

Hearings were scheduled on April 29 on House Joint Resolution 881, the American Indian Policy Review Commission, and on April 30, on S. 1017, the Indian contracting-educational reform bill. Unfortunately, we have had to cancel those meetings.

The full Interior Committee is in the

midst of consideration of H.R. 11500, the surface mining bill, and we in the full committee are working diligently to get this legislation to the floor as soon as possible. Because of the scheduled Democratic Caucus next Wednesday and Thursday, which will prohibit the full committee from meeting, the

full committee will meet on Monday and Tuesday on the surface mining bill.

I am sorry this will mean delay in considering what I believe to be progressive legislation in the area of Indian affairs. However, these hearings will be rescheduled as soon as our schedule permits.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, April 29, 1974

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jack P. Lowndes, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Let every person be subject to the governing authorities.—Romans 13:1.

Our thanks to Thee, O God, for the help and guidance of Thy Spirit through the centuries and for Thy presence in our world now.

Our thanks to Thee for the land Thou has given us and for those who serve as our leaders. Guide us now through the troubled waters in which we move. For the Members of this body we pray—the House of Representatives of the United States of America. Keep their consciences alive, their spirits alert, their minds open, and their bodies able and willing to follow Thy way of love.

In Thy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 24, 1974, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12109. An act to amend the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act to clarify the provision relating to the referendum on the issue of the advisory neighborhood councils.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Dicks) through this legislative week, because of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WE SHOULD NOT RENEW WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

(Mr. ROUSSELOT asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from New York (Mr. KOCH) has just suggested that we should renew Federal wage and price controls. I think the exact opposite action is required. I believe it has been proven that the Government cannot manage the vast number of daily decisions relating to wages and prices in this country and that, in fact, the wage and price control mechanism has contributed mightily to the inflationary impact which we are now suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the very fact that these consumer prices that the gentleman from New York mentions have gone up is the direct result of the fact that wage and price controls are being taken off now. The unnatural pressures that have built up under those economic controls has occurred as a result of those arbitrary lids and controls. Now, the free marketplace is beginning to work again. The Congress caused the problem when it originally instituted wage and price controls in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I could not disagree with my colleague more. Evidently, the Committee on Banking and Currency does not agree with Mr. KOCH either, because it voted 21 to 10 to discontinue wage and price controls.

THIS IS POSTAL REFORM?

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in opposing the so-called Postal Reform Act of 1970, I predicted on this floor that the new Postal Service would be self-sustaining—"completely free of deficit—as long as it has a pipeline out the back door pumping up money from the public well."

I am not at all pleased that this prophecy is being fulfilled.

In this fiscal year which ends June 30, the Postal Service has already received appropriations from the Federal Treasury of \$1,478 million. Just before Easter the House voted a further nest egg of \$230 million. An additional supplemental of \$284 million is being incubated. Assuming final action on these two supplementals, the Federal Treasury will have pumped nearly \$2 billion of Federal tax revenue into the Postal Service in fiscal 1974. Yet incredible as it may seem, even with this massive Federal payment, the Postal Service estimates a net operating loss of \$385 million for fiscal 1974.

This means that in the third full year of operation of the new Postal Corpora-

tion, the total deficit—the difference between operating revenues and operating expenses—amounts to nearly \$2.4 billion. This is exactly twice as much as the largest "revenue gap" which ever existed in the old Post Office Department—\$1.2 billion in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, I seriously question that the Nation can afford this new "self-supporting Postal Service."

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE FROM 29TH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

(Mr. KING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matters.)

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, in mid-February I submitted my annual questionnaire to the residents of the 29th Congressional District of New York. I have, to date, received a very heavy response to this poll and have just received the tabulated results which I would like to share with my colleagues.

Since more than 20,000 persons responded to the poll, I believe the questionnaire virtually constitute a referendum of the district, and I have found it to be an excellent antidote to pressure mail.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the tabulated results of my 1974 questionnaire:

1. Do you believe that sufficient proof of wrongdoing by President Nixon has been presented to warrant impeachment? Yes, 48%; no, 52%.
2. Do you favor proposals to finance Presidential and Congressional election campaigns from tax money? Yes, 43%; no, 57%.
3. Do you believe the United States should give Russia and China the same beneficial trade status that non-communist countries are given? Yes, 36%; no, 64%.
4. Do you think the Federal government should provide a health insurance program to everyone, even if it meant higher taxes? Yes, 46%; no, 54%.
5. Do you think Congress should allow drilling of oil on the outer continental shelf (in the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Oceans)? Yes, 86%; no, 14%.
6. Do you approve of the new farm bill establishing a floor under agricultural prices? Yes, 53%; no, 47%.
7. Should the U.S. impose export controls on feed grains and other scarce commodities until our domestic needs are filled? Yes, 95%; no, 5%.
8. Should Congress adopt a strictly enforced limit on total federal spending each year? Yes, 85%; no, 15%.
9. Do you think the President should be compelled to spend all funds appropriated by Congress? Yes, 31%; no, 69%.
10. Do you believe network television fairly

presents both sides of the issues? Yes, 43%; no, 57%.

11. Should the United States reduce the number of troops stationed in Europe? Yes, 65%; no, 35%.

12. Do you feel Congress should repeal daylight savings time during winter months? Yes, 48%; no, 52%.

13. In our efforts to relieve the energy crisis, should the use of nuclear energy be expanded? Yes, 84%; no, 16%.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Title I, section 102, of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1752a(e)), enclosed is the Annual Report of the Administrator of the National Credit Union Administration for the calendar year 1973.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 29, 1974.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 1027 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1027

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigations and studies to be conducted pursuant to H. Res. 74, by the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$979,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and for the procurement of services of individual special consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)), shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration. Not to exceed \$300,000 of the total amount provided by this resolution may be used to procure the temporary or intermittent services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)); but this monetary limitation on the procurement of such services shall not prevent the use of such funds for any other authorized purpose.

Sec. 2. No part of the fund authorized by this resolution shall be available for expenditure in connection with the study or investigation of any subject which is being investigated for the same purpose by any other committee of the House; and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to any study or investigation intended to be financed from such funds.

Sec. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations

established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members failed to respond:

[Roll No. 188]

Alexander	Flynt	Patman
Badillo	Fountain	Patten
Bafalis	Fraser	Pickle
Beard	Frelinghuysen	Powell, Ohio
Bell	Frenzel	Pritchard
Bergland	Goldwater	Reid
Blatnik	Gray	Rhodes
Bolling	Gubser	Roberts
Brademas	Haley	Roncallo, N.Y.
Breckinridge	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hansen, Wash.	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Harsha	Rose
Brown, Ohio	Hawkins	Rostenkowski
Burke, Calif.	Hébert	Shuster
Byron	Hollifield	Sikes
Carey, N.Y.	Ichord	Staggers
Carter	Johnson, Pa.	Stokes
Casey, Tex.	Jordan	Stratton
Chisholm	Kazen	Stubblefield
Clark	Kluczynski	Stuckey
Conyers	Kyros	Talcott
Danielson	McCloskey	Teague
Dellenback	McCormack	Udall
Dellums	McEwen	Vander Jagt
Derwinski	McKinney	Waldie
Devine	McSpadden	White
Diggs	Milford	Wiggins
Donohue	Murphy, Ill.	Williams
Dorn	Myers	Wolf
Dulski	Nichols	Young, S.C.
Eckhardt	Nix	
Flowers	Obey	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 339 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 179 I inadvertently voted "yes." My intention was to vote "no." I would like the Record to indicate that my intention was to vote in the negative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 24, I was recorded as not voting and paired on rollcalls Nos. 179, 180, and 181. I was unable to be in the Chamber on that occasion, and I would ask that the Record show that had I voted on rollcall No. 179, to change the effective date of H.R. 11321, I would have voted "no"; on rollcall No. 180, to recommit H.R. 11321 to the Committee on the Judiciary, I would have voted "no";

and on rollcall No. 181, final passage of H.R. 11321, Public Safety Officers Benefit Act, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1027 is for funding the Committee on the Judiciary in the amount of \$979,000. This includes an unexpended balance which the committee had for the year 1973 of \$492,070.88.

The chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROBINO), and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON) appeared with other Members and their staff before the Subcommittee on Accounts and satisfied us that these funds are needed for two purposes, the first being the regular needs of the committee for ongoing work in other areas; and the second, an amount of \$737,773.12 for the continuance of the work of the committee's investigative staff.

I must correct myself. That amount is for the projected need for the regular committee staff for the remainder of the year; \$733,759.31 represents the amount requested for continuation of the work on the several impeachment resolutions. The subcommittee heard the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROBINO) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUTCHINSON) in depth and agreed overwhelmingly that this is a reasonable amount and a needed amount. It is anticipated that the work of the investigative staff will be finished by June 30.

I feel the request is not only reasonable but also justified, and I will be glad to yield for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This, as I understand it, brings the total expenditure for this purpose to \$2.5 million. Is that about the amount; is it more or less?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. For which purpose, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. GROSS. For the investigation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It would bring the amount to \$1,733,000.

Mr. GROSS. To date \$1.6 million has been authorized. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. A total of \$1.6 million has been authorized for both. For the regular committee work, in the first instance the amount of \$536,000, and a supplemental request in the amount of \$70,000 for the regular committee, and for the impeachment proceedings \$1 million.

Mr. GROSS. What is the total for the investigation to determine whether there will be impeachment proceedings?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Assuming that this resolution is adopted?

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is \$1,733,759.31.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman assume that the Judiciary Committee would be back on July 1 at the beginning of next fiscal year looking for another rather substantial handout?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey does not make any assumption but expresses his belief that this will be sufficient. There may be unanticipated needs. If so, a resolution would have to be introduced and this process gone through again.

I can assure the gentleman from Iowa that although the committee feels this is totally justified there would indeed have to be very strong reason for any additional funding.

I might point out that there was unanimity in the Committee on the Judiciary relating to the needs represented in this request. We cut it back some because of the carryover which the committee had.

Mr. GROSS. I gather from the report that the committee has been spending at the rate of about \$10,000 a day. I do not know whether that is accurate.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The monthly spending rate, I might say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, has been \$125,000, so that is quite close to what the gentleman said.

Mr. GROSS. I would ask my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, if there was any indication given by the members of the Judiciary Committee as to when they expect to bring an end to the investigation and make some kind of report to the House of Representatives?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The target date is June 30, I might say, or possibly a few days before.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Can the gentleman tell me how much has been spent by the committee so far on the impeachment inquiry itself? What is that figure?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is \$1 million.

Mr. WYDLER. Has that all been expended?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), to answer that question.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, might I explain that, first of all, the Committee on the Judiciary made its original request last year for funds to provide for the work of the Committee on the Judiciary. We made no fund request at the time for the impeachment inquiry that we were charged with later.

We commenced our impeachment inquiry proceedings and investigation in November at which time a sum of \$1 million was authorized and appropriated. That sum, however, was for the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with the impeachment inquiry staff.

Now, the moneys that were spent for the impeachment inquiry proceedings from November until the end of March were \$438,365.34, out of the amount of money that we had authorized for us.

The amount of money that we are now requesting for the impeachment inquiry staff is through June 30, 1974. We anticipate that we will need \$733,759.31, which makes a total in that area of about \$1,172,124.65 that will have gone toward the impeachment inquiry proceedings through June 30.

Now, we are not able to give an exact breakdown as to the amount of money that went just to the Committee on the Judiciary, because the appropriation was for both the Committee on the Judiciary and the impeachment inquiry. This is what this further request is all about. It is for the work of the Committee on the Judiciary through the end of this calendar year; however, the work of the impeachment inquiry will proceed, we believe, with its investigation until the end of June—June 30—and we need the amount that is stated.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, could I ask the gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, how many charges are under investigation by the Committee on the Judiciary in its impeachment inquiry? Can the gentleman tell me the number that is being investigated?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, there were originally some 53 stated allegations. These have been studied. They have been investigated. All of the material relating to these allegations has been assembled and collated.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes. I yield further to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. RODINO. With this, the inquiry proceeded to the point where some of these charges were then considered as priorities in order that we might pursue the investigation with more central issues, because we thought that it was necessary to allocate the resources of our staff in those areas. At the present time no charges have actually been dropped, and our inquiry is still continuing; but, we have had to give priority to some of the allegations, because we felt that we would focus the investigation in certain areas at the present time.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, would he tell me, then, how many are under active investigation at the present time?

Mr. RODINO. I believe about 53 allegations—I cannot tell the gentleman exactly, but we issued a report the other day and that report indicates just what areas presently are being just set aside and what areas are being pursued actively. I am not able to give the present number or an exact number.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, might I ask the gentleman on the Committee on the Judiciary, to make sure I have the facts correct.

In fiscal year 1974, the regular budget for the Judiciary Committee was \$536,000.

Mr. RODINO. That is correct—the request for calendar year 1973.

Mr. DICKINSON. So, at the end of the year, in December, the gentleman came in for an additional \$7,000 supplemental because he was running short, which was approved.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that was at the time that the Select Committee on Crime was terminating its operations, and we were taking over the operations of that committee and thus requested an addition in our budget.

Mr. DICKINSON. But at the same time, the Judiciary Committee came in and asked for \$2 million additional because of the extra work load due to the impeachment inquiry. This was subsequently reduced to \$1 million, which the committee did in fact get at that time; is that correct?

Mr. RODINO. That is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. Now, the gentleman comes before our committee and says that he has \$492,000, approximately, carryover.

Mr. RODINO. That is correct as of March 31, 1974.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it might be added that because the Committee on the Judiciary has not been before us until April, that they have on hand now only \$142,000. However, we have reduced the request by the total amount of the carryover, or \$492,000, which leaves us with the figure before us today of \$979,000, for all purposes.

Mr. DICKINSON. The \$979,000, it is my understanding, involves new money. Is that wrong?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, that is correct. We reduced the initial request by the amount of the carryover to arrive at \$979,000.

Mr. DICKINSON. Of course, \$733,000 is earmarked for the impeachment inquiry to run from now to the 30th of June, which means it is running at about \$10,000 per day.

Can the chairman give us any assurance, any hope, that the date for the final report and conclusion of this investigation will coincide with the end of the fiscal year so that we can terminate this and end this, and the committee will not be back for more money?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman knows that I would want to terminate this as of now. If the investigation were completed, we could come back to the House and say that we have all the data. However, all I can tell the gentleman is that we have projected for June 30 because we believe that is a reasonable time within which that investigation will be fully completed and when the report will be coming back to the House.

Mr. DICKINSON. Of course, it was originally set for an April date; then that slipped and now we hear it is the first of July. I would hope that we have a good, firm date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr.

Speaker, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In the 93d Congress, 1st session, the Senate Judiciary Committee was authorized \$4,093,060 for the 12-month period.

For the corresponding period, the House Judiciary Committee was authorized \$606,000. When the impeachment inquiry arose, it was awarded \$1,000,000 additional funds for that work, bringing the House Judiciary Committee—38 members—to a total of \$1,606,000 for the 1st session of the 93d Congress, compared to the Senate Judiciary Committee's—16 members—authorization of \$4,093,060.

When the budgets of the two committees are compared, there is certainly room for valid complaint. The House committee does not ask for enough money for the importance of the work before it, which is assigned to it, of which impeachment is only a part.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman a public question, because he has set a time now of June 30. I presume he means 1974. If he means 1974, I would like him to tell us today when are we going to start some hearings, No. 1. We have been studying this thing for 5 months. We have not made rule No. 1 yet. We have not heard witness No. 1 yet. We have 53 issues. The committee recommended dropping about 40 of those, but no vote was even taken on these matters. We met last week to narrow the issues, but no vote was taken to narrow the issues.

When are we going to have an opportunity on that committee to vote for something or vote against something, and when will we have a set schedule? Otherwise, the gentleman is not telling the truth when he says we are going to end in 1974. This can go on for years.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I might respond. No statement has been made—

Mr. SANDMAN. When are we going to set an agenda? I would like to know that. When are we going to vote for something?

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will listen for a minute, maybe I can shed a little light on this. I am just as anxious as the gentleman is for the chairman to set a deadline. We have sat rather exhaustively in the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, it was reported in the press that I was against giving them any money, which is not true. I think we can cut to the heart of this issue and say that probably this matter can be terminated within a very few weeks after they get the evidence that they need, which has not been forthcoming.

The gentleman knows that as well as I do. There has been foot-dragging. There has been stalling. The President's

attorneys have used every trick in the book to keep from giving the evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to prejudice this matter. I do not have any idea how I am going to vote on impeachment, but I do say that we ought to have this matter resolved, and the sooner the White House decides to bring forth the tapes, and the evidence, the sooner the House can make a judgment.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. No, just a moment.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is what I would like—

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I do not care what the gentleman would like. It is not always what a gentleman likes around here. The gentleman would like to have been Governor of New Jersey, but he was not.

Mr. Speaker, just let me say this to you, that I think the House wants to dispose of this. I think there are some tactical mistakes being made downtown on this matter, as I said a long time ago.

Mr. Speaker, one of the President's secretaries said the tapes will prove his innocence. That is great. If they do, we ought to bring that out, because I said a long time ago that if I were President and the tapes would prove my innocence, I would not only give them to the committee; I would do better: I would give them to the television and sit there grinning while they were being played on television. Let us share the blame around here.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a couple of minutes, for one question?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Speaker, I coincide entirely with what the gentleman from Ohio said about the tapes, but I am interested in this: When are we going to hear something about the 700 documents we have now? When are we going to hear something about the 5 months of investigations by a staff of 105 with 43 lawyers on it? Am I not entitled to know when this committee is going to start doing some work? It has not done a thing since November. Let us be honest about it.

The staff reports when they feel like reporting. When are we going to have an agenda to vote on?

Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, and he is my friend, that he has stated the question three times. It will now be answered.

I yield to the chairman of the committee for an answer.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has been asking this question time and again. He has asked it in the committee, and he has a right to ask it. However, I wonder whether the gentleman has not been able to understand the responses that we have been making time and again, that only when all of this mass of evidence, some of it which has not been forthcoming, has been assembled, has been collated, has been analyzed for presentation to him as a mem-

ber, so that he can then make a judgment, will we present it to him.

Mr. Speaker, we are in no position at this time to give him any material because that material we are considering is a mass of information on the public record from various committees, some of it still in the White House, some of it recorded conversations that have not been produced.

Only after we have a comprehensive set of material and data are we as a committee going to be able to make a judgment. Only then can the gentleman honestly and justly say that the committee has not been in a position to hear the evidence because the evidence has not been forthcoming.

Mr. SANDMAN. One last question. When is the committee going to start meeting on consecutive days rather than once a week to hear what the counsel did last week? When will we do that?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey asks a question which I respectfully suggest cannot be answered in the context of this debate which relates to the money requested for the work of the committee.

Mr. WYDLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. I would just like to follow up and conclude what I was trying to find out about how many charges the staff still has to deal with. We do not seem to know the real number left, but can we be assured now that you have made this request that the number of charges has ended and there will not have to be any new charges made that will be investigated for impeachment purposes? I would like to have the chairman of the committee answer this question, because it is important in determining how much money is needed.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not think that the chairman of the committee needs to answer that. Who knows what is going to be produced and what is to be adduced from that amount of requested materials when the requested materials of the White House are finally delivered?

Mr. WYDLER. I will just say that I would think that relates to the charges that are current. I am talking about new charges. Have we brought all of the charges that are going to be filed to an end? Has that ended?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I do not think—and again I say this respectfully—that it is appropriate and debatable. I think anyone who has followed this would realize that here we are attempting to provide the committee with what its chairman and ranking member have requested. No one knows what is in those materials as yet undelivered. Anything might develop from that.

Mr. LATTI. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman for debate only.

Mr. LATTI. I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

In answer to the question raised by the gentleman from New York, I would just like to point out that I do not want

to be critical of the staff as individuals but I do want to be critical of the "free-hand" given the staff in conducting this inquiry. In so doing, I might shed a little light on why it is costing so much and taking so long.

As the chairman indicated, there were some 53 stated allegations being investigated by the staff, and I was somewhat dumbfounded as a newcomer on the committee to learn that the Committee on the Judiciary had not itself first voted to instruct the staff to investigate these allegations before the staff selected and took off on them of their own volition. When I learned that the staff had gone into these 53 areas without committee instruction or direction, I could hardly believe it. They might have gone into 153 or 253 areas if they had had sufficient taxpayers' funds to pay for their investigations.

I think this procedure was wrong and that the Committee on the Judiciary was derelict in not specifically instructing the staff as to the allegations it wanted investigated. The committee as a whole did not so instruct the staff. It was no wonder that the staff informed the committee at our last meeting that some of the allegations were not worthy of any more of the staff's consideration. Hopefully, after we vote this money, which we will, the staff will get some instruction from the full Committee on the Judiciary as to which allegations the elected members of the committee wish to be pursued by the staff.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might point out to the gentleman this—

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to have you point out anything.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That the Committee on the Judiciary has rules; they have been operating under the rules in what we consider to be a splendid, bipartisan and constructive fashion. The questions which the gentleman raises and the criticisms that the gentleman makes here are not relevant to the funding of the committee which has been requested by both sides.

Mr. LATTA. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I decline to yield.

Mr. LATTA. My objections are relevant as we are considering a funding resolution to pay for this staff. We should not be spending taxpayers' funds for a staff operating on its own without proper instruction from the Congress.

Mr. McCLODY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think it is incumbent on us to be informative as far as all Members of the House are concerned who are listening to this debate. I would like to make a couple of comments which maybe thereafter the chairman might want to comment upon.

It is my understanding that this week we will have submitted to us rules of procedure which will guide us during the

entire impeachment inquiry, that is, receipt of evidence by the committee, and that we will act on that this week as to what our procedure is going to be for handling this inquiry.

And then on May 7, which is next week, or a week from tomorrow, we will begin the receipt of evidence. We will have first an initial presentation. Then we will continue, hopefully on successive days, or to meet as much as we can, mornings and afternoons, and sometimes on into the evenings, to try to expedite the receipt of all the evidence that will be received by us, with the idea of expeditiously bringing this to the House.

