

Mr. DINGELL. One very brief question: Isn't it a fact, though, if there is a great deal of flame, fumes, and smoke the passenger will be pretty well incapacitated in a minute?

Mr. TIPTON. The present tests of evacuation are very realistic ones in providing smoke and noise and everything else. Don't we have a movie on this subject?

General VON KANN. Yes, we have. I believe some of the films were shown to the committee, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. TIPTON. I don't think they have been shown yet.

General VON KANN. A great deal of research is going into that very subject, as it is going into every aspect of survivability and evacuation. We hoped around the turn of the year that one development might give a flame arresting capability. Unfortunately, the toxicity level turned out to be too high. I have no doubt again that with the effects that are underway we will find ways to cut down the propagation of flame and give the passengers more time.

Mr. DINGELL. When you are dealing with a 400- or 500-passenger jet is it not fair to say that you ought to err, if you err at all, far on the side of safety, and we are faced with the problem of 2 minutes being too long. If that jet is full of smoke and fire and oxygen-absorbing conditions it might perhaps asphyxiate or poison through smoke poison the passengers of that aircraft.

Isn't that something that should be looked at?

General VON KANN. It is being looked at. We anticipate a new rule by FAA in the near future. Although I can't speak for FAA, there is an indication that this may go down to a 90-second rule.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for the attention we have received.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Did I miss you? I apologize.

Mr. PICKLE. As usual, Mr. Tipton, you give this committee very thorough and complete testimony.

Mr. TIPTON. Thank you.

Mr. PICKLE. Certainly what you have said can hardly be argued with as I see it. I take it that you have limited your discussion, however, to the original statement when you said you were largely going to give testimony that would focus on ways to reduce the risk of mid-air collision. I like the information you have given us. I note at this point, however, that we did not go further into the area of corresponding cost to other aircraft beyond the ATA organization with the type of construction on planes and exits, certainly as it affects general aviation.

I know you are representing ATA; you are not trying to sell somebody else's hardware, but we have the problem in this committee of determining what is the best approach and still what is going to be fair to general aviation. I cannot help but feel that if we do these things that you recommend, and they are desirable, perhaps mandatory, it will result in the inability of many users of general aviation to take advantage of these commercial airports.

I don't see how they can come in if they have to meet all these requirements. Am I correct in that?