

an increase of 150 percent while the number of tractors on Iowa farms was increasing only 115 percent. A report on tractor safety as suggested by the gentleman is long overdue and certainly the Secretary of Transportation is the logical official to be assigned the responsibility of preparing such a report.

I believe this approach is much preferable to that suggested by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), and will be more productive. I, therefore, rise in opposition to the substitute amendment and urge my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from New York in the nature of a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to develop some history and signify the intent of the committee.

In the matter of automobile tire sales it is clearly inherent in the language, and it is so intended by the committee, that the retailer will cooperate fully and that the rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Transportation for the implementation of the reporting procedures will take cognizance of the fact that there must be full retailer cooperation if the recall provision on tires is to be successful.

Now, the Tire Manufacturers Association in a letter to me dated July 28 indicated their strong support for the reporting procedure which is contained in this legislation. They took cognizance of the fact that it would require the cooperation of the retailer, and it must, of course, have that cooperation or it cannot work successfully. It is very vital that it does work, because in one instance one manufacturer had 18 tires fail in 18 test wheel tests. So there is danger in tires; there is a need to have the machinery for recall just as there has proven to be the need to have the machinery for the recall of automobiles that have been produced with defects in them.

So, Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to make the intent of the committee very clear on this matter.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. I certainly agree with the subcommittee chairman and call the attention of the House to the fact that the former Secretary of Transportation, Mr. Boyd, recommended this procedure to the Congress in January of this year, and it was also recommended by the present Secretary of Transportation.

Mr. MOSS. That is correct.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to ask the chairman of the com-

mittee whether any consideration was given in this proposed legislation to direct the Administrator to provide for regulations which would bring about uniformity of bumper levels. With the intermix of automobiles and trucks on our Interstate Highway System, I ride in terror, as does everyone else on the public highways, when approach is made to trucks which have no bumper levels to meet those of an automobile. The fear of telescoping under a truck is something that haunts every driver on our highways. There are thousands of accidents and hundreds of deaths that occur every year as a result of the telescoping problem. Some people have been decapitated in this way. And, it seems to me that some definite action should be taken to provide for uniformity of bumper levels between all vehicles, including passenger vehicles and the intermix of trucks and automobile vehicles.

I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, whether or not your committee considered this matter in connection with this legislation?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I would be very happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I might say that the Secretary and the agency or the bureau has this authority now. I am informed that they have probably been looking into it. We do not know whether they plan to come up with any recommendations. But this is their duty and I might say that we can call to their attention now the fact that they should come up with some recommendation in the manufacture of trucks and cars so that there might be, as nearly as possible, developed some safety device as the gentleman has suggested that will prevent these accidents in order to keep these vehicles from overlapping upon impact. I think the gentleman has raised a very good point.

When this bill was brought up in 1968 this authority was given to the Secretary and to the National Safety Bureau.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the distinguished chairman. I understand that the Department of Transportation has published, as of March 19, 1969, a proposed rule which would become effective as of January 1, 1971, to provide rear underride protection for trailers and trucks with gross vehicle weight of over 10,000 pounds. That rule proposal would provide that at a "height of no more than 18 inches from the road surface, the vehicle have a continuous structure that is capable of withstanding a large static load when tested at any one of three specified points."

The Department correctly points out the need for such standards noting that the "underriding of rear ends of trucks and trailers by passenger vehicles in the course of a rear end collision constitutes a major hazard to life and limb of the occupants of the striking vehicle."

But the Department's rule is inadequate. The rule does not "apply to truck tractors, or any vehicles with gross vehicle weight rating of 10,000 pounds or less." What these smaller trucks lack in danger in weight they make up for in speed. The standard should be applicable to all vehicles and trucks so that the risk of damage and fatalities resulting from nonmatching bumper guards is perma-

nently and forever removed from American highways. All trucks should be covered under the ruling and the ruling should have the force of law behind it.

If such a regulation is not adopted during this year, I hope that your committee will issue a mandate for this regulation next year.

Following is a letter which I received on this subject from Mr. Robert Brenner of the National Highway Safety Bureau on August 4, 1969:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., August 4, 1969.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VANIK: This is in further reply to your letter of July 14, 1969, requesting that the Secretary of Transportation issue regulations to improve bumper surface relationships between heavy trucks and passenger cars.

We concur with your views on the benefits that can be realized in reducing highway injuries and collision damage by requiring improved performance capabilities from motor vehicle bumpers. The National Highway Safety Bureau is, in fact, in the midst of developing several regulations that should alleviate, to some extent, the problems created by mismatched vehicle bumpers. These include: Docket No. 1-9, Bumper Height No. 1-10, Bumper Effectiveness, and Docket No. 1-11, Rear Underride Protection. Dockets Nos. 1-9 and 1-10 apply to passenger cars and light trucks, and Docket No. 1-11 refers to heavy trucks and trailers. Docket No. 1-11 has now been issued as a Notice of Proposed Rule Making with an intended effective date of January 1, 1971. A copy of the Advance Notice of Proposed Rule Making issued on Dockets 1-9 and 1-10 and a copy of the NPRM issued on Docket 1-11 are enclosed for your reference.

For your added information, the unsafe conditions resulting from the use of high-front bumpers on heavy trucks are to be evaluated for eventual development of a regulation. Test programs have been initiated to obtain factual data on the problems posed by these vehicles on the highways, and on the economic and operational impact the regulation may have on the transportation industry.

Sincerely,

ROBERT BRENNER,
Acting Director.

[Docket No. 1-9]

BUMPER HEIGHT—PASSENGER CARS, MULTIPURPOSE PASSENGER VEHICLES, TRUCKS, BUSES, AND TRAILERS

The Administrator is considering the issuance of a Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard specifying height requirements for contact surfaces of front and rear bumpers and bumper guards for motor vehicles, except motorcycles.

Comments due: November 13, 1967.

[Docket No. 1-10]

BUMPER EFFECTIVENESS—PASSENGER CARS, MULTIPURPOSE PASSENGER VEHICLES, TRUCKS, BUSES, AND TRAILERS

The Administrator is considering the issuance of a Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standard specifying requirements for bumper performance, including requirements to preclude bumper interlocking and over-riding between vehicles.

Comments due: February 5, 1968.

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS: REAR UNDERRIDE PROTECTION; TRAILERS AND TRUCKS WITH GROSS VEHICLE WEIGHT RATING OVER 10,000 POUNDS

The Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration is considering rule