That is my understanding of how we are going to proceed. I think the chairman will concur with that so that there is some hope that we will resolve this at an early date.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary just stated to me that the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois is substantially correct.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will yield very briefly to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out that I do not agree with my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, when the gentleman says that it is not relevant that we raise questions as to whether or not the staff of this committee should be instructed by the committee as to areas needing investigation when this staff has already spent \$450,000 of the taxpayers' money. We probably could have saved a considerable amount of this money by having instructed the staff as to the allegations to pursue in the first place.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that I am not saying that the distinguished gentleman's questions are not relevant. I merely mean to say that I do not believe that they are relevant to the request for the money. They are relevant to the internal operations and the decisionmaking process in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my great respect and appreciation for the work which has been going on over the last several months in the Committee on the Judiciary under the capable leadership of Chairman ROBINO. The impeachment investigation which is currently underway constitutes one of the most important studies ever conducted by a committee of the House of Representatives, and the eyes of the world are examining every move made by the committee in the course of its investigation. The fact that this committee is overwhelmingly recognized for the fairness of this inquiry demonstrates more than just the objectivity and responsibility of the committee. Since, like Caesar's wife, this committee must avoid even the appearance of anything improper, it is truly amazing that Chairman ROBINO, our distinguished colleague from the other side

of the aisle, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and the other members of this committee have been able to conduct what promises to be a thorough and meticulous investigation without so much as a reasonable suspicion of partisanship suggested by the minority members of the committee. Judiciary members and staff must be complimented on their patience, lack of bias, self-restraint, and constant attention to the best interests of the Nation as a whole.

Considering the sheer volume of material which it is necessary for the committee to study in the course of its investigation, I must also commend the members and staff of Judiciary for the speed with which they are completing the investigation. The Congress is not known for the speed of its deliberations and studies on important matters, and rightly so, for the wide-ranging effects of our actions here make it critical that we take the time to be sure of what we are doing. And yet, without substantially compromising the thoroughness of their investigation, it appears that the Judiciary Committee will present us with the results of their work within the next 100 days—truly an expeditious performance.

The work of this committee seems even more impressive when one considers the obstacles which have been placed in its path throughout the course of this investigation by an executive branch which, for reasons on which we can only speculate, is making every possible effort to withhold the best evidence in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge an overwhelming vote today in favor of House Resolution 1027, funding the continuing work of this committee, as an indication of the House's support for the outstanding job being accomplished under exceedingly difficult circumstances by the members and staff of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that the additional funding through June 30 for the House Judiciary Committee's impeachment inquiry be appropriated. This resolution came up last week for approval before the House Administration Committee, of which I am a member, and I voted for it then. I now ask all my colleagues here today to support this resolution.

Last November 15, we passed the initial impeachment funding request by a vote of 367 to 51. Since that time, the White House has been responsible for delay after delay, refusing to submit material requested by the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee reached the point where it found it necessary to subpoena documents and tapes which the President should have quickly and voluntarily provided. The extraordinary bipartisan anger at Presidential obstruction was reflected by the Judiciary Committee's most recent 33-to-3 vote—very nearly unanimous—to subpoena 42 critical tape recordings.

The President said in rebuttal that the committee has all the facts it needs to put Watergate behind us and to conclude the impeachment inquiry. What arrogance. How can the President decide

what evidence should be considered in the proceedings?

Mr. Speaker, this Nation will not respect its Government if the cleansing process does not take place. To limit the impeachment inquiry by withholding funding as of April 30—the end of this month—because the President has caused time-consuming delays would be to deny the American people and the Congress the only access to the facts which, for better or worse, they must have to make our Government processes work.

I believe that the President has committed impeachable offenses. I am convinced that he will be impeached. If he fails to provide the material requested, that will mean one more impeachable offense.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have discussed this matter in sufficient depth, and I therefore move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR EXPENSES INCURRED BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE RESTAURANT

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 768 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That effective January 3, 1974, expenses incurred by the Select Committee on the House Restaurant, pursuant to H. Res. 111 not to exceed \$34,500 including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and for the procurement of services of individual consultants or organizations thereof pursuant to section 202(1) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 72a(1)), shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman of such committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The chairman of the Select Committee on the House Restaurant shall furnish the Committee on House Administration information with respect to the activities of the select committee intended to be financed from the funds authorized by this resolution.

SEC. 3. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration in accordance with existing law.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat surprised that

we did not have a rollcall on the last resolution, to further fund the Judiciary Committee and its impeachment staff.

The resolution that is now before us, Mr. Speaker, relates to the Select Committee on the House Restaurant in the amount of \$34,500 to continue the work of that committee.

The distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI), appeared before the subcommittee, and the subcommittee was in substantial agreement that this amount of money should be granted, and the full committee felt likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I might point out that the committee has expressed its intent, that is, the majority have expressed their intent to approve no funds for this select committee in the 94th Congress.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the facts have been correctly stated by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON). I would like to reemphasize that this committee has done a good job, but we think that its existence has run its full course, that is, the need for it.

As stated in the report, we feel that this is the last time that this select committee should be funded, because we feel that the purpose of this select committee has been served.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I would support this resolution, and ask for its adoption.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the provision in this resolution for visual training? Can the gentleman from New Jersey explain briefly how that is handled, the money for visual training, the program for visual training?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. As I understand it, that relates to education on matters of how to set the food out, how to illustrate the menus, and how to make the necessary arrangements.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, was that done completely for the Members of Congress? They are not paid any talent fees, are they, for joining in this?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Not talent fees, but I am sure that Mr. KLUCZYNSKI would be delighted if Members of the House wanted to observe this visual education to have them do so.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, that does not include free meals, or something of that kind; does it?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No. I understand that there are no free meals; but I might say that if the gentleman could have lunch with Mr. KLUCZYNSKI in all likelihood Mr. KLUCZYNSKI would

buy the gentleman's lunch out of his own pocket.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I was not really seeking that kind of a favor, but I was wondering if that was the way it worked, with all of this visual training. I suppose they have a screen and movie cameras, and all of that sort of thing.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have not seen the type of educational materials.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Accounts Subcommittee, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues that the statement has been made, that it is the majority opinion of the members of the Committee on House Administration that the Select Committee on the House Restaurant not be funded in the 94th Congress. I would like the record to show that the Committee on House Administration does not have that kind of jurisdiction. The committee was appointed by the Speaker, and we want the Speaker of the House to know what the feelings of the Committee on House Administration are at this time. But none of us have a crystal ball. We do not know who will be elected to the 94th Congress. We do not know who the Speaker will be in the 94th Congress.

I also want to point out that the entire budget of \$34,500 is less than what a majority of the staff members are making on all of the other committees. I also want the record to show that I am against phasing out the Select Committee on House Restaurant at this time.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KLUCZYNSKI) is not here, but I know that I express his sentiments. I do hope that the Speaker in the 94th Congress, whoever he might be, will take under consideration the feelings of the Committee on House Administration, but I know he is not bound by our recommendations.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey might state that the statement made in the committee was, indeed, not unanimous, although no formal vote was taken on it, and the subject may well arise in the next Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the two resolutions just agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION ACT OF 1974

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11793) to reorganize and consolidate certain functions of the Federal Government in a new Federal Energy Administration in order to promote more efficient management of such functions, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of April 23, 1974.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to report to the House on the successful outcome of the conference with the other body on H.R. 11793, the bill to establish a Federal Energy Administration. A similar Senate bill (S. 2776) passed the Senate on December 19, 1973, and on March 13, 1974, the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause of H.R. 11793 and adopted the language of its own bill. A conference was held on April 4 and 8, 1974. All conferees signed the report and the statement.

The following Members joined me as House managers in conference: Representatives ROSENTHAL, ST GERMAIN, FURQUA, HORTON, ERLBORN, and WYDLER. I wish to express to them my appreciation for the time they gave and their dedicated work in helping to resolve the differences between the House and Senate bills.

The substance of the House bill, I am pleased to report, is preserved in the conference substitute. Provisions in the Senate amendment, accepted by the conferees, which added various reporting requirements and made changes in one particular or another, are consistent with the purposes of the House bill.

As the Members will recall, H.R. 11793 creates a temporary Federal Energy Administration to administer the Government's short-range energy programs. Separate legislation (H.R. 11510) has passed the House and is now before the Senate to take care of the longer range energy research and development.

H.R. 11793 provides for a Federal Energy Administration, headed by an Administrator, who is to be assisted by other designated officers, all these to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. A provision in the House bill for two Deputy Administrators was retained by the conferees. It is contemplated that one deputy will take charge of program operations and the other will develop plans and policies.

Also retained were provisions in the Senate amendment to require Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of four additional officers if and when they are assigned principally to administer programs for allocation, pricing, rationing—if effected—and Federal-State coordination. It was agreed that these program areas are of sufficient importance to warrant that the persons in charge be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The conference substitute authorizes 91 positions in GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, the so-called supergrades, in place of the 100 such positions carried in the Senate amendment. The administration advised us that 91 new positions in these categories were essential to the effective performance of the Federal Energy Administration. At the same time, 14 such positions will be acquired by transfer of functions to the new agency, making 105 in all. The conference substitute limits the total number of supergrades in the FEA to 105, to prevent further accretions of supergrades. When the act expires in 2 years, the authority for the 91 additional supergrades also will lapse.

I may say to the members that the House conferees, in modifying the Senate language and limiting the total number of supergrades, received valuable advice from the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and I wish to thank Chairman DULSKI, Mr. HENDERSON, and the staff of that committee for their assistance.

A provision in the House bill preventing the holding of two positions by top officers in the FEA was adopted in conference.

The conference substitute retains, in essence, the provisions of the House bill describing the Administrator's functions. For example, the House floor amendment to H.R. 11793 relative to propane pricing, is retained. At the same time, the conferees accepted language contained in both bills, but set out in greater length in the Senate amendment, making it clear that the statements of responsibilities and functions in the bill do not grant new program authority to the Administrator.

In other words, the functions and authority that the Administrator will have are limited to those: First, specifically transferred or vested in him by the bill; second, delegated to him by the President pursuant to specific authority of law; or, third, specifically vested in the Administrator by act of Congress. The intention clearly is not to give the Administrator free-floating authority, but to tie any program actions to statutory authorizations or Presidential delegations pursuant to law.

The Senate amendment had two titles: One to create a temporary Federal Energy Administration, and the other to create a permanent Energy Policy Council in the Executive Office of the President. The provision for the Energy Council was omitted in the conference substitute upon a recommendation of the House conferees, who pointed out that it was not appropriate to provide for a permanent council in temporary legislation.

At the same time, language of the Senate amendment was adapted in the conference substitute requiring the President, 6 months before the expiration of the act, to include in a report to the Congress on the disposition or continuance of FEA a recommendation concerning Federal organization of energy and natural resources. In other words, the President will have to reexamine the situation 1½ years from now and make recommendations to the Congress as to the future organization of energy and natural resources functions and agencies.

Provisions in the House bill governing administrative procedures and judicial review were adopted by the conferees as being more detailed and complete than the Senate version. The Members will recall that the House language on these matters was the result of a floor amendment by Mr. BROVHILL of North Carolina. Consistent with the legislative history of the House bill and the language of the Senate amendment, the conference substitute makes clear that the Temporary Emergency Court of Appeals will continue to function as an appeal court for matters now committed to its jurisdiction under the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973.

The conference substitute retains the substance of the House bill and the Senate amendment giving the Administrator extensive authority to gather information, conduct investigations, and make onsite inspections and examination of records, with the subpoena power to be used if necessary.

The House provisions that information be gathered and developed in meaningful categories, and that the Administrator's access to records be limited to enterprises engaged in energy supply and major energy consumption were retained. However, a provision for the use of administrative inspection warrants, contained in the House bill, was omitted at the insistence of Senate conferees who were concerned about possible invasion of privacy. If the Administrator is denied access or information which he is authorized to obtain, he will have recourse to the courts for judicial warrants or other legal process, but he will not be able otherwise to make any forcible entries.

In both the House bill and the Senate amendment, the Comptroller General was given an important role. He was to monitor agency operations, to make his reports available to the public, and to gain access to certain Administration and private records. The House bill authorized the Comptroller General to have access to all information possessed or acquired by the Administrator, and to certain records of Government contractors and recipients of Federal funds. The Senate amendment was considerably broader. It granted the Comptroller General the right of access to data from any public or private source or organization relating to the management and conservation of energy, permitted him to obtain information from persons under oath, and authorized the issuance of subpoenas for the production of records.

The conference substitute retains the House language regarding the Comptroller General's access to records of Government contractors and recipients of Federal assistance, and authorizes the Comptroller General to request access to records of businesses engaged in energy supply or major energy consumption. The conference substitute also provides that the Comptroller General can issue subpoenas only if he gets the concurrence, by resolution, of a duly established committee of the Congress having legislative or investigative jurisdiction over the subject matter. The resolution must set forth the necessity and scope of the subpoena and the identity of the persons to be served. The Comptroller General's authority in these respects will, of course, expire with the termination of the act.

The conference substitute incorporates, with technical and clarifying changes, the substance of a provision in the Senate amendment that the Cost of Living Council and the Environmental Protection Agency are to receive notice 5 days in advance of proposed rules, regulations, or policies relating, respectively, to energy pricing and to the environment. The COLC may disapprove a proposed action, and the EPA may offer comments, which are to be published along with the proposed period, within the 5-day period. In emergencies, the requirements for notice may be suspended for 14 days.

Differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment were adjusted in such matters as protection of employment rights in connection with transfer and reversion of functions; informing the Congress and the public of waivers under the conflict-of-interest law (18 U.S.C. 208(b)); a report by the Administrator on oil and gas reserves; open meetings of advisory committees; protection of confidential information and disclosure of information to the public; and administrative functions relating to contracting and the acceptance of services.

House provisions providing a 2-year tenure for the FEA, safeguards in handling of personal data, and a ban on sex discrimination were accepted with minor modifications.

Senate provisions for a comprehensive energy plan to be developed by the Administrator, an Office of Private Grievances and Redress in FEA, and specific dollar authorizations for FEA in fiscal years 1974, 1975 and 1976, also were accepted. The Senate amendment provided for numerous reports on energy-related matters. Several of these were omitted and the majority retained, after modifications to allow more time for preparing the reports and to reduce their frequency.

This was, in my judgment, a very successful conference. There was give and take, which is the business of a conference, but, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, the essentials of the House bill are preserved. In resolving differences, we also accommodated valid requests of the administration. I am confident that the President will sign this measure, which can be on his desk within a few days.

I ask the Members to support the conference report.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great care the information gathering and public disclosure sections—13 and 14—of the conference report (H. Rept. 93-999) on H.R. 11793.

The bill, as agreed to by the conferees, directs that the FEA "shall collect" energy information from persons engaged "in any phase of energy supply or major energy supply or major energy consumption," and information concerning energy resources on Federal lands from Federal agencies, including data on reserves, production, leasing agreements, et cetera. It also directs that the FEA shall "assemble, evaluate, and analyze" such information. Most importantly it provides for public disclosure of such information in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. 552. The conference report states on page 30:

The conference substitute incorporates a provision authorizing disclosure of confidential information under 18 U.S.C. 1905 to persons performing functions under this act, or in court proceedings. It also requires public disclosure, upon request, of information of the type which could not be excluded from public annual reports to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In other respects, the Freedom of Information Act will govern. The Administrator may withhold matters within the exemptions provided by that act, but there is nothing in the conference substitute requiring him to do so. In determining whether to disclose information under the Freedom of Information Act, the conferees expect that the Administrator will give consideration, among other things, to his affirmative duty imposed by section 14(a) to keep the public informed.

At this juncture, I think it important to note subsection (c) of 5 U.S.C. 552 which reads as follows:

This section does not authorize withholding of information or limit the availability of records to the public, except as specifically stated in this section. This section is not authority to withhold information from Congress.

That subsection makes it clear that the nine "exemptions" in the act do not apply to Congress. Thus, this bill (H.R. 11793) is not authority for the FEA to withhold from Congress or its committees any information collected under this bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I commend my chairman for bringing back to the House an excellent conference report. I note in the report, at page 11, that the Comptroller General may have power of subpoena to have access to oil company information including statistics and other data needed to formulate energy policy.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under certain circumstances, with the acquiescence of the committees of subject matter jurisdiction—incidentally, he can now come to a committee and obtain the papers by the committee's power of subpoena.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I note the word on page 12, "Information gathering power," the administrator "shall." Now, that is about as strong as we can go, is it not? To say that he must or shall collect, assemble, and evaluate information by categorical groupings. I am glad such strong language is included.

I hope the gentleman may agree that the one thing we are plagued with most in this whole problem of the energy crisis, is the lack of accurate information.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is certainly right, and I want to compliment the gentleman who is chairman of the Government Operations Subcommittee that has been looking into this matter.

The gentleman has brought to my attention this very fact. We feel it is absolutely necessary for the Congress to have adequate statistical information in order to properly legislate.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, on the provision of the conference report on the public disclosure of information, I think it should go on the record that the new administrator-designate, of FEO, Mr. Sawhill, was before our subcommittee last Thursday and as I listened to his testimony he has done a turn-around as far as the testimony of his predecessor, Administrator Simon.

I refer to the leak around the Arab embargo. At first Mr. Simon told us there were substantial quantities of leakage. However, it develops now from Mr. Sawhill that there may not have been much if any leakage, but all the while the people of this country did not know—they did not have any of these facts.

There were no statistics given even to the Library of Congress, nor even Customs. One could go down to the Customs in Treasury and find nothing on the manifest of tankers from the Middle East when we know very well at least some few were arriving.

Even the Freedom of Information Act would require there should be public disclosure of these matters.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California for this excellent report.

On page 20 of the conference report, section 24, subsection 2(B), the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army is directed to transmit a report on construction of hydroelectric facilities. The subsection authorizes:

A statement of the accomplishments which could be provided by the expedited completion of each facility, and a statement of any funds which have been appropriated but not yet obligated.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can assure that such a statement of accomplishments to be achieved by expedited construction of hydroelectric generating facilities, will be an objective analysis of

both pluses and minuses which will result from a speeded-up construction of such facilities. For example, I am very much concerned that such a statement could be used as an excuse to speed up construction of a dam on the New River, being proposed by the Appalachian Power Co. Such a dam would destroy the beautiful New River.

I am sure the gentleman from California would concede that there are possible adverse effects, as well as beneficial effects, which might result from a crash program of all-out construction of hydroelectric facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to make legislative history on this point. I would like to inquire from the gentleman from California whether he does not agree that such reports and statements should be completely factual, balanced and objective, in terms of both the pluses and the minuses of any crash programs.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

As the gentleman knows, of course, existing law requires an impact statement to the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, for any Federal expenditure of any concern of this kind.

This is merely to get the information out on it, and if any existing authorized and funded facility is lagging, we can find out why it is lagging and how much in funds has been spent on it and how much has not, and if any new facility is required, it would have to come to the Congress for authorization and funding.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this section 24 does not contemplate the short-circuiting of any of the protections written into present law?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; it is not the intention of the conferees to require any kind of short-circuiting of the protections written in the existing law.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I noticed with interest the text appearing in the conference report on page 4, and I am pleased that the chairman of the committee, his fellow managers of the conference committee that they have retained the language introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER) dealing with the rollback of propane prices. I notice that the propane prices shall be based on the prices for propane in effect on May 15, 1973, and in summary it was put into the text that only actual cost increases incurred in the manufacture of propane can be passed on to the consumer.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the conferees were very much aware of the interest of the House in the cost of propane and in the propane policy adopted by the House under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER).

We have retained it; we have even strengthened it.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman very much for it.

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I also would like to commend the gentleman for retaining the propane language in the bill.

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank and congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORON) and the other conferees for the fine work they have done on the FEAA conference report.

The Federal Energy Administration Act is responsible legislation, marking a consolidation and coordination of Federal energy-related agencies and efforts. It represents a firm movement away from the chaotic "state of emergency" tactics employed to date and a firm step toward a comprehensive effort to solve long- and short-range energy problems.

One intent of the FEA Act, as expressed in section 2, the "Declaration of Purpose," is—

To insure fair and efficient distribution of, and the maintenance of fair and reasonable consumer prices for (energy) . . . supplies.

In the delineation of functions, section 5, the new FEA is charged with the promotion of stability in energy prices and fair and efficient implementation of energy programs so as to minimize hardship.

I point out these various passages, Mr. Speaker, in order to emphasize that fair and stable prices as well as equitable treatment are high-priority objectives of the conferees and, indeed, the entire Congress, in this legislation. I regret, as I am sure my colleagues representing other districts with rural populations do, that to date, the Federal Energy Office has failed to provide this fair and equitable treatment for the nearly 13 million families nationwide who rely on propane gas as a relatively inexpensive fuel for heating and cooking, and millions of farmers who require propane gas for agricultural production.

I certainly applaud the conferees for including the Alexander amendment passed by the House on March 5, 1974, in their report, thus providing explicit language on the problem of propane prices.

Section 5, subsection (11) relating to propane gas regulations reads:

In administering any price authority, provide by rule, for equitable allocation of all component costs of producing propane gas. Such rules may require that (a) only those costs directly related to the production of propane may be allocated by any producer of such gas for purposes of establishing any price for propane, and (b) prices for propane shall be based on the prices for propane in effect on May 15, 1973.

Subsection (11) continues:

The Administrator shall not allow costs attributable to changes in ownership and movement of propane gas where, in the opinion of the Administrator, such changes in ownership and movement occur primarily for the purpose of establishing a higher price.

Section 5, subsection (11) of the Federal Energy Administration Act addresses a very real problem—a problem of equity and fairness in sharing the burden of increased energy costs. This attempt to

gain fair treatment for propane consumers deserves the attention and support of every Member of the House.

Propane consumers have been forced to bear an unusual and excessive share of increased energy costs. Hundreds of my constituents have contacted me about their propane gas bills which have doubled and tripled despite their efforts to conserve energy. Contrast a 100-percent, 200-percent, and in some cases, a 300-percent increase in propane prices with a 50- to 100-percent price increase for motor gasoline or home heating fuel and the enormity of the problem is clear. Believe me, I am not unsympathetic to the automobile driver or to those who require middle distillates to heat their homes, but I do believe that propane consumers have borne a greater portion of the burden than many other consumers and businesses. Propane consumers are not asking for special treatment, but they are rightfully demanding fair, equitable, and proportionate treatment along the lines of the provision in the conference report.

The propane price problem arises from the regulations established by the Federal Energy Office prior to January 31, 1974. In these regulations, propane gas was included under "other products" which pertained to everything but motor gasoline, No. 2 heating fuel and No. 2-D diesel fuel. Producers were allowed to apportion the increased production costs among these products in any proportion they desired. As a result, producers added a disproportionate share of the increased production costs to the price of propane in order to keep the price of other products lower than they should be. Propane consumers, in effect, have been subsidizing the users of other products ever since.

