

We feel the number of lives taken in the past by this activity, together with the fact that apparently Castro would like to build his own air force out of the airlines that are being operated today by keeping the aircraft that get to Cuba, we think it is a problem that should be given renewed attention.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I want to thank you, Mr. Jennings, for your statement. You have a lot of good suggestions. I should like to stress one thing I heard on the radio this morning where the FAA does not have any regulations but they allow people to take the border patrol school course and have a kit and tear gas and a pistol.

I am wondering, with all of these things, if a gun is at a stewardess' head, what should the pilot do—jeopardize all of the other passengers? The man knows if he is brought back alive he is subject to the death penalty under the act we passed so he would not care if he loses 100 of them. Some planes do have armed men up front.

Mr. JENNINGS. They may have reinstituted that practice, begun in 1961. I think we should train these crews in the various alternatives; give them some situations and perhaps test their judgment because their judgment is going to be involved. Crews deserve to not be totally at the mercy of the hijacker.

Mr. FRIEDEL. This committee went to the FAA installation at Oklahoma City. It is very impressive and I want to assure you that the FAA is trying to find out all it can concerning toxic fumes and heat.

In the report of our committee, page 2, members of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics in October 1967 saw a demonstration of an experimental smoke and fire protective hood where the wearer could be subjected to intense flame without injury.

We saw them get into the water and inflate little tanks—people could survive. There are a lot of worthwhile things that are going on in the FAA that the public does not know offhand. I wish everyone could have a chance to get out to the installations at Atlantic City and Oklahoma City.

I am very proud of what the FAA is doing on research in safety.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Jennings, I was not here to hear all of your testimony and I am wondering if your testimony covered this question I have.

You say a bullet penetrating the skin of an airplane would not cause any structural damage. What would a bullet do with respect to pressurization within a plane?

Mr. JENNINGS. I would assume it would cause a decompression. The laws of physics would take care of that.

Mr. PICKLE. I don't want to be misunderstood, but say you assume it would cause depressurization. I assume that to be true, but how severe would it be?

Would it instantly collapse the people in the cabin?

Mr. JENNINGS. There have been a number of decompressions in military and civilian aircraft. At the present altitudes most of our general aircraft operate 24,000 to 39,000 feet, the decompression does not result generally in injury.

If there are loose objects and there is a large hole, it will suck things out that way but generally it causes a large bang, then there is a cloud that forms in the cabin, a cloud of moisture condensation.