms and blizzards. And they towed gunnery targets to give artillery men something to practice shooting at.

By the end of the war, women had flown 60 million miles and had distinguished themselves repeatedly as pilots. For example, women were the first, other than test pilots, to take the controls of the B-29. The regular Army pilots balked at flying the Superfortress, so WASP crews were sent up to prove that this was a plane "even women could fly."

Yet, despite their heroic service -- 38 died in wartime plane crashes -- there was only grudging recognition, when there was any at all. Some of the first WASP's were forced to masquerade as a basketball team because the Army didn't want Hitler to think America were so desperate for pilots that our military had to use women.

It wasn't until 1977 that Congress finally agreed to give WASP's any veterans' benefits. When the bill finally was signed at a White House ceremony, no WASPs were invited.

We're lucky that our generation doesn't have to refight all those old battles for recognition. Although sometimes it seems like we're still being used for target practice.

There have been solid gains for women, and most of them have happened in recent years. Many of us here today can remember a different time when old patterns of power and privilege prevailed.

We're old enough to know that times have changed, but we're still young enough to reap the benefits.

The women of the FAA are now found throughout the agency, working in all kinds of jobs.

Thanks to organizations such as T-W-O, women are more involved than ever in making major decisions -- the ones which really matter to us all.

Peggy Gilligan has just become Deputy Associate Administrator for Regulation and Certification.

Lynne Osmus is moving into Peggy's old job as Chief of Staff.

Beth Yoest is Deputy Director for Aircraft Certification.

Cynthia Rich is Assistant Administrator for Airports. Sandie Allen holds the same position for Public Affairs.

Ruth Leverentz is our acting Budget Director -- a position of acute importance for the agency in these dynamic days when funding levels seem to change almost by the hour. Kay Frances Dolan is our acting director of Human Resources.

Three women are Regional Administrators: Carolyn Blum, Arlene Feldman, and Jackie Smith. Woodie Woodward heads up the Center for Management Development down in Florida.

I could name a dozen or more others. This is the first time that the FAA has had so many women in senior positions. And this rise to prominence comes at a critical juncture. It's a time when the agency is on the verge of fundamental and far-reaching change.

The next few months are probably the most critical in our entire history.

All of us in the Clinton Administration came into office determined to make government more productive. That means doing more with less -- shrinking the workforce and eliminating programs which don't work or are no longer necessary.

We've already shown we're up to the challenge. While air traffic has grown more than 6 percent over the last two years, we've seen the FAA budget experience a real decline for the first time in more than a decade. A six percent drop. Six hundred million dollars.

We've managed by eliminating technology programs that are no longer warranted. We've overhauled other projects that were going to cost too much. By the end of this fiscal year, we will have reduced our work force by more than 5,000 employees.

We took these actions in the spirit of reinventing government. We knew the result would be a leaner, more efficient FAA that could perform its critical aviation missions even better than before.

Now, the situation is different. We are facing the prospect of enormous budget reductions by the Congress and a consequent scaling back of FAA programs. That could have damaging long-term consequences.

You probably know that the House and Senate recently agreed on a budget plan that will dramatically reduce government spending to achieve a balanced budget and give Americans a tax cut. This budget compromise includes \$180 billion for DOT for fiscal years 1996 through 2002.

While we still don't know the specifics of how the FAA will be affected, one thing seems clear. The budget does not give us enough money to continue today's level of service to the American public.

I'm especially concerned about what could happen to the FAA safety efforts that have helped make our nation's airspace the safest in world.

Today, FAA employees keep more than 30,000 pieces of complex safety equipment and facilities across the nation operating at 99.4 percent reliability.

Our safety and security professionals conduct nearly 1,000 inspections on pilots, planes and airports on an average day.

It is truly an outstanding effort.

Can we do better? Absolutely!

But if we are forced to make do with the current budget projections, it will be impossible.

If the budget remains as is, critical technology programs would take a substantial hit. We would be forced to slow research on projects that would enhance system safety and capacity, even as air traffic continues to grow to record levels: more than 740 million passengers and nearly 8 million departures in this country alone by 2002.

We would have to defer the installation of new weather and windshear detection systems, and new systems to prevent runway incidents. We would have to stop research on new ways to increase passenger survival rates in airplane fires.

The FAA could not participate as fully in accident investigations. Many of our current inspection and certification services would have to be eliminated.

There would be a drastic reduction in the FAA's ability to monitor, inspect and enforce aviation security.

This is not just the "usual" budget crisis that we seem to experience annually. In my prior jobs, and now as Deputy Administrator, I've worked on the FAA budget for more than a decade. I can honestly say I have never seen a time like this.

The budget proposal on Capitol Hill would push us too far, too fast in a direction no one wants to go. Not the President, not the FAA, not the aviation industry, and probably not even the members of Congress ...once they take the time to think through the many serious implications..

The budget proposal overlooks the fact that the FAA is unlike most other agencies. While the function of much of the federal government today is to provide cash payments, the FAA still provides a service ... a critically important service ... 24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

Collecting taxes and issuing checks doesn't take a lot of people anymore. Computers have taken over much of the work once done by tens of thousands of clerical workers. In fact, the ratio of the federal bureaucracy to the overall workforce has shrunk steadily since the 1950s. (*New York Times*, June 11, 1995)

But the FAA is very different. As an operating agency, we depend on our workforce and recognize that our people are a vital resource. And we can't do the job demanded of us if we are unable to provide them the equipment they need ... adequate pay and benefits ... the technical and managerial training the demands of their positions require.

These conditions are going to be increasingly difficult to satisfy so long as the FAA continues to exist in its present form.

That is why the Clinton Administration has proposed that a new type of government corporation be created to take over the air traffic control and maintenance functions now housed within the FAA.

The proposal was not a hasty one. It was the result of a thorough analysis of the need for greater flexibility in personnel and procurement policies.

The corporation would also shield air traffic services from the chainsaw of budget politics.

The corporation would prevent any long-term erosion in the quality of our nation's air traffic services.

The idea is controversial. And there are several alternative plans -- some of which are being considered in Congress right now. We can't be sure which version will eventually prevail or what kind of compromise may finally emerge.

But David Hinson and I are fighting with all our power, and we will continue to make our budget case clear to the media, Congress and the White House.

Our ability to preserve aviation safety...to provide our employees a model workplace...to expand career opportunities for women and minorities...depend on winning this battle.

As we move toward the next century, I applaud you for the theme of this year's convention: "Moving toward a new century of diversity."

We must keep our momentum. Like the budget battle, there will be new hurdles. But working together, we can overcome them.

In conquering these challenges, we have taken up the mission left unfinished 50 years ago by the women who were WASPs. You have overcome -- and will continue to overcome -- the remaining barriers to full participation in all fields of aviation.

In our efforts, we are reinforced by the irrefutable proof that the gains we have made over the last half-century aren't just good for women. They are vital to keeping American aviation number one in the world.

Fifi-nella would be proud....

###