On January 31, 1974, the Federal Energy Office revised these price regulations providing for a proportionate pass-through of increased production costs. Only the percentage of increased costs equal to the percentage of total fuel production represented by propane gas could be passed through to the price of propane during the next year.

While this was a welcome change, it simply is not enough to correct the serious price inequities. In fact, the new regulations did nothing to reduce the disproportionate prices established before January 31; they only prevented the same thing from happening again. The Federal Energy Office specifically stated in the Federal Register of February 19, 1974, that it had no intention of correcting the price situation established before January 31. In other words, propane consumers are still subsidizing the users of other products because current propane prices still represent a disproportionate share of the increased costs incurred prior to January 31. This is clearly and unquestionably a discriminatory action by the Federal Energy Office against all propane consumers.

The other problem referred to in section 5, subsection (11) is the unconscionable practices of some propane brokers. The Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee has uncovered a number of propane brokers who have actually made hundreds of thousands of

dollars in a matter of hours through a series of transactions involving the same stock of propane. The language in the conference report clarifies the powers of the Federal Energy Administration to halt this type of business practice. While millions of consumers have been making sacrifices to conserve energy, a few men have lined their pockets from the earnings of millions of Americans who are already hard pressed to pay legitimate price increases. I applaud the conferees for their attention to this serious problem.

The propane provision in the FEAA conference report is similar to a bill I cosponsored with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. ALEXANDER), on February 7, 1974, although the provision before us today is less forceful than my bill. Nonetheless, it still is a clear mandate from the Congress demanding and expecting fairer treatment for propane consumers.

It does disturb me that Congress has not responded to this problem faster and more forcefully, but I welcome this first attempt to correct a serious problem for millions of propane consumers. As soon as this legislation is signed into law, it is imperative that the new Federal Energy Administration moves into action quickly.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether or not there is any language in this conference report which would permit the Administrator to impose rationing by rule or regulation?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

Mr. BAUMAN. I notice on pages 2 and 3 specifically there are references to the possibility of a subadministrator handling rationing, and it says, "if effected," and then further, it refers to three sources of power and mentions rationing as a possible imposition by the Administrator.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Administrator has consistently said that if the time comes when rationing is required in this country, he will ask for the authority to impose it, but this does not increase the authority in that manner.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to commend the chairman, Mr. HOLIFIELD, not only for his leadership on the conference report but also for his leadership in the drafting of the bill and the handling of it in the subcommittee and full committee and later on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take long, as Chairman HOLIFIELD has already explained the conference bill. There are a few points, though, that I would like to emphasize.

First, this is a very important piece of legislation. It is important because of the remaining problems we face in meeting the short-term energy needs of this country. We were fortunate to make it through the winter months,

using the ad hoc organization of the Federal Energy Office. But this should not cause us to disregard the remaining and significant organizational problems that have to be addressed through legislation. This bill creates a temporary organization designed to administer the programs to meet the expected near-term energy shortages. I hope soon we will have before us a conference bill on the Energy Research and Development Administration Act, which is designed to meet our longer-range energy needs. I also hope we will soon consider ways to provide overall coordination for programs affecting energy along the lines of proposals for a Department of Energy and Natural Resources or a Council of Energy Advisers.

Second, I want to emphasize that this conference bill remains an organizational bill as opposed to a bill granting program authority. It sets up the organizational structure and grants the administrative powers needed to run the existing energy programs now being handled by the Federal Energy Office. The bill does not prejudice any other program legislation now being considered, such as H.R. 13834, the new energy emergency bill, or H.R. 14368, the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act, which I understand may be on the floor later this week.

Third, the conference bill is an excellent piece of legislation, benefiting from careful consideration in both this House and the other. As the chairman noted, the conference committee maintained the substance of the House bill. Accordingly, the bill here today contains powerful information-gathering authority for the Administrator so that we will be able to obtain the facts needed to make appropriate policy decisions. In the conference, we added to the authority of the Comptroller General so that he could respond to the expressed interests of House and Senate committees wishing to obtain information not available through the Federal Energy Administration. The Comptroller General is authorized to issue subpoenas for energy information in response to resolutions of those committees which have legislative or oversight jurisdiction over the energy matters in question. In the House, certainly, we expect this authority would be granted only by those committees which are authorized to issue subpoenas.

The conference bill provides a single set of administrative procedures for the Federal Energy Administration, which I think will help cut some redtape. The bill provides for the appointment of advisory committees and requires that their meetings be open to the public, except where national security is involved. The bill, in section 20, has extensive language assuring close coordination with State governments. It also includes a section establishing an Office of Private Grievances and Redress, which should speed consideration of requests for exemptions and other forms of relief. The bill includes in section 18, a requirement that there will be no discrimination due to regulatory or other actions of the FEA against any industry or region of the United States. This section was included with the tour-

ism industry particularly in mind, as was the requirement that a report be issued within 30 days on what the gas situation will look like this summer. The conference bill also requires several reports which should help the Congress in the months to come keep track of what is happening in the energy field, and guide policy decisions in several problem areas such as the petrochemical industry.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has the support of John Sawhill, the FEO Administrator-Designate, and the administration. It deserves the support of the House. I urge adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HORTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of this conference report. I was pleased and delighted to sign it.

I want to say the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, handled the conference in the same fashion as he did the committee and that is with a great deal of consideration for everyone's viewpoint but also with a determination to get the piece of legislation out.

I want to make that point because I am not criticizing him when I also say what I think has to be said here regarding this legislation. The fact is that although this was intended to be emergency type legislation to help our Nation at a time when it was suffering from an energy crisis, the Congress still allowed a period of at least 5 months to go by in trying to get some legislation through the Congress. We needed it to set up a permanent organization to handle the energy problems of our country. I do not think that is the kind of performance the people expect of the Congress or a record that any of us in the House or certainly in the other body can be proud of.

Once again I say as far as I am concerned the chairman of this committee is least guilty of causing that delay. In fact, he was one of those who led the way in trying to get this legislation acted on in a timely fashion. But from the point of view of the people and the needs of this country for action in the energy field I think what we have done finally, although it is a reasonable and good bill, took much too long a period of time and that the Congress was not responsive to the national need in a timely fashion.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 11793, legislation which will, if passed, reorganize and consolidate certain functions of the Federal Government in a new Federal Energy Administration.

I am particularly pleased that the conference report retains the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas, the Honorable BILL ALEXANDER. As you know, this amendment prohibits the passing through of costs to customers of propane gas unless such costs are directly related to the production of propane. And future prices for propane shall be based on the prices which were in effect on May 15, 1973.

This amendment will protect individual propane users, as well as dealers. LP dealers have been struggling to remain in business since the price freeze. They are concerned about the people they serve. If something is not done to stabilize the price of propane, the entire industry could be placed in jeopardy as customers are forced to switch to other forms of heat.

Many people in Alabama and throughout the entire Nation have been hard hit by the huge increases in the cost of propane fuel. In some areas the price of propane increased by as much as 350 percent.

Realizing the chaos and hardships such increases were causing, I joined with several of my colleagues in introducing legislation to amend the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, to roll back the price of propane.

Following this action, the Federal Energy Office issued new propane pricing regulations to prevent future "price loading" onto propane. This regulation by FEO was followed a short time later by an FEO ruling which seeks to achieve a gradual reduction in the price of propane fuel.

This is a step in the right direction. But I believe this bill, containing the Alexander amendment, is still needed. I respectfully urge my colleagues to approve this legislation.

Propane gas is a big part of the total energy picture in Alabama. Many Alabamians, who must depend on propane fuel, live in the rural areas. A large number of these people are elderly and live on a fixed income. They use propane gas for heating their homes and cooking. The sudden, steep increases which occurred in the price of propane, placed a real burden on them.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the district I represent is one of the largest poultry-producing areas in the United States. Propane fuel, at a reasonable cost, is vital to these poultry producers.

Since LP gas represents only 3 percent of a barrel of crude oil, increases in the price of imported crude oil only slightly increases the cost of producing propane.

I commend Congressman ALEXANDER for his efforts in this area, and I urge approval of this important bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the conferees on H.R. 11793 for their diligence and thoroughness in ironing out the differences between the two versions of the legislation authorizing a Federal Energy Administration.

Naturally, I was especially pleased to see that the amendment I introduced in the House to lower the cost of propane gas is included in the conference report. This provision clearly sets out the mandate of Congress to reduce propane prices which skyrocketed during the last year placing an unconscionable burden on the poor, the elderly and the residents of our countryside who could not afford to heat their homes because of this unjustifiable price increase.

The Federal Energy Office said their February 1 regulations would take care of this problem. However, 2 months

later, we have seen nothing but token drops in prices—nothing to compare with the increases which came in the months preceding February.

I believe this legislation recognizes that pricing regulations must take into account two factors. The price must not be so high that the consumers cannot pay it and the prices must not be so low that it is unprofitable for the producers to manufacture the product. The rights of both the consumer and the producer are protected.

Warm weather is here. The immediate crunch is off. We cannot make amends to those who were forced to eat, sleep and live in their kitchens because that was the only room they could afford to heat. We cannot repay those who spent up to 75 percent of their limited income each month on propane bills.

However, our action now in enacting this legislation will prevent this squeeze on the pocketbooks of Americans next winter and allow some of our people once again to enjoy a heated home.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is long past the time when Congress should be giving statutory authority to the Federal Energy Office. Study after study has shown that the energy-related programs are scattered in far too many departments and agencies of the Federal Government. Experience has taught us that this makes for poor program administration. Since the 92d Congress, many here in Congress have been asking for reform and changes in the administration of energy policy. For example, in the 92d Congress, I cosponsored a legislation calling for the creation of a Council on Energy Policy. Additionally, the President has asked for legislation in this area.

As we all know, the energy crunch is going to be with us for many years. In order to meet the demands and problems presented by this critical situation, it is imperative that Congress take the steps necessary to consolidate all energy-related matters into one office, thereby providing better coordination of energy policy administration. All of us are aware of the difficulties encountered by the constituents, small businesses, and large industries in our districts in trying to obtain information from the various Government agencies dealing with the energy crisis. Indeed, even our staffs have had more than their share of such frustrating experiences.

Another critical problem is the need for qualified personnel to staff this new agency. The Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, recently held hearings on the effect the energy crisis is having on small business. One interesting aspect emerging from the hearings was the unanimous complaint that there are too few qualified people presently staffing the Federal Energy Office. So many of the people presently administering the program are on loan from other Federal departments, who stay for only a few weeks before returning to their original assignments. It goes without saying that this defect results in our constituents and staffs being given misinformation or no

information, without a resulting bad feeling toward everyone trying to do an extremely difficult job.

Fortunately, H.R. 11793 remedies both of these problems. First, it transfers to the FEA energy functions currently housed in the Department of the Interior: The Office of Petroleum Allocation, the Office of Energy Conservation, the Office of Energy Data and Analysis, and the Office of Oil and Gas. Second, it gives the FEA a line item in the budget, thereby providing the agency with the necessary appropriations to insure the hiring of its own qualified administrative staff.

Needless to say, this bill is a necessity. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which has worked long and hard to produce an acceptable energy measure, I feel it is imperative that we create the Federal Energy Administration to help us meet our goal of energy self-sufficiency.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to see the conference report on the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 come before us today. It represents the organizational foundation on which we can build a short-term energy policy to cope with our immediate fuel shortages.

Two provisions carry special significance. First, the bill addresses the problem of outrageous increases in the price of propane. Much of the blame for this past winter's soaring prices can be attributed to a disproportionate sharing of the increased cost of the crude products from which propane is derived. FEO first attempted to deal with this through a regulation prohibiting continuation of the disproportionate pass-throughs, and then it tried to reduce the damage already inflicted through informal discussions with major producers. This helped, but more can still be done.

The bill before us requires an equitable allocation by rule of all component costs of producing propane gas. It suggests a formula under which propane prices would be based on May 15, 1973, levels plus a factor covering increased costs directly related to propane production. In addition, it breaks new ground by restricting the questionable activities of middlemen, who allegedly have driven these prices still higher. I expect these provisions to significantly ease the burden carried by the nation's propane consumers.

Second, I wish to indicate my pleasure with the information-gathering powers conferred by Sections 12 and 13. Access to reliable information on energy supply and demand is a prerequisite for a rational energy policy. Unfortunately, we have not had sufficient data in the past.

I was one of several Members to cosponsor legislation correcting this situation. The conference report before us today adopts the approach taken in that earlier proposal; the FEA has primary authority for gathering vital information, and the Government Accounting Office can verify and evaluate its findings.

Both the propane-pricing and the information-gathering provisions meet

painfully obvious needs. I strongly endorse the positions adopted by the conferees on these particularly important issues.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the enactment of the conference-reported bill now before us, H.R. 11793. I am, however, disappointed that the conferees did modify significantly the right to privacy provisions of the House-passed bill.

Let me refresh the memory of my colleagues on the history of that House-passed amendment.

When the bill was being read for amendments on March 7, an amendment was offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GOLDWATER), for himself and for both the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH) and myself, to protect and assure the privacy of individuals and personal information affected by or obtained through the provisions of the Act. That amendment read, as follows:

To protect and assure privacy of individuals and personal information, the administrator is directed to establish guidelines and procedures for handling data pertaining to individuals. He shall provide in such guidelines and procedures a reasonable and expeditious method for each individual data subject to:

(1) be informed if he is the subject of such data.

(2) gain access to such data.

(3) contest the accuracy, completeness, timeliness, pertinence and necessity of retention or inclusion of such data.

The administrator shall take necessary precautions to assure that no indiscriminate transfers of data pertaining to individuals is made to any other person, organization or government agency.

The broad support for that amendment was best reflected in the vote in this Chamber when 86 percent of those voting supported the amendment. I think such a plurality can best be characterized as overwhelming.

Unfortunately, that important amendment has been watered down in the conference committee. The conference-reported provision, proposed section 14(c), reads as follows:

To protect and assure privacy of individuals and confidentiality of personal information, the Administrator is directed to establish guidelines and procedures for handling any information which the Administration obtains pertaining to individuals. He shall provide, to the extent practicable, in such guidelines and procedures a method for allowing any such individual to gain access to such information pertaining to himself.

How does this conference-reported language differ from the House-passed bill? In several ways, all important ones:

First, it strikes the requirement that an individual on whom information has been gathered be first informed that he is the subject of such data. How else is he to know?

Second, it strikes the important provision which gave him a right at law to contest the accuracy, completeness, timeliness, pertinence, and necessity of retention or inclusions of such data. This was the real "guts" of the House-passed provision. Under the conference-reported measure, there will be no right to either contest and to correct information.

Third, the conferees have stated in the statement of managers that—

It was the intent of the conferees that this provision apply only to information concerning individuals in their strictly personal capacity, and not to information which relates in any way to an individual's business activities covered by this Act.

Thus, while one can obtain access to information about individual activities, one cannot obtain access about business activities, no matter how inaccurate, or impertinent, or incomplete, or untimely, or unnecessary for the carrying out of this act such information may be.

The conference-reported measure does not adequately reflect the commitment of this House—as reflected in its overwhelming passage of the amendment to insure this right to privacy—to the principle of assuring further that right against unwarranted intrusions by Government.

It, rather, infers a judgment that Government powers ought to subsume the rights of individuals.

With such a judgment, I could not disagree more.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 356, nays 9, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—356

Abdnor	Broyhill, N.C.	Daniels,
Abzug	Broyhill, Va.	Dominick V.
Adams	Buchanan	Davis, Ga.
Addabbo	Burgener	Davis, S.C.
Anderson,	Burke, Fla.	Davis, Wis.
Calif.	Burke, Mass.	de la Garza
Anderson, Ill.	Burleson, Tex.	Delaney
Andrews, N.C.	Burrlison, Mo.	Dellums
Andrews,	Burton	Denholm
N. Dak.	Butler	Dennis
Annunzio	Camp	Dent
Archer	Carney, Ohio	Derwinski
Arends	Cederberg	Dickinson
Armstrong	Chamberlain	Dingell
Ashbrook	Chappell	Donohue
Ashley	Clancy	Downing
Aspin	Clark	Drinan
Baker	Clausen.	Duncan
Barrett	Don H.	du Pont
Bauman	Clawson, Del.	Edwards, Ala.
Bennett	Clay	Edwards, Calif.
Bevill	Cleveland	Eilberg
Blagel	Cochran	Erlenborn
Blester	Cohen	Esch
Bingham	Collier	Eshleman
Blackburn	Collins, Ill.	Evans, Colo.
Boggs	Conable	Evans, Tenn.
Boland	Conlan	Fascell
Bolling	Conte	Findley
Bowen	Conyers	Fish
Brasco	Corman	Fisher
Bray	Cotter	Flood
Breaux	Coughlin	Foley
Breckinridge	Cronin	Ford
Brinkley	Culver	Forsythe
Brooks	Daniel, Dan	Fountain
Brotzman	Daniel, Robert	Frey
Brown, Mich.	W. Jr.	Froehlich

Fulton	McKay	Ryan
Fuqua	McKinney	St Germain
Gaydos	Macdonald	Sandman
Gettys	Madden	Sarasin
Gialmo	Madigan	Sarbanes
Gibbons	Mahon	Satterfield
Gilman	Mallory	Scherle
Ginn	Mann	Schneebell
Gonzalez	Maraziti	Sebelius
Goodling	Martin, Nebr.	Seiberling
Grasso	Martin, N.C.	Shipley
Gray	Mathias, Calif.	Shoup
Green, Oreg.	Mathis, Ga.	Shriver
Green, Pa.	Matsunaga	Shuster
Griffiths	Mayne	Sikes
Grover	Mazzoli	Sisk
Gubser	Meeds	Skubitz
Gude	Melcher	Slack
Gunter	Metcalfe	Smith, Iowa
Guyser	Mezvinaky	Smith, N.Y.
Hamilton	Michel	Snyder
Hammer-	Miller	Spence
schmidt	Mills	Staggers
Hanley	Minish	Stanton,
Hanrahan	Mink	J. William
Hansen, Idaho	Minshall, Ohio	Stanton,
Hansen, Wash.	Mitchell, Md.	James V.
Harrington	Mitchell, N.Y.	Stark
Harsha	Mizell	Steele
Hastings	Moakley	Steele
Hays	Mollohan	Steelman
Hébert	Montgomery	Stephens
Hechler, W. Va.	Moorhead,	Studds
Heckler, Mass.	Calif.	Sullivan
Heinz	Moorhead, Pa.	Symington
Helstoski	Morgan	Taylor, Mo.
Henderson	Mosher	Taylor, N.C.
Hicks	Moss	Thompson, N.J.
Hillis	Murphy, N.Y.	Thompson, Wis.
Hinshaw	Murtha	Thone
Hogan	Natcher	Thornton
Holifield	Nedzi	Tiernan
Holt	Neisen	Towell, Nev.
Holtzman	Nichols	Traxler
Horton	Obey	Treen
Hosmer	O'Brien	Udall
Howard	O'Hara	Ullman
Huber	O'Neill	Van Deerlin
Hudnut	Parris	Vander Veen
Hungate	Passman	Vanik
Hunt	Pepper	Veysey
Hutchinson	Perkins	Vigorito
Jarman	Pettis	Waggonner
Johnson, Calif.	Peyser	Walsh
Johnson, Colo.	Pike	Wampler
Jones, Ala.	Poage	Ware
Jones, N.C.	Podell	Whalen
Jones, Okla.	Powell, Ohio	Whitehurst
Jones, Tenn.	Preyer	Whitten
Jordan	Price, Ill.	Wildall
Karth	Price, Tex.	Williams
Kastenmeier	Pritchard	Wilson, Bob
Kemp	Quie	Wilson,
Ketchum	Quillen	Charles H.,
King	Railsback	Calif.
Koch	Randall	Charles, Tex.
Kuykendall	Rangel	
Kyros	Rees	
Lagomarsino	Regula	
Landrum	Reuss	
Latta	Riegle	
Leggett	Rinaldo	
Lehman	Robinson, Va.	
Lent	Robison, N.Y.	
Litton	Rodino	
Long, La.	Roe	
Long, Md.	Rogers	
Lott	Roncalio, Wyo.	
Lujan	Rosenthal	
Luken	Roush	
McClory	Roy	
McCollister	Roybal	
McDade	Runnels	
McEwen	Ruppe	
McFall	Ruth	

NAYS—9

Collins, Tex.	Landgrebe	Schroeder
Crane	Rarick	Steiger, Ariz.
Gross	Rousselot	Symms

NOT VOTING—68

Alexander	Carter	Frenzel
Badillo	Casey, Tex.	Goldwater
Bafalis	Chisholm	Haley
Beard	Danielson	Hanna
Bell	Dellenback	Hawkins
Bergland	Devine	Ichord
Blatnik	Diggs	Johnson, Pa.
Brademas	Dorn	Kazen
Broomfield	Dulski	Kluczynski
Brown, Calif.	Eckhardt	McCloskey
Brown, Ohio	Flowers	McCormack
Burke, Calif.	Flynt	McSpadden
Byron	Fraser	Milford
Carey, N.Y.	Frelinghuysen	Murphy, Ill.

Myers	Roncallo, N.Y.	Stuckey
Nix	Rooney, N.Y.	Talcott
Owens	Rooney, Pa.	Teague
Patman	Rose	Vander Jagt
Patten	Rostenkowski	Waldie
Pickle	Steiger, Wis.	White
Reid	Stokes	Wiggins
Rhodes	Stratton	Young, S.C.
Roberts	Stubblefield	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Blatnik.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Flynt.
 Mr. Patten with Mr. Hanna.
 Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Roberts.
 Mr. Brademas with Mr. White.
 Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Rhodes.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. Bafalls.
 Mr. Kazen with Mr. Frenzel.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Beard.
 Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Freling-huysen.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Teague with Mr. Devine.
 Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Reid.
 Mr. Rose with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Alexander with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Badillo with Mr. McCloskey.
 Mr. Bergland with Mr. Nix.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Brown of California.
 Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Waldie.
 Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Eckhardt.
 Mr. Byron with Mr. Myers.
 Mr. Casey of Texas with Mr. Dellenback.
 Mr. Danielson with Mr. Stokes.
 Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
 Mr. Dorn with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Pickle with Mr. Talcott.
 Mr. Fraser with Mr. McCormack.
 Mr. Haley with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
 Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Young of South Carolina.
 Mr. Owens with Mr. Milford.
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Vander Jagt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FIRE PREVENTION AND CONTROL ACT OF 1974

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11989) to enhance the public health and safety by reducing the human and material losses resulting from fires through better fire prevention and control, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from GEORGIA (Mr. DAVIS).

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11989, with Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 11989, the National Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. This bill will provide a very modest, but badly needed effort to help reduce the staggering losses which our Nation experiences due to fires.

The magnitude of these losses will become clearer through a few statistics. Each year 12,000 Americans lose their lives as a result of fires. Thousands more are maimed for life. Among those who lose their lives every year are 200 firefighters who perish in the performance of their dangerous duty. The property losses are equally large. The estimates place the annual losses in this category in the billions.

H.R. 11989 would provide assistance to local fire departments and districts in several ways. The bill has three titles corresponding to the three areas in which the committee found that additional effort is needed.

Before describing these three titles let me emphasize one important point. And that is this. The bill will in no way reduce the responsibilities of the Nation's firefighting forces as they now exist. The thousands of dedicated firefighters, fire officers, and fire units across the country will continue to be the primary focus for community fire protection. It will be to these fire prevention forces our citizens can continue to look for improved firefighting and fire prevention. This bill is aimed at providing better information, better equipment, and better training for the Nation's firefighters.

Title I of the bill provides for the establishment of a National Bureau of Fire Safety with the following responsibilities:

First, this Bureau will conduct a program of public education aimed at bringing a better understanding to more people of what can be done to prevent and fight fires. It is particularly important that the old and the young, who make up 20 percent of the population but who incur 45 percent of the bodily injuries and the losses of life, achieve a better understanding of the simple things that can be done to prevent fire losses and injuries.

Second, it shall provide assistance in the development of more modern technology for use in the prevention, detection, and fighting of fires. This is a field with great opportunities for improvement. Let me cite just a few examples. The breathing apparatus which our firefighters now carry into a fire is un-

duly heavy and is limited in operating time to less than half an hour. Modern technology can lighten this load and increase the operating time without sacrificing the high reliability which has been achieved in the devices now in use. Another example, where some progress has already been made, is fire detectors. A cheap but reliable fire detector which can be installed in every home, could save untold lives, and advanced technology can make a great contribution to the achievement of this goal.

The third responsibility of the Fire Safety Bureau is to operate a comprehensive national fire data system. One of the things that became clear during the committee's hearings was that although we know the coarse statistics concerning the results of fire, such as the number of deaths, we know very little about the detailed statistics, such as the causes of deaths. The fire data system would serve to develop these detailed statistics.

Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, the Fire Safety Bureau would have the responsibility of advancing the professional development of fire services personnel by providing high-quality training and education at the national level. The bill provides for the establishment of a U.S. Fire Academy to serve this function. The Academy is patterned after the FBI Academy which provides the same education and training for the Nation's law enforcement services. The Academy would be located on a site to be selected by a Site Selection Board appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and would provide courses in all types of fire-related subjects. The training provided would be aimed at both technical proficiency for the firefighter, and leadership and management proficiency for commanders and fire chiefs.

In title II of the bill, the organic act of the National Bureau of Standards is amended to provide for a Fire Research Center. This Fire Research Center would carry on the already existing research activity of the National Bureau of Standards. In the past the work of this Center has been concentrated on basic research in such fields as combustion chemistry and the dynamics of flame ignition. The bill would extend this work to include research on biological questions related to the effects of fire exposure on man. For example, research would be done on the effects of smoke and toxic gases on the respiratory system, and on improved methods of providing first aid to fire victims.

Title III would provide for an expanded effort in the area of burn treatment. It calls for further medical research on burns, on the treatment of burn injuries, and on the rehabilitation of burn victims.

During the committee's hearings on this part of the bill we heard testimony from several doctors who are experts in this field. They pointed out that patients who are treated in hospitals with specially trained staff and which are equipped with special burn treatment facilities have a much higher chance of survival. For example, the national survival rate of children who have suffered burns over 60 percent of their body is between 10 and 20 percent depending on

the age. But the survival rate for children with the same burn injury, who are treated in hospitals which are specially equipped and staffed, jumps to between 50 and 60 percent. The problem is that too few such specially equipped hospitals now exist.

For this reason the bill provides that the National Institutes of Health shall establish 25 additional burn centers at hospitals throughout the country, which will have the capability of both treating burn victims and training medical specialists in this field. In addition, the bill provides for the establishment, at 90 general hospitals throughout the country, of burn treatment programs which would provide the needed facilities for the specialized treatment of burn victims.

The funding authorized for the activities in this bill is very modest: \$3.5 million would be authorized under title II to carry forward the already existing fire research program in the National Bureau of Standards. In addition \$2 million would be authorized for the new fire activities under title I, and another \$2 million would be authorized for the medical program in title III. The total amount authorized in the bill is \$7.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the committee. It has wide support from the fire service community. I respectfully urge its favorable consideration by this body.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I very enthusiastically support H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, and I commend both Chairman TEAGUE of the full committee and Chairman DAVIS of the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development for the leadership they have provided in bringing this innovative legislation to the floor.

This truly landmark legislation, to combat the ravages of fire, has the unanimous support of all minority members of the Science Committee. And I am proud to call very special attention to one Member on our side of the aisle, though not a member of the committee, the gentleman from Connecticut, BOB STEELE, who truly pioneered the efforts which brought forth this very important bill.

No Member of Congress has done more on behalf of the firefighters of America than Mr. STEELE. Just over 2 years ago he introduced the first comprehensive package of fire prevention and control legislation ever submitted to Congress, and the bill that is before us today, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, is a direct result of his vigorous, effective push. His knowledge, expertise, and specific proposals have been invaluable as groundwork in our drafting of this bill.

BOB STEELE truly was the leader in forging a Federal program for the prevention and control of fire. We on the Committee on Science and Astronautics recognize this, and I know that the firefighters of this Nation recognize it as well. The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut is acknowledged as the "fire expert" in this House, and his activities

in that area typify his thorough and productive efforts also in other areas.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years our Science Committee has been besieged with legislative proposals seeking to combat one of the oldest people killers known to man—fire. This committee had before it over 75 separate bills when hearings began last session on fire prevention and control.

We welcomed the urgent emphasis these bills provided on today's increasing fire problems. It seemed to me a very sad state of affairs that public concern about fire safety tended to be limited to occasions of major fire catastrophe. And even the best planned annual campaigns to educate the public to the need, evoked only mild concern.

It is a startling fact that this seeming indifference is in the face of 12,200 people killed by fire in this country during 1972. Fully one-fourth of these victims were children, and 210 of the dead were firefighters.

The figures for damage to property are no less shocking. An estimated \$2.9 billion of damage was caused by more than 2½ million fires in 1971. Of this total, approximately \$2.3 billion represents damage to buildings and their contents.

These dismaying statistics were compiled by the President's National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control which released its comprehensive 24-month study on the Nation's fire problem in 1973. It is also of note that the Commission concluded that the principal causes of building damage were defective, misused, and overloaded electrical wiring and equipment; defective or overheated heating and cooking equipment; and careless use of smoking materials.

The point to be drawn from these statistics is that safety slogans and fleeting public concern have not accomplished the job. Thus, new techniques must be pursued to improve this Nation's ability to prevent and control fire. This was the Science Committee's challenge in drafting the proposed legislation and I see this bill as a creative, well-reasoned approach toward resolving our age-old fire problem.

Although the measure proposes a concerted effort on the part of the Federal Government to reverse growing fire losses, it is the declared policy of the bill that primary responsibility for fire prevention and control will remain in the hands of local authorities. There is no question, however, about the need for Federal assistance and Federal resources in support of local authorities, if we are meaningfully to reduce the Nation's fire losses.

The first of several key provisions of the legislation provides for establishment within the Department of Commerce of a National Bureau of Fire Safety. The so-called Fire Bureau will have as its mission to focus the Federal effort directed to fire prevention and control. The Director of the Fire Bureau will therefore undertake programs of technology development, training and education, data collection and analysis, and other efforts in cooperation with State and local governments.

As a part of the Fire Bureau, there will also be established a U.S. Fire Academy. The role of the Academy will be to supplement training now provided through various institutions by offering a more comprehensive program, plus providing training in more specialized and advanced areas.

The bill also creates a Fire Research Center in the Department of Commerce. The Center will carry on and expand the National Bureau of Standards' present fire program, directed to basic and applied research. There will be both a physical science program, addressing the physics and chemistry of fire and its effects, as well as a program aimed at the effects of fire on humans.

As the third and final major provision of the bill, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be directed to establish a program of improved treatment and rehabilitation for burn victims. This will be carried out within the National Institutes of Health.

NIH will be responsible for sponsoring the establishment of three types of burn treatment activities: 25 new "burn centers," 25 new "burn units," and 90 new "burn programs." The "burn center" will be a separate hospital facility having highly advanced and specialized research and teaching programs as well as patient care. The "burn unit" will be a less elaborate facility operating as an adjunct to a general hospital although staffed with specialists. The "burn program" will operate as a staff of burn injury specialists without special facilities.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that this bill now before the House will significantly improve the Nation's ability to save lives and property. The public has been led to believe that we work and live in safe, modern buildings and that we as a nation are doing all we possibly can to reduce the toll of fire. Regrettably, this is not so.

I agree with those who characterize ours as a highly combustible society.

Therefore, I see the present legislation as a very positive measure to enhance the public's safety and welfare. The bill will channel \$7.5 million of funding into a number of the highest priority problem areas. Hopefully, this will result in a major reduction in the fire hazards of the environment in which we all work and live.

I strongly endorse this measure and I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for its passage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH).

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. I also wish to extend my appreciation to Mr. MOSHER, Chairman TEAGUE, and Chairman DAVIS for their diligence in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation's fire record is deplorable. The yearly toll of death, injuries, and property damage is almost beyond comprehension. There are 12,000 deaths, tens of thousands of injuries, and \$2 billion in property damage attributed to fires each year. The full impact of fire tragedy often is not fully appreciated. In addition, I am reluctant to admit

that many Americans may have unknowingly acquiesced to the existence of fires. Fires have been with us for so long that they begrudgingly have been taken for granted.

The scientific progress of the past 100 years has proven wrong other accepted facts which were also once "taken for granted." That the chief mode of transportation was the horse, that malaria had no cure, that thought of man walking on the Moon was an idle daydream—all these were once taken for granted, but not any longer. If we apply the same determination to coping with the problem of fire as we have applied to other technical challenges, I am confident we can achieve correspondingly satisfactory results.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the principal responsibility for the prevention and control of fires lies with local authorities. But I also know that local authorities alone often do not have the resources to spearhead a comprehensive fire campaign. The investigation and research necessary to solving the problem is beyond their means. This has been realized for many years and the National Bureau of Standards has been performing significant national studies on controlling fire.

It is time to expand the Federal Government's role in assisting local authorities fight fires. The Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 establishes a comprehensive framework by which we can attack the fire problem on several fronts simultaneously.

Title I of the bill establishes the National Bureau of Fire Safety within the Department of Commerce. The Fire Bureau will be the focal point for coordinating the Federal fire program. It will undertake public education, technology, and data collection programs. Public education will avail itself of the mass media and public service advertising. It will concentrate its message on the two groups most vulnerable to fires, the young and the elderly. The fire technology program will investigate a wide variety of fire safety equipment. Fire sprinklers and alarms must be built to work right the first time—there may be no second time. Protective clothing and breathing apparatus must be improved for our firemen. Data collection will give us a better overall picture of the causes of fire, and the techniques which best prevent fires.

Title I also establishes a U.S. Fire Academy. This recognizes that our conquest of fire will not come about by sheer brawn but by teaching men to use the latest technology. It will teach basic concepts and advanced techniques to firemen from all over the country. The Fire Academy will foster the high professionalism which our firemen have earned.

Title II of the act provides for the creation of a Fire Research Center within the Department of Commerce. This will be devoted to basic and applied research on fire prevention and control. The materials we use to build and furnish our homes must conform with a set of standards which provide at least a minimal level of fire safety for the occupants.

Other areas of research will include: The effects of fire and smoke on humans; the hazards caused by exposure to fire; and improved first aid methods for fire victims. This research recognizes that some fires probably will occur despite our best efforts. We must strive to reduce the human suffering of fire victims.

Title III of the act carries on this theme of alleviating human suffering by establishing in the National Institutes of Health a program to improve treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims. The bill provides for the dissemination of NIH's expertise by setting up local burn centers, burn units, and burn programs.

In conclusion, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure loans made to nursing homes for the purposes of installing fire safety equipment. The aggravated tragedy of nursing home fires is a source of national shame. This provision will help rectify a situation long in need of help.

Mr. Chairman, I see the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 as a vigorous attack on one of our oldest scourges. The bill will enable the Federal Government to lead the way in tackling the problem. While the Federal Government may lead the way, the road ultimately ends on every residential street and byway in our country. In fact, it ends at our doorstep.

The debate today has adequately demonstrated the need for this legislation. Although I rise in support of H.R. 11989, I would stress that this need may be inadequately met by the funding levels of the House bill. I am hopeful that in the conference with the Senate this inadequacy is, to the degree possible, corrected.

I am hopeful in the years ahead we can fully utilize the skill and expertise of this Center as we move to develop and implement the program.

In making this contribution we will be involved in a number of areas including a research and development program, a training and education program, and a national system of fire data and information. These are all worthwhile endeavors and I look forward to their initiation. However, I did want to briefly comment on one of these programs with which I am very familiar and which I believe merits special comment. I am referring to the provision for a program of improved treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims. I am privileged to have in my district the University of Michigan Burn Center. Headed by Dr. Irving Feller, this center is renowned for its pioneering work in this field. It has, as many publications have pointed out, "given second lives" to burn victims. I have visited the center on a number of occasions and believe that any assistance we provide will be returned manifold in benefits to those who have been badly burned.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CAMP).

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my support for H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. I would also like to congratulate the sub-

committee chairman, Mr. JOHN DAVIS of Georgia, as well as the ranking minority member, Congressman MOSHER of Ohio, for their leadership in drafting this excellent piece of legislation. I am pleased to be associated with this landmark bill and look forward to its successful passage today.

Mr. Chairman, it is my personal belief that too few Americans realize the formidable losses which this Nation suffers each year because of fire. On the average, every minute of every hour of the day there is a fire in an American home. And on the average, each day approximately 175 Americans are killed or left permanently disfigured by fire. This tragic toll is far too high and must be reduced.

Statistics on destruction of lives and property in the United States are all the more discouraging when compared to the death and damage rates in many foreign countries. As an example, our death rate from fires is twice as great as that of Canada, four times that of the United Kingdom, and 6½ times that of Japan. Clearly, the Federal Government must increase its efforts to reduce these losses by focusing public attention and mobilizing public resources. This in fact is precisely the thrust of the legislation at hand: The bill now before us seeks to revitalize and expand the role of the Federal Government in dealing with our catastrophic fire problem.

In drawing up H.R. 11989, the committee based its legislation not only upon our own intensive hearings but also upon the results of a comprehensive 2-year study undertaken by the President's National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. It was particularly interesting to me that the Commission's report identified as one of the highest priority safety functions that of providing a training and education program. As a result, the committee is recommending that a U.S. Fire Academy be established as a part of the suggested National Bureau of Fire Safety. The new Bureau in turn would function as an integral part of the Department of Commerce.

I personally feel that better training and education for our firefighters is of critical importance. The problem with the training offered today is that it is far from uniform in quality. This results in highly effective course work being available in some areas of our country while in other areas there is very little.

I point out, however, that the bill does recognize the existence within the United States of an established system for fire training. This system now provides basic training to recruit firefighters and certain advanced training in special fires, as well as some other types of training. But, because of the lack of uniformity in training now available, in addition to the fact that there is only limited management training offered for fire chiefs, there is a compelling need to supplement current local and regional programs. Thus the role of the Academy in supplementing the present system will be to fill the gaps where there is now no activity and to improve ongoing programs as necessary.

Clearly, the Academy plays a key role as it is to take the lead in achieving a

greater professionalism among the fire services and, where an improvement would result, to break away from conventional approaches by introducing more progressive and imaginative techniques and technology. In effect, the Academy is to serve as the principal vehicle by which to introduce new material and knowledge into the practices of the fire services.

I would also like to point out that the committee report accompanying the legislation addresses itself to the Academy facility proper. Specifically, the Academy will consist of whatever buildings and special facilities, staff and other personnel as are necessary and appropriate for its programs. The actual location of the Academy will be the selection of the Secretary of Commerce after he takes into account such factors as travel distance for students and local environmental suitability. The Secretary of Commerce is also permitted to designate more than one single site if he deems it desirable.

In this connection, I would like to recommend strongly that close consideration be given to establishing the Fire Academy at an institution which has the appropriate background and experience in fire training. I would venture to say that there may be a number of institutions throughout the Nation which meet this criteria but I would cite as one particularly unique example the Oklahoma State University in Stillwater, Okla.

I personally believe that OSU, which is known among fire experts as the "West Point of Fire Service," would be an outstanding location for the new Academy. The superb work which is conducted at the university in such areas as fire science, fire technology, and fire protection publications has received national recognition by experts in the field. In fact, the OSU fire technology degree program, which was started in 1937, is the oldest in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, without question, there are any number of potential sites for the future Fire Academy, but it is my conviction that because of the impeccable credentials of Oklahoma State University plus its excellent geographical location that no institution is as well qualified as OSU. I therefore recommend that the Secretary of Commerce give close consideration to locating the Academy at Oklahoma State University.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 11989 as it envisions a broad approach to the prevention and control of fires in this country. Furthermore, the Department of Commerce has also indicated to the committee that it is ready and eager to manage the activities set forth in the proposed legislation. I therefore commend this legislation to my colleagues and ask them to join with me in offering this bill our unqualified support.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CONLAN).

Mr. CONLAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few brief remarks in support of H.R. 11989, The Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. I want first to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who like myself have supported and cosponsored this bill.

Other speakers have recited in detail statistics about the thousands of deaths and billions of dollars in losses we suffer each year from fires. There is no need for me to repeat the numbers; we know the Nation has a problem. The question is—what to do about it?

Mr. Chairman, it is clear that we do not want another program of massive Federal intrusion into local affairs. Yet, I believe there is a proper Federal role in the area of fire prevention and control. This bill has been carefully drafted to insure that the Federal role does not tread on local responsibilities but is a supplement to local efforts.

H.R. 11989 acknowledges both the existence and limitations of training establishments already in operation at the State and local levels. Through the present training system, most firefighters get good training in basic and intermediate firefighting skills. However, there are limitations related to advanced or very special firefighting skills, for example aircraft or chemical fires, and management and command training for fire officers. The reason for this is easy to see—on a local level there is simply not enough demand for such specialized or advanced courses. However, nationwide there is sufficient need for specialized training. Recognizing this need, the U.S. Fire Academy is created by this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I want to also point out that under H.R. 11989, the Academy will not be sequestered in one central location. It will reach out to the volunteers and others who cannot attend courses far from home, by preparation of training aids, offering correspondence courses, sponsoring and staffing local workshops, and by training instructors who will return to the local firefighting organizations.

A similar situation occurs in the case of research on fire problems. No single local department can justify spending its funds on general research, yet research can save lives and prevent injuries. There is fire-related research now being done by various Federal agencies.

Research now being carried out at the Bureau of Standards, has developed an improved protective coat for firefighters. The Bureau and NASA are jointly funding the field testing of an improved firefighters breathing apparatus developed by NASA. Each of these projects should reduce firefighting injuries and at the same time enable firefighters to be more effective. Research funded by the National Science Foundation has shown that the large majority of fire deaths are caused by smoke or toxic gas inhalation. Also, basic research at the Bureau of Standards is examining fire ignition and flame spread. The knowledge gained in such research will be used to develop more accurate and usable flammability tests for building materials.

There is a need to coordinate and stimulate this basic research so H.R. 11989 creates within the Bureau of Standards a Fire Research Center. The Center will provide the research and testing. The results will become a national tool to enable the local jurisdictions, through their own fire code, and firefighting efforts to apply the latest methods to reduce fire's deaths and losses.

The area of data is another example of the need for Federal assistance. Fire-incident data must be collected, voluntarily, by the local fire departments. The local department may not see patterns merging or may see false patterns because of the relatively small number of fires and the random, sporadic nature of accidental fire. Yet, if such data is assembled and analyzed nationally, as this bill provides, clear patterns will emerge from the much larger number of incidents. Thus a national data system will identify problems, suggest priorities, and monitor the success of activities to reduce fire loss.

One last point, Mr. Chairman. It is my understanding that all fire service personnel and organizations are covered under the provisions of this bill. This is another example of the care with which H.R. 11989 is drawn, for local fire protection organizations vary from volunteer, paid full-time fire protection, to private industry contract service.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out for the record that in my district in Arizona many of the municipalities have contracted with private organizations as their sole source of fire protection. This has proven to be a very effective system.

I have been assured by the staff and the other members of the Science and Astronautics Committee that it is our intent that these private organizations are included under the provisions of this bill. Therefore, no firefighter will be denied the use of the opportunities and facilities created in this bill.

To summarize, Mr. Chairman, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 provides for a limited and balanced Federal role which includes activities in research, data analysis, and training. Carefully limiting the Federal role has three benefits. First, we are able to make the coverage broad—we do not have to try to restrict what we mean by a "fire department." Second, since we know the Federal Government will not be intrusive, we can encourage outreach training activities by the Fire Academy. Third, and most importantly, we can leave the responsibility for fire at the local level where it belongs, and where local people can control it.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CRONIN).

Mr. CRONIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, H.R. 11989. The need for this legislation has been clearly and completely documented in the report "America Burning" written by the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. This report covered America's fire problem in great detail and I do not intend to repeat those facts.

The fire problem was also discussed in hearings before our committee. Let me just say that the 12,000 deaths and hundreds of thousands of injuries annually demand action.

The most forceful recommendation of the National Fire Commission and a constant theme of testimony in our hearings was that a U.S. Fire Academy should be established to assist in training a more professional fire service for the Nation.

Testimony further pointed out that there is a good model for a U.S. Fire Academy, the British Fire Service Technical College in England.

Mr. Chairman, in order to better understand how best to meet the need for a U.S. Fire Academy, Chairman JOHN DAVIS and I have visited the British Fire Services Technical College at Moreton-in-Marsh, England. At this facility, built on the site of a World War II bomber base, there are modern classrooms, teaching laboratories, dormitories, dining halls, and so forth, that rival those in any American college or university. However, the outstanding facilities are those for teaching firefighting in realistic situations. Thus along the old runways there are full-scale models of a ship—surrounded by water—a warehouse, a seven-story tower, a commercial block, petroleum tanks, and manifolds, and a breathing apparatus training building. Students learn theory in the classrooms and put it into practice in these realistic fire situations. The Fire Service Technical College admirably serves the British needs and provides an interesting example for us.

However, the situation in the United States is somewhat different. First, our country is much larger and a single central training facility is probably not practical. Second, there is in existence in this country at the State and local level a fairly extensive establishment for basic firefighting training.

What is needed and what this legislation establishes is an academy to supplement, not duplicate or supplant, the existing training efforts. There are needs for higher level courses for officers—courses in strategy and command and public administration. There are needs for highly technical and specialized courses such as chemistry for arson investigation. Finally the local training efforts need to be supported through such approaches as preparation of training aids, courses for instructors, and regional workshops on new firefighting or fire prevention techniques.

H.R. 11989 has several provisions which will advance the Nation's fire safety performance, but most important to me are those provisions establishing a U.S. Fire Academy to fill the needs I have just described.

The bill also recognizes the fact that in most communities the fire departments are the primary operational Civil Defense organization.

In England we found that the local fire departments had complete responsibility for civil defense, primarily as a result of the emergency created by the complete devastation caused by the bombing raids during World War II. For this reason the bill provides for coordination between the Fire Academy and the Civil Defense Staff College in Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, for all the reasons I have given, I strongly urge the passage of the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

I am particularly pleased to support this measure since it substantially incorporates many provisions outlined in a series of bills in which I joined the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. STEELE, in sponsoring earlier in this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have been confronted with an alarming and steady increase in fatalities and property losses due to fire.

In Orange County in New York State, which is part of my congressional district, for the year 1972, deaths and serious injuries by fire totalled 55. It is obvious that when multiplied by the numbers of deaths and serious injuries throughout the other counties in our 50 States, this total can be staggering . . . an estimated 12,000 fatalities.

In world standings, the United States does not rank high in the prevention and control of fires. Canada, the United Kingdom and Japan all have had substantially greater success in preventing per capita death rates than our own country. For a nation that has led the world in technological advancement, this is not a laudable record.

Our advanced technology has, in fact, fostered increases in deaths and property losses. The influx of high rise buildings and the proliferation of synthetic materials, many of which are not sufficiently fireproof, are creating severe fire hazards.

While we can be proud of some of these advances, we should bear in mind that we may have been much too hasty in our developments without adequately preparing ourselves against the risks from fire.

It has been estimated that the price of destructive fire in the United States amounts to at least \$11.4 billion a year.

The 1973 report of the National Commission on Fire Protection and Control entitled "America Burning," while bringing some startling facts to light, came up with some sound recommendations for congressional action. It is partially as a result of this thorough report that we are taking this action today.

By this legislation, the Congress is establishing a National Bureau of Fire Safety for acting as a central resource and for focusing national attention on fire prevention. Within this National Bureau, the bill provides for the creation of a long-needed U.S. Fire Academy, for advanced training and educational programs in fire-related subjects.

While this bill may not be the final solution for preventing and controlling fires, it is a significant step in recognizing this high-priced need—the need for improving national fire safety.

I urge my colleagues to wholeheartedly support this measure.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE).

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, almost 3 years ago, I became convinced of the need for a major new national effort to reduce the staggering loss of life and property damage resulting each year from the ravages of fire. With the assistance of fire experts from throughout the country, I developed and introduced on February 2, 1972, the first comprehensive package of fire prevention and con-

trol legislation ever submitted to Congress, including legislation to create a National Fire Academy and eight other bills. It is in this context, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to offer my full support for the National Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

In many ways, the conversations and the research I undertook paralleled the extensive investigation later conducted by the extremely able and knowledgeable chairman of the subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, Mr. DAVIS. I particularly wish to express my admiration for Chairman DAVIS' vigorous leadership in helping to obtain action on the fire problem and my appreciation for his efforts to move this vital legislation through the long legislative process as quickly as he did. Similar appreciation is due to my outstanding colleague from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) who has worked effectively for this legislation from the outset and who has proved to be an invaluable friend of the Nation's 2 million firefighters, and to the other distinguished members of the subcommittee for their role in formulating a comprehensive, omnibus bill from the fire proposals referred to the committee.

In retrospect, my real awakening to the magnitude of the fire problem began the night I spent with Dennis Smith and Engine Company No. 82 in the South Bronx section of New York—which has been termed the busiest firehouse in the world. I witnessed a case of arson and three other fires within the first hour of my arrival. It quickly became apparent that these fires occurred every night in major cities across the country. I realize that like everyone else, my understanding of our Nation's fire problem came from a few, spectacular fires which were reported in local papers or on television. However, the most important part of a fire story, which generally goes unreported, begins after the fire, when individuals must put the pieces back together.

We are undertaking an enormous job. The mounting fire problem has been neglected by the Federal Government for too long. We must seek to reduce the total net annual U.S. fire loss, which is conservatively estimated to be \$11.4 billion; to change the public's attitude about fires; to provide funds for effective programs; and to lend new equipment and better educated firefighters into an improved firefighting system. In short, we are being asked to help solve a problem that has been traditionally considered exclusively a local responsibility. But I consider these goals both justified and of the greatest urgency.

Consider, if you will, that during the 1 hour of debate on this fire bill, it is statistically probable that 300 destructive fires will begin to burn in the United States. By the time they are suppressed, these fires will have caused more than \$300,000 worth of property damage. One person will be dead with 40 individuals injured, some crippled or disfigured for life.

Since I first introduced my 9 fire proposals, over 70 other related fire bills have been referred to the Science and Astronautics Committee and well over a quarter of the Members of Congress have

either sponsored or cosponsored fire legislation. Certainly there has never been a greater recognition in Congress of our Nation's fire problem and the need to take positive action to improve our Nation's fire prevention and firefighting program.

History shows that there were similar periods of concern about fire, but unfortunately, they have been followed in every case by long periods of neglect and inaction.

One of the first such periods of concern prompted President Truman's Conference on Fire Prevention in 1947. Promises were made and recommendations were written. There were high hopes that these promises and recommendations would be implemented. But sadly, no action was taken for 20 years until Congress passed the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968.

Two more specific cases further illustrate the cycle of concern and neglect. One period of concern followed the 1958 fire at Chicago's Our Lady of the Angels School in which 93 children were killed. Immediately, we closed, condemned, razed, and renovated thousands of schools. Yet, in the 10 years that followed, school fires increased by 272 percent. Another period of concern followed a fire in 1962 in Norwich, Conn., when firefighters routinely responded to a truck fire that unexpectedly and tragically blew up in their faces. Four firefighters were killed and six other persons were hospitalized with injuries caused by exploding chemicals. As a result, the Federal Government started to develop a uniform placarding system for marking dangerous cargoes. But once again, effective regulations were never implemented, and firefighters and law enforcement personnel are little better informed of potential cargo dangers today than they were 12 years ago.

These examples serve to illustrate the need for a continuing focus on the fire problem within the Federal Government. I emphasize the word "continuing"—which is especially critical because there have been many Federal programs which have been undertaken, but which have failed. I am confident that the legislation before us today will not fail because of neglect or by getting lost in a maze of bureaucracy.

Only the Federal Government can change our Nation's fire priorities. Today our fire safety efforts are designed primarily to suppress fires once they have begun rather than preventing them before they occur. The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control illustrated this point by explaining that about 95 cents of every dollar spent on fire services is used to extinguish fires; while only 5 cents is spent in preventing fire. Congress must recognize that a full understanding of the fire problem is needed and that only the Federal Government has the resources to comprehend and address the total fire danger our society and technology has created for us.

The fact is that we live in a combustible society. The new synthetic fabrics that are wrinkleproof, fadeproof, and almost as flammable in some instances as

a book of matches, are worn daily by all of us. We furnish our homes and offices with highly flammable synthetic materials that many times emit deadly fumes when burned. The chairs we sit on often contain such toxic substances, and commonly the mattresses and pillows, and even the insulation in our homes and offices incorporate these dangerous synthetics.

Obviously, then, there is a need for us to look at the role that we as Members of Congress can play in mobilizing the forces of the Federal Government against the fire problem and the unconscionable loss of more than 12,000 men, women, and children who perish in the 2.7 million fires which take place yearly in the United States. In my view, we should assess which steps hold the highest priority in terms of results for the money spent.

The Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 embodies three objectives which I view as being the most important first steps to be taken in reducing our Nation's fire problem.

First, is the creation of a National Fire Academy responsible for conducting courses and developing curriculums for use by colleges and universities, as well as local training centers. Specifically, the Academy would offer courses including techniques of fire inspection and fire arson investigation; tactics and command for fire situations; the administration and management of fire departments; civil defense operations; courses for training instructors and courses on fire-related subjects not available elsewhere. Also the Academy would offer assistance to existing local training centers and encourage additional centers where there are currently none. It would help colleges and universities develop 2- and 4-year degree programs in fire engineering. Of particular significance to firefighters across the Nation is the authorization to pay students up to 75 percent of the cost of attending Academy-approved courses at such colleges, with stipends of up to 75 percent for tuition, travel, and subsistence paid to students attending the Academy itself.

In fact, for the first time the National Fire Academy would provide our Nation with a continuing educational institution which would enrich the training courses of every fire department in the country. For the first time it would allow firefighters to engage in a systematic exchange of information: It would allow them to develop nationwide programs utilizing new technology and techniques. It would help volunteer, as well as paid, departments to improve their standards and training. And in the process, it would formally recognize the dedication and raw courage of the Nation's more than 2 million firefighters.

The second key objective is the establishment of a national fire data clearinghouse to provide a better understanding of the fire problem and to secure accurate, reliable data urgently needed in order to expand fire technology R. & D. programs. Under the legislation now before us, the Director of the National Bureau of Fire Safety within the Department of Commerce would collect and

analyze data in order to give a realistic appraisal of the size and character of the Nation's fire problem. The information would serve as a basis to establish priorities and select those areas which need immediate attention. And as part of the effort to provide a continuing focus on the fire problem, the data would be used to monitor the progress of the fire safety program. All of this would be possible by developing a standardized data reporting system and assisting State and local governments in gathering data.

The third objective is to facilitate the transfer of technology to the fire service.

Manufacturers of firefighting equipment acknowledged in the documentary film "Firetrap" that there is far too little communication between fire departments and the developers of fire equipment. The results can be disastrous. Equipment is sometimes so incompatible that neighboring fire departments cannot assist one another in an emergency because the hose couplings are different sizes. Nearly 60 different sizes are sold by manufacturers. When I visited Engine Company No. 82, I witnessed firefighters using the same kind of flammable leather fire helmets that have been in use for over 100 years, even though safer and more practical helmets were developed many years ago. Additionally many firefighters are injured each year because they have to hang on the back of fire trucks for dear life on the way to a fire. In other countries, firefighters ride to the fire in safety in a special vehicle or in a special cabin behind the driver. Another grave danger to firefighters is the inadequate and flammable turnout coats they wear. The National Bureau of Standards tested some firecoats which proved unable to pass the flammability standard for children's sleepwear. One final part of the firefighters' ensemble, the breathing apparatus, is also woefully inadequate because of its weight and bulk. It is so clumsy, in fact, that some firefighters refuse to use it.

It is important for us to make a special effort to improve the firefighter's uniform and breathing apparatus. We can make great progress in this vital area if we quickly capitalize on NASA's recent breakthroughs in firefighting technology. They have created a fire suit that offers protection from 1,500-degree flame. They have constructed a breathing system that is far lighter, smaller, longer lasting, and more efficient than current models. And they have produced several designs of clothing previously known in the firefighting profession.

This new equipment is being tested in actual fire situations by several paid departments across the Nation and by volunteer firefighters in eastern Connecticut.

Paid and volunteer firefighters alike have responded to NASA's innovations with enthusiasm. Now we must insure that such new equipment is mass-produced and distributed by private industry as quickly as it is developed.

In closing, I would add this point: The full effect of our failure in the area of firefighting equipment is hard to measure, but is nothing short of tragic. At

least 170 firefighters died last year in the line of duty and nearly 40 percent of all firefighters were injured. We will never know just how many of these firefighters or how many of the roughly 12,000 Americans killed each year by fire could have been saved if our firefighters were provided with the equipment they need and deserve.

I hope we do not fool ourselves into thinking that by passing this bill the Nation's fire problem will disappear overnight. Rather, I hope it will be viewed as only the first step, the turning point toward a major new effort by our country to reduce the toll of fire.

This landmark legislation is of great importance to the tens of thousands of full-time and volunteer firefighters who place their lives in jeopardy regularly as part of their dedication and sacrifice as public servants. It will provide essential benefits to our Nation's fire service similar to those long enjoyed by law enforcement agencies. While Congress appropriated on average over \$250 million per year between 1969 and 1972 for law enforcement activities, this bill authorizes a modest figure of only \$7.5 million for fiscal year 1975.

To return to a point I made earlier, it is important for us as Members of Congress to determine priorities in terms of the results for the money spent. The National Commission calculated that if a 5 percent reduction in fire losses could be realized annually, the Nation's losses would be halved in about 14 years. Or to look at it another way, a 5 percent reduction in property losses would mean a saving of \$350 million in the very first year.

But this legislation is important for a reason above the dollars and cents saved. It very well could yield substantial reduction in the number of deaths and injuries resulting from fire. And in our society, where we place the highest value on human life, this must be among our highest priorities.

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

Mr. STEELE. I am happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I wish to rise in enthusiastic support of this legislation. I wish to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE) for the outstanding work the gentleman has done in this effort, an effort that is not only appreciated in the State of Connecticut, but throughout the country. The gentleman has done an outstanding job, and the gentleman deserves our sincere thanks for his concern.

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

Mr. STEELE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman in the well and compliment him on those remarks. I rise in strong support of this legislation and urge all of my colleagues to accept it for the very cogent reasons he has given us. Such legislation is long

overdue and I am glad it has finally been accomplished.

Mr. STEELE. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. STEELE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEMP. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill pending before us, H.R. 11989, the proposed Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

This is of vital importance to the thousands of full-time and volunteer firefighters in our country whose lives and expertise are put on the line daily on our behalf.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS ACT

H.R. 11989 would enhance the national effort to more effectively control the occurrence of fires, thereby reducing their threat to life, limb, and property, and the inevitable scars associated with them and their terrible aftermaths. It is fully consistent with the commitment of the Congress to curb the incidence of fires and damage created by them.

This measure would, specifically—

Create a National Bureau of Fire Safety and a Fire Research Center within the U.S. Department of Commerce;

Authorize an improved treatment program to be conducted by the National Institutes of Health;

Authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to extend loan insurance to nursing homes for fire prevention equipment; and

Provide reimbursement for local firefighting efforts on Federal property.

All of this is needed.

Each year an estimated 3.6 million fires occur nationwide, killing 12,000 people and causing injury to an additional 300,000. Estimated annual losses due to fires in the United States total \$11,400 billion.

Title I of the bill before us establishes within the Department of Commerce a National Bureau of Fire Safety, within which will be established a U.S. Fire Academy. The academy will conduct courses in all aspects of firefighting and provide teacher training for its enrollees—mostly fire service personnel—at fees set by the superintendent of the academy. In addition, it will develop and run correspondence courses, workshops, seminars, and conferences; encourage fire programs offered by State, local, and private organizations and institutions; and, promote fire prevention education among architects and builders.

The superintendent of the academy will be authorized to provide stipends covering up to 75 percent of tuition costs for students attending the academy or academy-approved courses at other universities or colleges, as well as providing scholarships to fire-engineering students. The superintendent may also provide institutional assistance of up to \$2,500 annually per student enrolled in approved fire research and engineering programs.

One of the first bills I introduced at the beginning of this 93d Congress was H.R. 4094, a bill to provide for the crea-

tion of the National Fire Academy. The concept contained within that bill has been incorporated within the provisions of the bill pending before us.

I share with my colleagues, particularly who joined in the introduction of H.R. 4094, a deep sense of appreciation to the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and to its leadership, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, its chairman, and Mr. MOSHER of Ohio, its ranking minority member, for incorporating that concept into the present bill. I also think words of praise are due for the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE), who helped lead this effort.

THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH EMBODIED IN THIS BILL IS NECESSARY

I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of all my colleagues what I believe to be the principal merit of this bill: The use of a comprehensive approach to the problems of fire prevention, firefighting, fire damage reduction, and rehabilitation—of both property and lives.

When H.R. 4094 was introduced on February 7, 1973, it was as part of a comprehensive legislative package designed to attack this problem. In addition to the bill to create the National Fire Academy, I cosponsored the following measures:

H.R. 4095, a bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen—a proposal incorporated in large measure and at a higher percentage rate as authority given to the superintendent of the academy in the bill before us;

H.R. 4096, a bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to accredited institutions of higher education to pay for up to one-half of the costs of fire science programs—a proposal which also in slightly amended form is incorporated in the bill now pending;

H.R. 4097, a bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment—a proposal which I hope will soon be the subject of additional action by the committee and by the House;

H.R. 4098, a bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatuses—a measure which too ought to be soon considered;

H.R. 4099, a bill to extend for 3 fiscal years—through June 30, 1976—the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs, an assurance which we now have; and,

H.R. 4100, a bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Clearinghouse within the National Bureau of Standards—a proposal which will now be administered through the Fire Research Center within that Bureau, as that center is authorized by the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, we take great strides today, but there is still much to be done. When I talk to men like Thomas Owczarczak, the chairman of the Legislative

Committee of the Western New York Volunteer Firemen's Association, or Patrick Mangano, Jr., the president of firefighters Local 282 in Buffalo, or Ronald D. Feuerstein of the Lancaster Volunteer Fire Department, or Kenneth Hoertz of the Elma Volunteer Fire Co. and others I know how much more we have to do to help them in their valiant efforts. I am committed to that undertaking.

Mr. STEELE. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. STEELE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. THONE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to associate myself with my other colleagues who have spoken in enthusiastic support of this bill. In particular, I should like to commend the gentleman in the well. He is the one who sparked my interest in this legislation. I am sure he also stimulated the interest of many other Members of this body in this legislation.

As pointed out in the report accompanying this bill, and as confirmed to me in previous discussions with Hobart H. Boswell, the fine president of Local 644, Lincoln Fire Fighters Association, Lincoln, Nebr., the six areas of the fire problem in America are as follows:

First. There needs to be more emphasis on fire prevention.

Second. The fire services need better training and education.

Third. Americans must be educated about fire safety.

Fourth. In both design and materials, the environment in which Americans live and work presents unnecessary hazards.

Fifth. The fire protection features of buildings need to be improved.

Sixth. Important areas of research are being neglected.

This legislation goes a long way in an effort to help solve some of these problems. It merits strong support of all Members of this body.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN).

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in congratulating the chairman of the committee and also the ranking minority member. However, it has come to my attention that some of the provisions in this bill present a jurisdictional problem with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This has been brought to my attention by our chairman, as well as the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS). I just visited a minute with Mr. ROGERS, and there seems to be some area where these things can be ironed out. I hope the chairman and the ranking minority member will discuss this with Mr. ROGERS, who I assume will later speak to that point.

I just want to add my word from the minority saying we hope this can be worked out, because these jurisdictional problems are sometimes a bit sticky, but committee jurisdiction needs to be adhered to in order to keep some semblance of organization as to our efforts on these various committees.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly agree with the remarks that the gentleman has made. The Burn Treatment Centers are clearly a matter of concern to the National Institutes of Health, the overview of which comes under the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The gentleman is eminently correct in stating this. Our intention is not to get into the medical end of it at all.

I recently had a short conference with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), and I quite agree that many authorizing funds for the National Institutes of Health would properly come through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I have, therefore, entered into an informal agreement and am preparing an amendment which would delete the actual funds, \$2 million, which are allocated to the NIH.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. NELSEN was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. NELSEN. Perhaps the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) would care to respond so that we may have a better understanding. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We have had discussions here with the distinguished chairman of the committee. He has agreed that this subject matter is one which falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as our chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. STAGGERS) has so stated.

The reason we feel somewhat strongly about this is because if we let every bill that comes up have some authority where people could go to the Committee on Appropriations without funneling it through the basic committee that has jurisdiction, we are going to have so many authorizations that we could never keep track of what is happening.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS) has been kind enough to recognize this, and he says he will take care of this problem by an amendment, and then he will handle the matter in conference.

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

Mr. NELSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ESCH. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to get assurance from the chairman of the committee that has authorization on this that the correct channels will be followed.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I would want to have assurance, however, from the chairman of that committee that they are very much interested in and concerned with the burn centers and that we can develop a cooperative arrangement so that we can authorize ad-

ditional funds for research in cooperation with this bill as we proceed. Can the chairman give me assurances that they are working on this program?

Mr. ROGERS. If the gentleman will yield, we are very much interested in the program. I might say we feel the authorization of \$2 million probably would not move us very far at this time for the HEW estimates a burn center would cost between \$1.2 and \$1.5 million for the first year and about \$800,000 to 1 million a year thereafter, and it might be difficult to have as many as 25 centers all at once.

Mr. ESCH. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman also recognize the need to have burn centers throughout the country to support the work that is going on?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. I think all of us would like to see this. Many hospitals are setting up burn centers along with the trauma centers and emergency medical facilities as well.

Mr. MOSHER. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

Mr. GOODLING. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I can say everything I want to say in 2 minutes. I had no idea I was going to take part in this bill, but I want to point out to the Members of this House that this is one more instance where emotion takes over and good judgment goes out. I trust the supporters of this amendment have the ways and means of raising the money that this particular bill is going to require.

I suppose I should have on a bullet-proof vest before I oppose this bill. I can assure the gentlemen I do not, but I still want to talk against the bill, even though I know the skids are greased.

Tornadoes are very prevalent and I assume that any time now we are going to have a bill to prevent tornadoes.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions if he will respond. Mr. Chairman, I notice in fiscal year 1974 the National Bureau of Standards had allocated \$4 million for this purpose. Can the gentleman tell the House what was done with that \$4 million, how much has been spent and what did we derive from the \$4 million?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is not talking about this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. I am talking about the Commerce Department budget for the fiscal year 1974, which was for the National Bureau of Standards program, under the National Fire Research and Safety Act for fiscal year 1974, which shows \$4 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. They have an ongoing program at the National Bureau of Standards where they do a great deal of fire research. The other fire research is done by the Consumer Products Safety Commission under the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1967 or 1968. They do a great deal of research.

Mr. GOODLING. Can the gentleman give us an example of what they did specifically? Can he give us something specific?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. One thing they did was to test the flammability of carpeting. One way they did that was to take a sheet of metal with a hole in it and drop a pill in the center of that hole and measure how far the carpet burned before the flame went out.

Mr. GOODLING. Some time ago this Congress set up a bureau which has five Commissioners to look into standards of safety. Is that not a duplication of effort?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not know what bureau the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. GOODLING. I have forgotten the exact name of the bureau. I used the name a week or two ago.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. There was a Fire Commission set up.

Mr. GOODLING. It is not the Fire Commission. This is a Bureau of Consumer Safety.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That did not come out of this committee.

Mr. GOODLING. I realize that, but it is a complete duplication of effort.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think the gentleman must have reference to the Consumer Products Safety Commission which has to do with consumer products and in my view has no relevancy whatever to this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. I think if the gentleman will check, he will find that Commission is doing a great deal of what is proposed here.

One more question, if I may.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, that is a consumer problem. They go into such things as children's pajamas and toys and things like that, but that is a consumer problem. This bill is designed to fight the broad subject of fire in general, as well as to learn how to prevent fire.

Mr. GOODLING. One more question. How much of this \$7.5 million is budgeted for this year?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, if I have 1 more minute, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman was noticing a minute ago, we had agreed to strike \$2 million out of the bill. That has to do with the creation of the burn unit.

Mr. GOODLING. But for the fiscal year 1975, it is \$7.5 million?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct. I have agreed to strike out \$2 million of that and let the authorization for that come through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That leaves only \$5.5 million in this bill.

Mr. GOODLING. How much of this is budgeted?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is all budgeted.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I have one more request for time. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, I experienced a very severe fire in my business on January 24. Perhaps I should not be up here speaking against this bill, but I must carry through a bit with

the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

We are already spending a good deal of money on fire prevention at the Federal level. Also, we have universities, States, and cities that have fire training academies. This is another one of those friendly little bills that authorized only \$5.5 million to start, and then goes quickly to \$15 million and \$20 million.

I must remind the Members of this House and myself that the interest on our national debt has more than doubled. I repeat, more than doubled, during my short time in Congress, going from \$14.6 billion for fiscal year 1969 to an amazing \$29.1 billion in fiscal year 1975.

Now, if this is such a good, necessary bill, why do not the proponents move along with it a companion bill providing for the tax increases necessary to provide for its cost?

I would like to point out, too, that the administration opposes this bill on the grounds that the creation of a separate fire research center in the Bureau of Standards is a rather superficial exercise in more bureaucracy, more cost, without a resulting return on the taxpayers' money; so with this brief explanation, I will be voting against this bill.

Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. It is my pleasure to have been able to participate in the committee effort which produced this legislation and to have been able to work closely with our very able subcommittee chairman, JOHN DAVIS. I feel this act is an excellent piece of legislation, fully deserving the unanimous support which the committee provided it.

Mr. Chairman, man has always had an ambivalent relationship with fire. It has protected him but it has also frightened him. It has provided warmth to his home but it has also injured him. It has contributed substantially to his current-day prosperity but it has also destroyed his possessions and his environment.

Throughout the ages, however, man has been more and more able to control fire and use it for beneficial purposes. But he has never learned to completely control it and this is particularly so in 20th century America.

It is a documented fact that fire strikes a home in the United States on the average of every minute of every day. Hundreds of thousands of injuries and billions of dollars in property damage are the result. If this same problem with this kind of disaster and destruction were a public health problem it would be labeled an "epidemic"—an epidemic which reached more than three-quarters of a million of the Nation's 65 million residential dwellings in 1971.

In the course of the year, the United States reports 13 fires for every 1,000 of its residents. Japan, also a highly industrialized nation, records only 0.61 fires per 1,000 population. Japan also has only 2.9 fire deaths per million population while the United States records 57.1.

As if further emphasis is needed, I would also point out that during the 10 years ending in 1972, 3 times as many Americans died in fires as died in the Vietnam war—143,550 versus 49,925.

This averages out to over 12,000 Americans killed annually by fire alone.

Another 190,000 are injured by fire each year—tens of thousands of them seriously enough to require special medical treatment. And there are only minimal resources and facilities to provide them with the type of specialized care which they require. In fact, fewer than 100 of this country's 6,000 general hospitals provide specialized burn care. In addition, there are only 12 centers in this country which can properly be classified as medical burn centers.

One reason for the cost and scarcity of treatment centers is a lack of basic knowledge about burns and the body's ability to heal from this type of injury. The amount of money being devoted to burn research has been minuscule when compared with the magnitude of the problem. In fiscal year 1972, the National Institutes of Health spent approximately \$1.25 million on burn research in an attempt to reduce the 12,000 annual death toll. By contrast, \$34 million was spent on research into renal disease—which kills 9,000 Americans annually—and \$16 million on hypertension—which kills 16,000 Americans annually.

Another way of defining the dimensions of the fire problem is to analyze the enormous, complex system which has grown up over the years to combat fires. There are more than 20,000 fire departments in the United States with 200,000 paid firefighters and 20 million volunteers. And from any perspective, firefighting is a hazardous—and costly—occupation. Injury rates for paid firefighters are two to three times the national average for that of the manufacturing industries. Also, injury rates for volunteers are two to three times higher than for paid firemen.

Mr. Chairman, the legislation now before the House is a comprehensive bill designed to alter these horrible statistics by improving research, training, and education. Primary emphasis, of course, is placed upon the prevention and control of fires.

The act is in no way intended, however, to supplant State and local efforts at minimizing fire losses; rather, the legislation is designed to supplement these many worthwhile efforts.

To cite just one example of this cooperative relationship I mention the creation of a U.S. Fire Academy which is called for by H.R. 11989. This facility will provide access to the most advanced scientific, technological, and educational concepts. Instruction will be offered to as many firefighters as possible from around the country who will take the courses offered by the Academy.

The Academy will also offer management and administration courses for senior officers and establish a system of correspondence courses to permit training to be taken while the firefighter remains with his local unit. It will also support and encourage education and training programs at the local level such as in universities and community colleges.

Mr. Chairman, there are many additional important and innovative provisions in this bill. As a number of these have been discussed, I would therefore

simply add my support to this significant piece of legislation and ask that my colleagues join with me in reducing the proportions of this Nation's fire problem.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, losses from fires have reached very high levels in the United States. Each year more than 12,000 persons lose their lives as a direct result of fires and many tens of thousands are injured and maimed. Close to 200 of those lost are firefighters who die in the performance of their dangerous duty. The losses in property are equally large, and are estimated to exceed \$2 billion each year. Other indirect costs of fire, for example the cost of maintaining fire departments, may total another \$8 billion per year. The prevention and control of fires is and must remain the responsibility of local authorities. But if the trend of growing fire losses is to be halted and reversed, the Federal Government must make a contribution in certain fields where only a national effort can provide the needed initiative and effort. This bill is aimed at filling that need.

The need for improvement in all areas of fire prevention and control is evident. It is the intent of the bill to provide assistance in the reduction and prevention of fires and in the reduction of the losses resulting from fires. If enacted, the bill would set policies for Federal activities in this field and establish an agency to deal with fire safety matters.

As a result of 5 days of hearings, study of the National Fire Commission report, "America Burning," and personal member and staff involvement and study of the fire problem, the committee has found that the United States has the highest rates of death and property loss from fire of any industrial nation; that these losses are unacceptable; that while fire prevention and control is properly a local responsibility, the Federal Government can be of invaluable assistance; that both firefighting and civil defense programs can benefit from closer cooperation; that there is need for professional training for the fire services; that additional research is needed in the area of fire safety; that there is a need for a national fire data system; that the U.S. facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims are severely limited in number; and that the Federal Government's role in research, data, and training needs to be strengthened in order to improve the effectiveness of the Nation's firefighters.

Title I of the bill establishes in the Department of Commerce a National Bureau of Fire Safety, the "Fire Bureau," headed by a presidentially appointed director. The Fire Bureau shall be the Federal focus of efforts to improve the Nation's fire prevention and control. To this end, the Fire Bureau will undertake programs of technology development, training and education, data collection and analysis, public education, and other efforts, in cooperation with State and local governments, which continue to have the primary responsibility, and with the private sector. The Director is instructed to insure that results of the Bureau's work are widely available and to encourage their use where

applicable. This last item recognizes the diffuseness and diversity of the fire community which makes transfer of technology and utilization of new information particularly difficult.

Mr. Chairman, let me now explain the activities to be included in the Fire Bureau in the order they appear in the bill.

The Director is instructed to undertake a continuing and extensive program of public education in fire safety and fire prevention. It is the intent of the committee that this include programs in the schools, training for teachers, mass media/public service advertising, and educational materials. The bill provides that the Director shall collaborate with other organizations in this field and that the program shall include special messages targeted for particularly vulnerable groups, such as the young and the elderly. In recognition of the apathy which greets most current efforts in public education, the Director is instructed to conduct research into new methods of public education.

The Director shall develop new technology for fire safety to include both equipment and techniques. This section of the bill recognizes the need for new technology in fire protection and also recognizes that this must be proven technology. Because of the sporadic, surprise nature of fire incidents and because lives are at stake, equipment must function correctly the first time, often, as in the case of sprinklers, after long standby periods. Thus testing, evaluation, acceptance, and validation test procedures, operation tests demonstration projects, and actual fire investigations are included. In the area of techniques the Director shall develop purchase specifications and standards for equipment.

Further in the area of techniques the Director shall conduct research on the management and operation of fire departments, on fire department productivity, and on fire service personnel needs and problems.

The thrust here is to develop techniques and guidelines to enable the fire chief to utilize his manpower and equipment and resources effectively and efficiently.

Finally, the bill recognizes that there exists much underutilized technology which could be adapted to fire protection and instructs the Director to take full advantage of this resource.

The Director shall operate a comprehensive integrated national fire data and information system.

The integrated system shall collect data from all appropriate sources—for example, fire departments, insurance organizations, medical facilities—combine and analyze it so that it delivers its message to the desired user, publish, and disseminate it.

The Director is authorized to develop standardized fire data reporting methods to insure that reports from different jurisdictions are compatible, but the use of such standard reports is not made mandatory. The Director is, however, authorized to assist State, local, and other agencies in developing and reporting information, and to make use of existing data capabilities as much as possible,

so that he can thereby encourage the development of a sound, reliable data base.

The bill establishes a U.S. Fire Academy as part of the Fire Bureau, to be headed by a Superintendent appointed by and responsible to the Director. The provisions of the bill recognize that there exists in the United States an established system for fire training. This existing system now provides basic training for recruit firefighters, certain advanced training in special fires such as flammable liquids, and other types of training. However, the training available to firefighters varies across the Nation and there is little management training for fire chiefs. Thus the role of the Academy in supplementing the system is to fill the gaps where there is no activity, and to improve existing programs where necessary.

To accomplish this, the Academy will have three separate activities: There will be courses of study given at Academy facilities; there will be correspondence courses offered by the Academy; and there will be assistance to existing and new and local programs.

The list of areas and means of instruction in the bill is intended to give the superintendent wide latitude in carrying out the program. To assist him in this the superintendent is directed to conduct a continuing study of the training needs of the Nation's fire forces. This activity will provide him with the information he needs to insure that his program does fill gaps; that is, supports, not supplants, existing programs. This continuing study will also inform him as to which local programs or which areas of training might need shoring up, and which courses should be offered or developed by the Academy.

Courses offered by the Academy would include techniques of fire inspection and fire and arson investigation; tactics and command for fire situations; the administration and management of fire departments; civil defense operations; courses for the training of instructors; and topics not offered elsewhere. Correspondence courses would be developed and offered in areas of need, where the topic can be handled in this way.

The superintendent is authorized to assist existing local training programs and to encourage the development of new programs, where they are needed. This assistance would be rendered through curriculum development, development of texts or manuals, workshops for instructors, and so forth, and by paying students up to 75 percent of the cost of their attendance at Academy-approved courses at colleges and universities.

As another kind of assistance to fire education, the superintendent is also authorized to encourage professional schools of architecture, city planning, and engineering to include fire safety in their curriculums. This would enable designers of buildings and products to understand the reasons for certain provisions in fire codes and the performance expected of their design.

The Academy proper shall consist of whatever buildings and special facilities, staff, and other personnel are necessary

or appropriate for the Academy programs. The location of the Academy will be selected by the Secretary of Commerce after receiving a report from a site selection board. This board, the superintendent plus two others, will consider such things as travel distance for students, environmental factors, and so forth. If found desirable, the Academy may have more than a single site.

Because the existing training system is very diverse, the bill provides that the superintendent shall establish a committee to study the issue of accreditation of fire training courses. This committee would consider whether a mechanism of accreditation is desirable and what role the Academy should play.

Students in Academy courses and programs are to be selected from members of the fire services or civil defense forces, or other individuals that might be able to better contribute to reduction of fire losses with further training.

The bill provides that the Superintendent may establish fees for courses and may provide stipends to students, up to 75 percent of tuition, travel, and subsistence costs.

To encourage the growth of a cadre of trained fire professionals, the Superintendent is authorized to provide scholarships and make loans to full-time students in fire engineering courses.

The bill provides that a Board of Visitors be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce to review annually the Academy program and report to the Secretary.

The bill provides that a fire protection district or fire department may be reimbursed at least in part for its costs incurred in fighting a fire on Federal property. To receive this reimbursement the district or department must file a report with the Director stating: First, the losses or expenses incurred as a result of fighting the fire; and second, the costs of operation of the district or department for the year preceding the incident and the year of the incident, and the estimated costs for the following year. Using this report the Director can determine the relative burden of a particular Federal fire incident. The Director shall then determine and make a payment to the fire district or fire department which shall represent their costs less a pro-rata share of Federal payments made in lieu of taxes. The committee intends that, upon making such a payment, the Director will be reimbursed by the Federal agency on whose property the fire occurred.

Two million dollars is authorized to carry out the activities of the Fire Bureau for fiscal year 1975.

Title II of the bill establishes a Fire Research Center in the Department of Commerce which is intended to carry on the National Bureau of Standards fire program and which is to conduct basic and applied research on the phenomenon of fire in order to provide the information needed to develop new technology, better fire codes, and so forth. The activity shall have two parts: First, a physical science program to include the physics and chemistry of fire and its ef-

fects, and second, a program on the effects of fire on humans to include biology, physiology, psychology.

The intent of the bill is to authorize the Fire Research Center to conduct laboratory or test investigations of fires, and whenever necessary to supplement these controlled investigations with field investigations of actual fires.

The physical science program shall study such topics as fire dynamics, fire growth and spread, ignition, extinguishment, the early stages of fire—to improve early detection, that is, to determine what characteristics of a new fire one should detect—and the behavior of fire in buildings. The program shall study unique fire hazards that arise from industrial use of dangerous materials including chemical fires. A very important part of the program is the determination of the products of combustion, including smoke, which account for most fire deaths.

Another part of the program shall study the design of buildings and other structures to generate design concepts enabling an architect or builder to incorporate fire safety into buildings that are comfortable, beautiful, economical, and useful.

The human-effects program will investigate the effects of fire, smoke and heat on humans. The goal is to produce basic information on the actual mechanisms by which fire affects its victims so that buildings, products, materials, and procedures can be made safer.

Further, the program must cover both the actual or potential fire victims, who perhaps are exposed to fire once in a lifetime, and the firefighter whose job requires repeated exposure to fire. Specific areas of research shall include: First, the effects on humans of toxic substances produced by fires, for example smoke and other combustion products; second, hazards and stresses caused by the exposure to the heat, smoke and danger of fire, especially as this applies to firefighters; third, research for the development of simple tests to determine the cause of a fire victim's death—this recognizes the fact that many bodies are recovered badly burned, but may have been burned after dying from exposure to toxic smoke; fourth, improved methods of first-aid for fire victims, simple treatments to be given at the scene of a fire; and fifth, other studies—biological, physiological, and psychological—as necessary.

The bill also provides that the research program shall examine the psychological and motivational characteristics of arsonists.

The bill instructs the Director to insure that the results of the research program are put to work improving fire safety. The principal means of applying the results named in the bill are codes, standards, and test methods. However, the Director should also insure that where appropriate research results are given to the U.S. Fire Academy, to other Federal agencies, to industry, and to State and local governments.

Three million five hundred thousand

dollars is authorized to carry out the fire research program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

Section 204 makes changes in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards. The effect of these changes is to insert sections 201 and 202 of this bill into the NBS Organic Act to describe the fire research program to be carried out at NBS. The intent is to insure that a strong, competent scientific program in fire research be carried out and managed by the National Bureau of Standards.

Title III authorizes and directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish in the National Institutes of Health a program of improved treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims. The bill provides for a broad program of research, training, and improved treatment.

The bill provides that NIH shall sponsor and encourage the establishment of three types of burn treatment activities: 25 new burn centers; 25 new burn units; and 90 new burn programs.

The National Institutes of Health is also directed to provide training and support for the treatment and rehabilitation specialists necessary to staff the activities described above; to provide training in emergency care for burn victims; to increase their sponsored research program on burns, burn treatment, and burn rehabilitation; to systematically study smoke inhalation injuries; and to sponsor and support other necessary research and training programs.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, and I urge its adoption by this body.

Mrs. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

I was pleased to cosponsor this important legislation, and I am equally pleased that it is before us today for consideration. The committee has seen fit to incorporate many of the suggestions from the report "America Burning" prepared by the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. This measure will provide our country, for the first time, with national standards on fire prevention and control, and will add greatly to the public awareness of fire and firefighters. There will now be a concerted effort to promote programs of fire prevention, and to mobilize our technological resources to improve our ability to combat fires.

The programs advanced by this legislation will greatly contribute to the safety of our firefighters through research into improved protective equipment and through quality training and teaching of advanced firefighting techniques. The establishment of the National Fire Academy is a step forward in upgrading the quality of training available to our firefighters, and in providing advanced curriculums to local training programs. I would ask that serious consideration be given to the State of Maryland as a location for the new Fire Academy. Maryland would certainly qualify under the criteria which will be considered by the Site Selection Committee in terms of access and location. In addition, the outstanding

training which is being provided through the Fire Administration School at the University of Maryland, and the forward looking and highly proficient firefighting teams in Anne Arundel and Prince Georges Counties of my district, would serve as nuclei for the fledgling school in providing expertise from their own ongoing training programs.

It is my earnest hope that this new Federal program will make real inroads into our frightful national fire statistics, and will help to save thousands of lives, tens of thousands of injuries, and billions of dollars in damage and loss. It is interesting to note that the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control commented that of every dollar spent on fire services, only 5 cents is directed toward fire prevention. H.R. 11989 will, while maintaining fire-suppression activities, reorient our approach and provide far more emphasis on the prevention which will yield huge benefits in lives and property.

Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this historic legislation.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Fire Prevention and Control Act. As a member of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development, I was proud to play a role in the formulation of this needed legislation. I want to take this time to compliment the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, JOHN DAVIS, who was the guiding force in putting together this fine bill.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time the Federal Government will have an agency that is dedicated to improving the Nation's fire prevention and control techniques. A National Bureau of Fire Safety will be established within the Commerce Department and will undertake systematic investigation of various fire technology developments, training programs, and educational efforts. This new bureau will also distribute this information and work with State and local government fire departments and officials.

Further, the bill creates a new fire research center to carry out the basic and applied research for the development of new firefighting technologies. For this innovative effort, the bill provides \$3.5 million next year.

Finally, the bill also provides for assistance to people who suffer personal injuries from fires. The bill directs the Secretary of HEW to establish within the National Institutes of Health a new program of improved treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims. Further, the bill also provides loans to nursing homes for the installation of fire safety equipment.

As can be seen from this description of the bill, it is prudent, but necessary. Firemen not only from Connecticut, but from all over the United States testified in support of it. It represents a beginning in coordinating a systematic national attempt to prevent fires and protect firefighters.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I cannot avoid observing that the passage of the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1973, taken together with the Public Safety

Officers Benefit Act of 1973, which provides \$50,000 to firemen killed in the line of duty, and was passed yesterday, that the House of Representatives has moved constructively and swiftly to aid our Nation's firefighters.

I urge my colleagues to overwhelmingly support this necessary legislation.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. As one of many sponsors of earlier proposals in this area, I am pleased to see this necessary legislation coming to a vote on the House floor.

This bill will benefit both the average citizen who may never be involved in a major fire, as well as the Nation's firemen who must battle fires on a daily basis. A long-term benefit of this kind of legislation should be to reduce fire insurance rates in the United States.

Firefighting is now designated as the most dangerous occupation in the Nation. More than 12,000 persons, including close to 200 firefighters, lose their lives in fires in the United States each year. One of the findings accompanying this bill is that this Nation today has the highest rates of death and property loss due to fire of all major industrial nations.

The annual cost of fires in the United States—including property loss, fire department operations, burn injury treatment, operating costs of the fire insurance industry and productivity loss—is conservatively estimated at \$11.4 billion. Not included in that monstrous total are losses suffered by businesses closed due to fire or wages lost when jobs are interrupted by fire.

These figures point out the necessity for accomplishing the things this bill tries to do. The problems we face were illustrated in the final report of the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control issued in 1973.

The Commission said there should be more emphasis on fire prevention, and this bill attempts to do that through public education and through research and development of new techniques for fire prevention and control.

The Commission said firefighting units need better training and education, a problem this bill addresses through establishment of a U.S. Fire Academy.

Americans must be educated about fire safety, the Commission said, and the public education effort envisioned under this bill should do that. The Commission said that in both design and materials the environment we live in is unnecessarily hazardous and that the fire protection features in our buildings need to be improved. The Fire Research Center established under this bill, with duties that include studying the characteristics of fires and developing fire safety design concepts for buildings, will help solve this problem.

Another beneficial feature of the bill is its direction to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish in the National Institutes of Health a program of research, training, and improved treatment for burn victims. Improvements in this area are vitally necessary, especially when we realize that half the

victims of burn injuries are children who may spend a long lifetime suffering from psychological as well as physical disfigurement if adequate treatment techniques are not available.

This is a broad bill to attack a problem that is growing in seriousness in the United States. I urge your support.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was proud as a member of the Rules Committee when a rule was granted by the committee on the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. This landmark legislation, being considered today, will add a national dimension to an all-out campaign against fire, the major killer of 12,000 Americans each year.

The form of this new approach is presented in the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. I feel this is a necessary step toward educating our citizenry and professionalizing our firefighting efforts. The bill is designed to fight fire with increased technology and more efficient administration.

In the past we tried to tackle fire on a piecemeal basis, with each community providing its own limited forces. Although State and local governments will continue to have the primary responsibility under the new act, the Federal Government will assume a central role in the expansion of research, data, and training. A second aspect of the bill will increase the cooperation between civil defense and firefighting forces. These actions will consolidate our technological and experimental knowledge into a national effort to improve the overall effectiveness of the Nation's firefighters.

A historic provision of the Fire Prevention and Control Act establishes the U.S. Fire Academy. There has long been a need in our country for such an institution to act as a central education and training facility for fire services. The Fire Academy will be the principal means of transmitting new material and techniques to fire departments across the Nation.

The Fire Academy will service those individuals recommended for further training as well as those seeking careers as professional firefighters. Firemen need not be enrolled at the Academy since correspondence courses will be made available to interested parties. Workshops for instructors will also be provided, as will assistance to existing local training programs. A study will be conducted by the Fire Academy, moreover, to discern the training needs of the Nation and gear our future curriculum development in these areas.

Financial assistance to interested individuals should encourage many to participate in the program. Payment of up to 75 percent of the cost of attending Academy-approved courses in fire training will be provided. Interest in becoming a professional firefighter will be sparked by scholarships and loans made available to full-time students in fire engineering courses.

I am certain that the U.S. Fire Academy will be an excellent opportunity to raise the technical and professional status of fire services throughout the Nation.

A second innovative provision of the Fire Prevention and Control Act relates to the improved treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims. The new program is meant to eliminate the delay that often accompanies a burn victim's arrival at a facility and, furthermore, to insure that the hospital is able to attend adequately to his needs.

Three types of burn treatment facilities will be established. The first, the burn center, will be a separate hospital with interrelated programs of patient care, research and teaching. A highly professional staff consisting of general, orthopedic and plastic surgeons, specially trained nurses and physical therapists will be recruited. Additionally, psychologists, psychiatrists and social workers will be part of the staff. Burn patients will receive top medical attention at this facility, as well as help in rehabilitation.

The second center will be a burn unit which can be located within any general hospital. This unit will be reserved for burn patients and be staffed by burn specialists. The third type of program will consist of a staff of burn injury specialists without special facilities. This group will be more mobile and able to go where needed.

I feel that this three-pronged approach should lead to a considerable improvement in the treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims.

Hopefully the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 will promote better use of manpower and equipment. Then we can successfully cope with the complex fire problems created by urban development.

Surely the personal aspects of this legislation are worthy of national attention. The untold tragedy to the lives of burn victims and their families highlights the need for effective action much more forcefully than mere words could ever express. Last year in Chicago alone there were more than 95,000 calls to the fire department—40,000 of those calls signalled real fires, leaving 216 dead, 690 injured. These statistics report an ever-increasing loss of life and property resulting from fire.

Unfortunately fire remains an unrecognizable problem until it strikes home. The time is now to awaken our citizens to the very real danger presented by fire. Hopefully, this legislation will be instrumental in saving lives and helping those who are needless victims.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11989—the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. The act establishes a comprehensive approach for coping with man's oldest scourge—fire.

Because the problem has been with us for so long, I fear that in the past we may have unwittingly resigned ourselves to the inevitability of fire's devastation. This bill dispels any notion of such complicity and sets the stage for a coordinated program to reduce sharply the losses due to fire. When Americans think of fires, they usually recall the spectacular incidents—a raging forest fire or a blazing warehouse—which attract hundreds of firemen and scores of fire engines. But the biggest problem is right in the backyard. It is the person who

dies in an easy chair after falling asleep while smoking who contributes most to this Nation's deplorable fire statistics. Other culprits include overloaded electrical circuits and defective space heaters.

Fire strikes an American home every minute of the day. Every day more than 30 persons die and 500 are injured because of fire. The most frequent victims are often those least able to help themselves—the young and old.

The Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 will meet this enormous problem head on. The act establishes a National Bureau of Fire Safety to serve as the focus of Federal efforts to improve fire prevention and control. The Bureau will pursue programs of developing new fire technology, training firefighters, collecting data and cooperating with State and local governments which continue to have primary responsibility in firefighting.

A Fire Research Center is established to carry on the fire program of the National Bureau of Standards. The Center will investigate the scientific phenomenon of fire itself and the effects of fire on humans. The former will study topics such as fire dynamics, and fire ignition, growth and propagation.

Since some fires probably will occur despite our best efforts, we must be ready with meaningful assistance to fire victims. To accomplish this, the human effect program will study the effects of fire, smoke, and heat on humans.

Central to the Center's research is the development of standards to provide for proper use of materials for construction and furnishing of our homes. We need to reduce the ease with which clothing, bedding, and furnishings can ignite and spread. Standards are needed for safer matches, kitchen appliances, and space heaters.

The new Center will also explore the development of less expensive and more reliable and effective fire detection systems. The day hopefully will come when a reasonably priced fire detector is available for every home. Another important avenue of research to pursue is that aimed at an improved fire suppression system. Triggered at the inception of a fire, such systems can control the growth of a fire and thereby reduce its threat. In this regard, title III of the act authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure loans made to nursing homes for the purpose of the purchase and installation of fire safety equipment.

Mr. Chairman, I have enumerated several of the positive contributions which this bill makes to coping with the tragedy of fires. The bill also sets up a major public education program and establishes a special educational facility to teach basic and advanced techniques to firefighters.

Mr. Chairman, men have been plagued by fires for as long as they have dreamed of walking on the Moon. We have already fulfilled the latter dream. I believe that if we apply ourselves, we can make comparable progress in resolving one of man's oldest scourges. I look forward to our great-grandchildren being

able to refer to fire engines and disfigured fire victims as anachronisms belonging to the past.

Mr. WINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974. I would also like to add my compliments to those of Mr. MOSHER in congratulating both Chairman TEAGUE and Chairman DAVIS for their initiative and perseverance in bringing this innovative piece of legislation to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, this Nation's fire record is appalling. Statistics for the number of fires and fire deaths in the United States are higher than those for any other industrialized nation. Although our rate of fire deaths—the number of deaths per million inhabitants—continued its drop in 1972 that has been the trend over the last 20 years, the absolute number of fire deaths in the United States increased. In addition, 1972 witnessed a significant increase in the amount of fire losses over those reported in 1971—the total loss for 1972 exceeding one-quarter of 1 percent of this Nation's gross national product. These statistics indicate the immediate need for improving all areas of fire prevention and fire control.

As a means of resolving our pressing fire problem, I feel it is important that the Federal Government assist local governments in a national effort in fire prevention and control activities. H.R. 11989 will provide precisely this type of assistance by establishing within the Department of Commerce a National Bureau of Fire Safety, whose function will be to improve the Nation's efforts in fire prevention and control through public education, advanced technology, training and education for firefighting personnel, as well as by a number of other concepts and techniques.

One particularly innovative approach will involve the increased use of data and statistics relating to fire problems. A comprehensive national fire data and information system will be set up to include statistical information on fires that have occurred. This will indicate such factors as cause, losses, injuries, means of suppression, the route of fire spread, et cetera. Any firefighting injuries will also be included. Furthermore, a vital data base will be created relating to fire laws and codes, inspection practices, and firefighting organization administrative structures. Technical information on fire properties of materials, fire behavior, and best methods of control, will also be entered.

In addition, the present legislation also establishes a U.S. Fire Academy to advance the professional development of fire service personnel, civil defense personnel, and related fire safety personnel. The provisions of the bill recognize the existence of an established system for fire training in the United States with the role of the Academy therefore to supplement the established system either by filling the gaps where there is little or no activity at present, or by improving existing programs where necessary.

All activities I have just described including the new Bureau as well as the fire data and information effort will be

funded initially under a \$2 million authorization.

This legislation also establishes within the Department of Commerce a Fire Research Center to perform and support research on all aspects of fire. The aim of the Center will be to provide scientific and technical knowledge applicable to preventing and reducing fires. This activity will have two parts including a physical science program focusing on the physics and chemistry of fire and its effects, and a program on the effects of fire on humans which will emphasize the disciplines of biology, physiology, and psychology—\$3.5 million is authorized for this phase of the effort.

Finally, the bill establishes within the National Institutes of Health under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a program of improved treatment and rehabilitation for burn victims. The compelling need for this particular program is best stated by the recent report of the President's Commission on Fire Prevention and Control which pointed out—and I quote—"at present, fewer than 100 of the 6,000 general hospitals in the United States provide specialized burn care. Together, these few hospitals treat only 8 percent of the Nation's patients with serious burn injuries."

As recommended by the Commission, this bill sets up three types of burn treatment activities. First, 25 new burn centers will be established. These centers will be separate hospital facilities having interrelated programs of research and teaching as well as patient care. Next, 25 new burn units will be organized. These units represent a less elaborate specialized facility in a general hospital for the exclusive care of burn patients. Third, 90 new burn programs will be initiated. Each program corresponds to a staff of burn injury specialists who will be trained to operate without special facilities. The authorization for this program of improved treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims is \$2 million.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 11989 is funded at a minimal amount—\$7.5 million—in comparison to the pressing need for the types of programs which it proposes. When compared to our property losses alone of over \$2 billion each year, not to mention losses in human lives—almost 12 thousand in 1972—this bill will pay for itself many times over in the benefits reaped from this Nation being able to better prevent and control destructive fires.

Because of the far-reaching beneficial impact of this bill I urge my colleagues to join with me in offering their support for this measure.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, today the House of Representatives has an opportunity to act on legislation which is long overdue. The fire prevention and control legislation, H.R. 11989, is designed to provide the training and guidance needed to effectively fight and control fire in our communities.

In 1972 alone, fire caused the tragic death of over 12,000 Americans and brought about the destruction of over \$3 billion worth of property. When fire is

controlled, it is a useful element. On the other hand, if uncontrolled, fire is one of the most dangerous and deadly perils. It is the No. 2 accidental killer.

The time has come to take positive steps to improve and modernize our firefighting system. This legislation before us now can help to accomplish that end.

The bill, as it comes to us today, is the culmination of many long hard hours of review and study, not only by the able members of the Committee, but also by the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control. The legislation includes many of the recommendations of that Commission such as the establishment of a fire academy for training firefighting personnel. It would also create a research center to carry on much needed research in the field of fire prevention and fire control.

The academy will provide firemen with the training and skills they need to operate modern equipment for maximum effect at the scene of a fire. This training will directly benefit the American public through better fire protection.

Certainly a key to fire control is good fire prevention. By learning new and better means of fire prevention, the firemen of America's communities can help each of us to do our part to avoid the ravages of fire.

In order to develop the new techniques of fighting fires, adequate research must continually be in process. The research center will permit this to happen by providing facilities and means of conducting experiments on flammability, fire detection, fire extinguishment, and fire behavior. In addition, new research would be started in areas related to fire such as medical evacuation, transportation, toxic substances, and related topics.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this legislation is great. Through the resources of the Federal Government we can help communities all across the land to improve the services they provide to their citizens, our constituents. I urge my colleagues to give this proposal their serious consideration, for each of us could some day be the beneficiary.

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, it is tragic and inexcusable that the United States—the technological leader of the world—has more per capita deaths and property losses from fire than any other major industrial nation.

Fires account for 12,000 deaths annually, second only to highway fatalities. Per million people, this country reports 57.1 deaths caused by fire, nearly twice that of second-ranked Canada. Another 300,000 individuals are injured, many of them scarred for life. In addition, the annual cost of fire has been estimated at more than \$11 billion—33 percent more than Canada on a per capita basis.

Last year, the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control released its shocking, but excellent, report on fire safety in this country. In transmitting the report, entitled "America Burning," Chairman Richard E. Bland stated:

We know our great Nation has the resources and technology presently available

to lessen the destructive impact of fire. We believe a continuing Federal focus on the fire problem is a necessity.

The bill before us today—H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act—incorporates most of the recommendations of the Commission. In both the 92d and 93d Congresses, I cosponsored bills to improve firefighting techniques and programs. I commend the committee's current efforts and strongly support the bill before us today.

The measure contains a three-pronged approach toward reducing human and financial losses resulting from fire. First, it establishes a National Bureau of Fire Safety to improve the prevention and control techniques. The Bureau would undertake programs of technology development, education and training data analysis, and public education in cooperation with State and local governments. Second, it establishes a Fire Research Center to conduct basic research on fire. Third, it directs HEW to establish a program of improved treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims. To finance these programs, the bill authorizes \$102 million over 5 years, less than 1 percent of the annual national fire toll.

Most of the proposals which I have cosponsored have been incorporated into the language of H.R. 11989. For example, a National Fire Academy would improve and supplement existing training programs. The data and information system of the Bureau would meet the pressing need for statistical, practical, and technical information on fires. The Bureau would also develop and test new technology for fire safety and control, including modernized equipment. The Fire Research Center would conduct and coordinate basic and applied research on fire and improve our knowledge of the phenomenon of fire itself. All of these proposals have been cosponsored by me in separate bills introduced in the 92d and 93d Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, we entrust our firemen with the dangerous and demanding job of protecting our lives and property from fire. Unless they employ the best available equipment and utilize the most effective techniques, their jobs are made unnecessarily difficult and dangerous. Passage of H.R. 11989 would aid firemen by improving the availability of modern firefighting techniques.

The potential impact of H.R. 11989 on the safety and welfare of our Nation cannot be comprehended easily. Proper utilization of the Bureau of Fire Safety and the Fire Research Center, along with a sustained commitment by local officials and other concerned citizens, could lead to a decrease in the massive annual fire losses sustained by the United States. As the Commission on Fire Prevention and Control noted, such a commitment could reduce fire losses by 5 percent a year and cut the Nation's fire toll in half within 14 years.

The Fire Prevention and Control Act clearly is important, lifesaving legislation that must be written into law.

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, the incredibly high rate of death, injury and property loss caused by fire in this country demands meaningful Federal action

to assist in the control and prevention of fire. Twelve thousand Americans die each year from fire, and several hundred thousand are injured and maimed. Property losses are estimated to exceed \$2 billion every year, and overall losses from fires including fire department operations, burn injury treatment, insurance costs and productivity losses come close to \$12 billion annually. Despite technological advances in other areas, firefighting knowledge and technique have not kept pace, and often out-dated equipment must be employed in fighting huge high-rise conflagrations which may spew forth lethal fumes more deadly than the flames themselves.

Until recently there has been a general lack of Federal involvement in meeting the demands the constant threat fire imposes upon us. In 1968 the Fire Research and Safety Act provided for a comprehensive fire research program at the National Bureau of Standards and set up a National Commission on Fire Protection and Control to study fire problems. Their report to Congress, "America Burning," was submitted in 1973 and it included over 90 recommendations including the need to develop more effective control and prevention techniques, increase public awareness and concern for the seriousness of the threat of fire, establish a central data center on fire prevention and control methods, and provide financial support for both research into how best to control fire and training and education for firefighters across the country.

The Commission's report coupled with several extremely destructive conflagrations in this country has enhanced general public concern for the need for fire control and prevention legislation, and I was pleased to join in cosponsoring a package of legislation designed to meet these needs during both the 92d and 93d Congresses. Hearings were held in 1972 and 1973, and H.R. 11989 which was brought out of the House Science and Astronautics Committee on February 7, 1974, encompasses many of the recommendations made by the Commission's report and individual legislative proposals. I urge House passage of this legislation.

The major thrust of this proposal is fire loss prevention and the reduction of indirect fire costs such as the costs of operating fire departments by providing for better management techniques. To do this, H.R. 11989 calls for the establishment of the National Bureau of Fire Safety within the Department of Commerce to set policies and act as a spearhead for a national effort to improve fire prevention and control. During fiscal year 1975 \$2 million is authorized for the Bureau to promote public education aimed at the young and elderly in particular through our schools, teacher training and the media; develop new firefighting equipment and techniques meeting certain specifications and standards; and establish a fire data system to make available to fire departments across the country statistical, practical, and technical information to assist them in their job of firefighting.

Within the Bureau of Fire Safety will

be established a U.S. Fire Academy to run education programs in fire-related subjects and administer training grants to students and schools offering relevant courses. Courses will not only be offered at the Academy but also through local programs and via correspondence, thus making this training available to more firefighters. Support will also be given academy-approved courses at colleges and universities, and efforts will be made to encourage schools in related areas, such as architecture, to establish courses in fire safety as well. And of particular help to many local fire companies are provisions calling for the reimbursement of firefighting costs of fires fought on Federal property.

A Fire Research Center in the Commerce Department is established to carry on the National Bureau of Standards fire program. The Center will head up basic and applied research on all aspects of fire including the effects of fire on humans and the motivation of arsonists, and promote incorporation of their findings into relevant building, fire and other codes.

To assist victims of fires, the National Institutes of Health will establish a program to improve treatment and rehabilitation of burn victims. Hospital burn centers, burn units, and burn programs will be set up nationwide and provide training and support for specialists to work in these facilities.

To promote purchase and installation of fire safety equipment in nursing homes, H.R. 11989 authorizes the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide loan insurance to nursing homes. The threat of fire is particularly severe in nursing homes because many residents are unable to flee in that event. Equipment such as sprinkler systems are necessary to comply with the Life Safety Code of the National Fire Protection Association, and the availability of such loans should lead to greater protection from fire for the residents of nursing homes.

While H.R. 11989 does not provide as much direct assistance to local fire companies as they may need, I believe it is an important step in promoting awareness and concern for the problems fire can cause, and the development of new techniques for fire fighting. I urge my colleagues to lend their support to this effort.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, fire prevention and control is something which we in America all too often take for granted until it is too late—until a fire has damaged or destroyed a home or business, until it has taken the life of someone dear to us. Fires in our country are no small problem. More than three and a half million fires occur each year in the United States, killing an average of 12,000 people a year, and injuring 300,000 more. Direct and indirect costs resulting from these fires run more than \$11 billion yearly.

The Fire Prevention and Control Act before the House today will help place more emphasis on prevention and enable financially strapped local municipalities to train their firefighting personnel more thoroughly. It will establish a

new National Bureau of Fire Safety to coordinate these programs.

Adequate training in fire control and prevention will be especially important to the many volunteer fire departments across the country, and in my own district in Maryland, which is almost entirely rural. The men who serve in these volunteer departments do so at considerable risk. Many of these firefighters are injured each year in the line of duty. Often, they are inadequately equipped because of severely limited local budgets, and their training is necessarily limited for the same reason.

The bill before us today will be of real import to these men, who will now have the opportunity to receive thorough, advanced training in firefighting. A new U.S. Fire Academy, to be established within the new Bureau of Fire Safety, will design and conduct courses in all aspects of firefighting, and will offer correspondence courses, workshops, seminars and conferences. The Academy will be able to provide stipends to students of up to 75 percent of tuition costs at the Academy or other approved educational institutions with similar courses, such as the University of Maryland, which has pioneered in training fire fighters.

Needless to say, once this program has had a chance to train and equip many of America's firefighters, we will all be able to rest a little easier. For those in rural areas who are not served by full-time professional fire departments as in larger cities, the change will be especially important.

Finally, the new Bureau will engage in the development, testing and evaluation of new methods of firefighting and new equipment, and will conduct research on ways to construct buildings in order to minimize or eliminate the chance of fire. Over the long run, efforts at prevention will offer the most promise of reducing the occurrence of fires and saving lives.

At the very least then, we should enact this legislation in order to provide the sort of support for those brave men who risk their lives daily fighting fires, both by better equipping them for their jobs with training and machinery, and by stimulating efforts at fire prevention so that they will have to risk their lives less often. For many small communities in Maryland's first district, it is the only chance we have.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

For too long our country has reacted indifferently to the problems associated with fire and fire safety. Fire, however, is an awesome killer claiming 12,000 American lives per year. Every minute there is a fire in an American home, and every day approximately 170 Americans are killed or left permanently disfigured by fire. The 1971 fire loss data reports property loss as a result of fire costing \$2,743.46 million. Too many people have died or been injured by fire in this country, and the social and economic losses have been an unnecessary burden on the American taxpayer.

It has become increasingly evident in

greater Federal assistance in reducing fire losses by supplementing State and local fire authorities with programs of research, development, training, and education. The measure before us today focuses the role of the Federal Government on the problems of fire safety and control while maintaining the integrity of the local and State responsibility to this problem.

H.R. 11939 authorizes the establishment of a National Bureau of Fire Safety within the Department of Commerce to undertake a program of public education in fire safety and prevention, to develop, test, and evaluate fire equipment, and to analyze and disseminate fire information. There is also to be established a U.S. Fire Academy for the training and education of fire service, fire safety, and civil defense personnel.

A Fire Research Center within the Commerce Department is also to be established, the main purpose of which is the performing of basic and applied research on all aspects of fire prevention. Such work has the greatest potential for reducing future fire losses. An expanded program of research on burns, the treatment of burn injuries, and the rehabilitation of burn victims within the National Institutes of Health would also be authorized by this measure.

The Fire prevention and Control Act of 1974 also contains provisions that would assure Federal moneys and research in the areas of specialized fires, including forest fires and brush fires. In an average year in the United States, forest fires start in 125,000 places, burn 5 million acres, consume 113 million tons of wood, put out 165 cubic miles of smoke, emit 364,000 tons of smog-producing hydrocarbons, burn 25 Americans to death and injure 1,350 more. Expenditures for forest fire control activities average about \$316 million per year, and a single large fire may cost as much as \$10 million to suppress. In my own home district of southern California in the 1970 fire season, more than half a million acres were burned, killing 8 people and destroying 1,000 buildings.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues would join me by giving their unanimous support to this legislation. The Federal Government must commit itself today to fire safety, prevention, and control, for tomorrow may be too late.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, I believe this to be a vital piece of legislation in reversing the alarming trend of death and property loss from fire in this country. When the Congress established the National Commission of Fire Protection and Control in 1968, it anticipated the need for a national focus on the problem—to provide coordination and direction for the diverse firefighting efforts of our local communities. And H.R. 11989, in answer to the recommendations of the Commission, provides just that.

Recognizing that fire prevention and control must remain a local responsibility, this bill establishes a national program of improved training, educa-

tion and research which will augment existing local programs, not supplant them.

Federal efforts in this area will center in a National Bureau of Fire Safety within the Department of Commerce. Operating under the Fire Bureau will be a fire academy offering new educational opportunities in firefighting techniques and management through in-resident and correspondence courses. The goal here is a more uniform standard of training. Academy approved courses will be offered at colleges and universities throughout the country with enrollment encouraged with a student grant and loan program.

Professionalism and a nontraditional approach to the problems of fighting fires, and perhaps just as important, to the management and personnel problems of the fire department, is emphasized.

Setting a standard for firefighting equipment, through a testing and evaluation program, an area the Commission found particularly lacking, will also be a function of the Fire Bureau.

The Commission also found that important areas of research have been neglected. This bill authorizes the establishment of a Fire Research Center to conduct research on the phenomenon of fire on humans. The bill emphasizes relevance to real fire problems in the Center's research efforts, to get away from the compilation of a lot of inapplicable facts and figures.

The bill attacks the fire loss problem on many fronts—treatment and rehabilitation programs for burn victims will be expanded, loans to nursing homes for fire safety equipment are authorized and a public education program of much greater scope is instigated—but the dominant theme here is prevention. We have come a long way in sophisticated techniques for fighting fires but a large scale, concerted effort to prevent fire losses has been too long neglected.

Mr. Chairman, one need only take note of the sheer number of fire-related bills—more than 80, I believe—my colleagues and I have introduced in the first session of this Congress to realize how eminent is the need for Federal action. The statistics speak for themselves. We cannot afford to hesitate in approving this legislation.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and would like to commend the Science and Astronautics Committee for reporting this measure out favorably for consideration by the whole House. As co-sponsor of a similar bill, I feel very strongly that the House of Representatives should give its very strong support and an overwhelming vote of approval to the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

I am particularly pleased with the section of the legislation that would lead to the establishment of a U.S. Fire Academy. This school in the techniques of fire prevention and firefighting will go a long way toward assisting local fire departments, especially volunteer units, to improve their skills in order to save lives and prevent needless property damage.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the bill.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, firefighters are often viewed as glamorous figures, forever dashing off to perform feats of courage and acts of mercy. What is frequently given less thought are the consequences of the heroic acts of the approximately 200,000 paid firefighters and 2 million volunteers who man the 20,000 fire departments in the United States.

Each one of these firefighters is exposed to unusual occupational hazards each hour they are on duty. And, because an injured firefighter cannot function effectively, the entire country shares in the resulting losses due to deaths, personal injuries, and widespread property damage.

Injury rates for firefighters are two to three times the national average for the manufacturing industries. And the injury frequency rates for volunteer departments are two to three times higher than those of paid departments.

Like the injury frequency rate, the injury severity rate is higher for firefighters than the average for all manufacturing industries. The figure, in fact, is 3,936 for firefighters, compared with 702 for industries.

In addition, volunteer firefighters receive more serious injuries than their paid counterparts: 10,308 against 2,651 disability days per million employee-hours. When we consider these statistics it becomes clear that firefighting is one of our most hazardous occupations.

One way to help reduce injuries to firefighters and, in turn, reduce national fire losses would be to improve the equipment these men use. The National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control states in its final report, "America Burning":

Of the fire chiefs and firefighters who responded to our nationwide survey early in 1972, more than seven out of ten said there is a need for greater innovation to improve the equipment and protective clothing they use every day.

The Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974, H.R. 11989, responds to this need for development, testing and evaluation of firefighting equipment. It calls for a federally funded research program to provide technological expertise in innovation and the means to aggregate a market for new products. Such an equipment program offers a clear opportunity to upgrade the safety and effectiveness of the firefighter.

Further justification for such a program lies in the fact that there are barriers to developing innovative firefighting equipment. Manufacturers are reluctant to invest in research and development programs to produce new equipment which a fragmented market may reject. Traditionally, low levels of funding may discourage fire departments, especially volunteer departments, from purchasing new or untried equipment.

Viewed in the context of the enormous potential for having a favorable impact on reducing fire losses, this lack of technological innovation is especially disconcerting in today's world. For example, a typical breathing apparatus weighs

approximately 30 pounds and carries 30 minutes' air supply. The weight of the device and other factors may lead to overexertion and a corresponding decrease in the length of air supply. In addition, some face masks leak, subjecting the firefighter to smoke, toxic gases, and superheated air.

The firefighter is also subject to blows from falling objects, mishandled equipment, and so forth. However, "turnout" coats offer little impact protection, although impact injuries to the trunk of the body occur 26 times as often as burn injuries to the trunk, according to a Bureau of Labor Statistics study.

Many fire helmets—the only piece of equipment designed especially for impact protection—fail to meet the common standard requiring resistance to an impact test. The test requirement is lenient compared to the standards of some other countries. The requirement in Great Britain is three times as high. Also, some hard plastic helmets soften and deform when subjected to heat. And metal helmets, while offering some impact protection, conduct heat.

It is clear, then, from the foregoing statistics and examples that priority attention must be given to developing, testing, and evaluating the effectiveness and the safety of firefighting equipment. H.R. 11989 recognizes the importance of this effort and proposes a coordinated and aggressive program to reduce the suffering and loss of life and property due to fire. Mr. Chairman, I support this bill and urge its adoption.

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Chairman, while serving as a member and acting director of the Board of Public Safety in Indianapolis, I worked closely with both the city and volunteer firemen and learned first hand about the evident need for improvement in all areas of fire prevention and control. Therefore, shortly after I became a Member of Congress last year I was glad to join in cosponsoring the bill, H.R. 5589, which was, in fact, the forerunner of the legislation we are considering today.

Losses from fires have reached very high levels in the United States. Each year more than 12,000 persons lose their lives as a direct result of fires and many tens of thousands are injured and maimed. The losses in property are equally large, and are estimated to exceed \$2 billion each year. Last year 13 lives were lost in Indianapolis as a direct result of fires and property damage was approximately \$9.6 million. In one major fire in the downtown business district property damage was about \$8.3 million.

While I feel strongly that the prevention and control of fires is and must remain the responsibility of local authorities, it seems to me the Federal Government must make a contribution in certain fields where only a national effort can provide the needed initiative and effort. This bill is aimed at filling that need.

Another provision in the bill is to establish a U.S. Fire Academy, which will supplement and improve the present system for training firefighters and fill the gaps where there is no activity. To

accomplish this, the Academy will have three separate activities. There will be courses of study given at the Academy facilities; there will be correspondence courses offered by the Academy; and there will be assistance to existing and new local programs. The Fire Academy concept is based on the highly successful national FBI Academy.

While a research effort has been underway for several years in the National Bureau of Standards the provisions of H.R. 11989 will increase the areas to be explored to include research on standardization of equipment, the effects of smoke inhalation and burns on the body, the behavior of fires involving high rise buildings, fire hazards arising from the transportation of combustible material, improved methods of providing first aid to victims of fires, and others. In my judgment, antiquated techniques and lack of an efficient mechanism for transmitting new advances down to the local fire station are responsible in part for the deaths of nearly 200 firemen a year and other deaths, injuries, and property losses. Hopefully, the passage of H.R. 11989 will provide the improvement we seek.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 11989, the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

There is no one here today who has not known either first or secondhand the terrible disaster that is caused by fires each day in this Nation. But the tragedy of fire is not an unpreventable natural disaster. It is not like the tornado dropping from the sky virtually without warning and entirely out of human control. It is not like the rockslide caused by unknown forces beyond man's control. Rather, the phenomenon of fire is one that can be controlled to a very great degree by what we know today.

No one can question that fire is a national problem. Second only to motor vehicle accidents as a cause of accidental death, fire claims 12,000 lives each year while inflicting unnecessary injuries on 300,000 more. Fires in this country inflict over \$11.4 billion a year in damage, not including the costs of lost employment, irretrievably lost businesses, and the toll it takes in irreplaceable personal pride and memories.

The United States reports by far the world's highest rate of deaths-per-million-population and economic loss per capita. But the tragedy is that these distressing statistics need not be so high. The fact is that the technology to prevent and fight most fires is available to us today. The technological know-how to prevent and fight many other fires is on the horizon. That is why I rise here today to support vigorously H.R. 11989.

The first area addressed by this proposed legislation is fire safety. Under title I, a National Bureau of Fire Safety would be set up for the purpose of improving the tools, instruments, and means of firefighting. This effort would be designed to reduce the hazards to individual people as well as to firefighting personnel once fire has broken out.

As a part of the National Bureau of Fire Safety, this bill would establish a U.S. Fire Academy. This Academy, rec-

ognizing the lamentable fact that many firefighters have not had the opportunity to receive the most complete, up to date, and technologically advanced training, would conduct courses in all levels and areas of firefighting procedure. It is reasonable to expect that this measure will reduce the personal dangers while increasing the effectiveness in this, the most dangerous of professions.

Today's modern, high-rise buildings, the most obvious examples of our advanced technological ability, are filled with volatile synthetic materials. These buildings and many of our modern homes, which are claimed to be "fire-safe," have the potential to turn into giant, smokey kilns of heat and flame when but a few errant sparks find their way to these flammable surfaces. From time to time in the news, we are filled with the horror of such infernos unexpectedly ignited.

Title II of H.R. 11989 would establish a Fire Research Center in the Department of Commerce. This Research Center would investigate all aspects of fire, particularly its chemical causes and the physical properties of its development. The Center would also investigate the biological, psychological, and physiological effects of fire on victims and firefighters. Therefore, I support this measure as a significant step toward learning how to prevent and to deal with fire and its causes and effects. This measure will enable us to help our fire-related technology to catch up with the sophistication of our new man-made environments.

Then there are the tragic victims of fire. Men, women, and children accidentally burned in but a few moments of time with the result that they will never again be able to function normally; men, women, and children severely injured or crippled by the toxic gases accidentally inhaled from burning synthetic materials. For these unfortunate victims, this bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish an expanded research program on burns, treatment, and rehabilitation in the National Institutes of Health. We must do all we can to help these people victimized by fires we did not prevent.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to change our priorities in the field of fire prevention and extinguishing. Today, only 5 percent of our dollars directed toward fire services goes toward fire prevention. H.R. 11989 is not a cure-all; it is but one step in an effort to put an end to these terrible tragedies caused by fire.

Mr. Chairman, last week we passed by an overwhelming vote the Public Safety Officers Benefits Act of 1974. That bill, when it becomes public law, will provide survivors' benefits for the dependents of firefighters killed in the line of duty. That law will be the first step in improving the terms and conditions of employment, and contribute to the overall effectiveness of our fire departments. H.R. 11989 is an important second step, which I urge my colleagues to take by voting in favor of it.

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the important bill pending be-

fore us, H.R. 11989, the proposed Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974.

This bill would enhance the public health and safety of all of us by reducing the human economic losses which result from fires.

The enactment of this bill is of vital importance to the thousands of courageous full-time and volunteer firefighters in our country whose lives and expertise or services whose members give more of themselves—yet unfortunately receive less credit and recognition for it—than our firemen. Every time that bell goes off in the enginehouse or the general alarm sounds out across the town and countryside, these men, these firemen, put their lives on the line—to protect the lives and property of others.

This bill has broad coverage. The committee, its leadership, and Mr. STEELE are to be commended for providing it. For purposes of the bill before us, the term "fire department" means—and the terms "fire prevention," "fire fighting," and "fire control" relate to activities conducted by—any organization consisting of personnel, apparatus, and equipment under the direction of a chief officer for the principal purpose of protecting property and maintaining the public's safety and welfare from the inherent dangers of fire. The personnel of any such organization may be salaried, volunteer, or a combination thereof. The location of the organization and its responsibility for extinguishment and suppression of fire shall include—but not be limited to—a city, town, borough, parish, county, fire district, fire protection district, or rural fire district. I think, Mr. Chairman, this covers everyone, as it should.

Voluntary service is one of the great traditions of our Republic. It arises from the cornerstone which is the ageless principle that men and women can act unselfishly from altruistic motives and that inward motivation toward self-satisfaction can be as strong a motivation as financial remuneration.

We have, in this country of ours, a great fulltime corps of firemen, and we have an equally outstanding corps of volunteer firemen. Each unit of government must determine for itself whether it wants a full-time fire department or a volunteer service. That is certainly no place for the Federal Government to interject its opinions. But, whatever that local decision, there is a role for the Federal Government. That role has been well reflected in the bill before us.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS ACT

H.R. 11989 would enhance the national effort to more effectively control the occurrence of fires, thereby reducing their threat to life, limb, and property, and the inevitable scars associated with them and their terrible aftermaths.

This measure would, specifically—

Create a National Bureau of Fire Safety and a Fire Research Center within the U.S. Department of Commerce;

Authorize an improved treatment program to be conducted by the National Institutes of Health;

Authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to extend loan

insurance to nursing homes for fire prevention equipment; and

Provide reimbursement for local firefighting efforts on Federal property.

All of this is needed, for each year an estimated 3.6 million fires occur nationwide, killing 12,000 people and causing injury to an additional 300,000. Estimated annual losses due to fires in the United States total \$11,400 billion.

And, nearly 800 firemen died in the line of duty during the past 10 years.

How does this bill deal with these problems?

Title I of the bill establishes within the Department of Commerce a National Bureau of Fire Safety, within which will be established a U.S. Fire Academy. The academy will conduct courses in all aspects of firefighting and provide teacher training for its enrollees—mostly fire service personnel—at fees set by the superintendent of the academy. In addition, it will develop and run correspondence courses, workshops, seminars, and conferences, encourage fire programs offered by State, local, and private organizations and institutions; and, promote fire prevention education among architects and builders.

These benefits will be available to full-time and volunteer departments.

The superintendent of the academy will be authorized to provide stipends covering up to 75 percent of tuition costs for students attending the academy or academy-approved courses at other universities or colleges, as well as providing scholarships to fire-engineering students. The superintendent may also provide institutional assistance of up to \$2,500 annually per student enrolled in approved fire research and engineering programs.

One of the first bills I introduced at the beginning of this 93d Congress was H.R. 4094, a bill to provide for the creation of the National Fire Academy. The concept contained within that bill has been incorporated within the provisions of the bill pending before us.

THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH EMBODIED IN THIS BILL IS NECESSARY

I wish to take this opportunity to call to the attention of all my colleagues what I believe to be the principal merit of this bill: The use of a comprehensive approach to the problems of fire prevention, firefighting, fire damage reduction, and rehabilitation—of both property and lives.

When H.R. 4094, to provide for the creation of the National Fire Academy, was introduced on February 7, 1973, it was as part of a comprehensive legislative package designed to attack this problem. In addition to that bill, I cosponsored the following measures:

H.R. 4095, a bill to provide the Secretary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to States, counties, and local communities to pay for up to one-half of the costs of training programs for firemen. This proposal has been incorporated in large measure and at a higher percentage rate as authority given to the superintendent of the academy in the bill before us.

H.R. 4096, a bill to provide the Secre-

tary of Commerce with the authority to make grants to accredited institutions of higher education to pay for up to one-half of the costs of fire science programs. This proposal is also in slightly amended form incorporated in the bill now pending.

H.R. 4097, a bill to provide financial aid to local fire departments in the purchase of advanced firefighting equipment and, H.R. 4098, a bill to provide financial aid for local fire departments in the purchase of firefighting suits and self-contained breathing apparatuses. No aid to departments is provided for as to these two categories in the bill before us, but greatly enhanced research funding as to fire techniques and equipment is provided for in the bill.

H.R. 4099, a bill to extend for 3 fiscal years—through June 30, 1976—the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to carry out fire research and safety programs, an assurance which we now have;

H.R. 4100, a bill to establish a National Fire Data and Information Bureau of Standards—a proposal which will now be administered through the Fire Research Center within that Bureau, as that center is authorized by the pending bill.

MUCH TO BE DONE REMAINS

Mr. Chairman, we take great strides today, but there is much which remains to be done. When I talk to men like Thomas Owczarczak, the chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Western New York Volunteer Firemen's Association, or Patrick Mangan, Jr., the president of firefighters Local 282 in Buffalo, or Ronald D. Feuerstein of the Lancaster Volunteer Fire Department, or Kenneth Hoertz of the Elma Volunteer Fire Co. and others I know how much more we have to do to help them in their valiant efforts.

We must move toward the enactment of those specific measures which were part of the comprehensive package which are not a part of the bill before us.

We must move to insure, even more strongly, all our firemen—full-time or volunteer—that we will stand behind them.

I am committed to that undertaking. The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Clerk will now read the bill by titles.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 11989

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

- (1) The United States today has the highest per capita rate of death and property loss from fire of all the major industrialized nations in the world;
- (2) the losses of life and property resulting from fire which are now being experienced in the United States are entirely unacceptable;
- (3) while fire prevention and control is and should remain a State and local responsibility, the Federal Government can be of invaluable assistance in attaining significant reduction in fire losses;
- (4) the firefighting and civil defense pro-

grams in each locality can both benefit from closer cooperation;

(5) there is a need for professional training and education primarily oriented toward improving the effectiveness of fire departments, developing leadership for fire prevention, and reducing firefighter injuries;

(6) the state-of-the-art in fighting and in protecting persons and property from combustion hazards, requires additional research and development in the area of fire safety;

(7) there is a need for a national fire data collection, analysis, and dissemination system to establish priorities for research and action;

(8) the number of specialized medical centers for the treatment of burns which are properly equipped and staffed to save lives and rehabilitate the victims of fires is severely limited in the United States;

(9) the Federal Government's role in fire research and development, information collection and dissemination, and education needs to be further strengthened in order that the effectiveness of the Nation's dedicated firefighting forces may be increased.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is therefore and hereby declared that the policy of the United States shall be to—

(1) reduce the Nation's losses caused by fires from starting and by improving the efforts and means for suppressing fires;

(2) supplement rather than supplant existing programs of research, training, and education, and to encourage new and improved programs and activities by State and local governments;

(3) place the responsibility for the Federal share of this fire reduction effort on the Secretary of Commerce of the United States;

(4) encourage increasing cooperation between the Nation's firefighting and civil defense forces at all levels;

(5) carry out an enhanced public education effort aimed at improving the understanding by every citizen of the methods and techniques for fire prevention, fire rescue, and firefighting;

(6) develop and provide for the widest possible use of new approaches, techniques, and improvements in fire prevention and control;

(7) establish a United States Fire Academy to provide training and education beyond the basic training level;

(8) establish an integrated and comprehensive fire data system; and

(9) direct the National Institutes of Health to conduct an intensified program of research into the treatment of burn and smoke injuries and the rehabilitation of victims of fires.

TITLE I

NATIONAL BUREAU OF FIRE SAFETY

SEC. 101. There is hereby established within the Department of Commerce a National Bureau of Fire Safety, hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau".

SEC. 102. The Bureau shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall serve subject to the provisions of section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 103. (a) It shall be the function of the Bureau, under the general direction of the Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary", and in cooperation and coordination with State and local governments and the private sector, to improve the Nation's efforts in fire prevention and control through public education, advanced technology, training, and education, improved statistics, and other relevant efforts.

(b) The Director shall insure that results and advances arising from the work of the Bureau are disseminated and shall encourage their use, where applicable, to further fire safety activities and to improve the effectiveness of firefighting and prevention activities.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

SEC. 104. The Director shall undertake, in collaboration with existing public and private organizations, including Civil Defense organizations, a continuing and extensive program of public education in fire prevention and fire safety which shall include specialized information aimed at those particularly vulnerable to fire hazards such as the young and the elderly, and shall sponsor and encourage research into new methods of public education in fire prevention.

FIRE TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 105. (a) The Director shall conduct a program of continuing development, testing, and evaluation of equipment for use by the Nation's fire, rescue, and civil defense services with the aim of making available improved suppression, protective, auxiliary, and warning devices incorporating the latest technology. In the conduct of this program, the standardization, compatibility, and interchangeability of fire equipment shall be given strong attention. Such development, testing, and evaluation activities shall include—

(1) safer, less cumbersome articles of protective clothing including helmets, boots, and coats;

(2) breathing apparatus with the necessary duration of service, reliability, low weight, and ease of operation for practical use;

(3) safe and reliable auxiliary equipment for use in firefighting such as fire location detectors, visual and audio communications equipment, and new types of mobile equipment;

(4) special clothing and equipment needed for brush and forest fires, oil and gasoline fires, and other special firefighting situations;

(5) fire detectors for residential use having high sensitivity and reliability and low cost and maintenance to insure wide acceptance and use;

(6) in-place fire prevention systems of increased reliability and effectiveness;

(7) methods of testing fire alarms and fire protection devices and systems on a non-interference basis;

(8) the development of purchase specifications, standards, and acceptance and validation test procedures for all such equipment and devices;

(9) operation tests, demonstration projects, and fire investigations in support of the activities set forth in this section;

(10) such other development, testing, and evaluation activities deemed necessary to accomplishing the purposes of this section.

(b) The Director shall not engage in the manufacture or sale of any such equipment or device except as may be necessary to develop, test, and evaluate it.

(c) The Director shall perform studies of the operations and management aspects of fire departments and services using quantitative techniques including operations research, management economics, cost effectiveness studies, and such other techniques as are found applicable and useful. Such studies shall include, but not be limited to, the optimum location of fire stations, the manner of responding to alarms, the operation of citywide and regional fire dispatch centers, the effectiveness, frequency, and methods of building inspections, and firefighting under conditions of civil disturbance. In the conduct and support of such studies, the Director is authorized to perform operational tests, demonstration projects, and fire investigations.

(d) The Director shall conduct research on problems concerning productivity measurement of fire department personnel, analysis of job categories and skills required under varying conditions, reduction of injuries to fire service personnel, the most effective fire prevention efforts by fire service personnel.

(e) In conducting the program under this

section, the Director shall take full advantage of the applicable technological developments which have been made in other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, in State and local governments, and in business and industry.

FIRE DATA

SEC. 106. (a) The Director shall operate directly or through contracts an integrated, comprehensive national fire data program based on the collection, analysis, publication, and dissemination of fire information related to the prevention, occurrence, control, and results of fires of all types. The program shall be designed to provide an accurate national picture of the fire problem, identify major problem areas and assist in setting priorities, determine possible solutions to problems, and monitor progress of programs to reduce fire losses. To carry out these functions, the program shall include—

(1) information on the frequency, causes, spread, and extinguishment of fires;

(2) information on the number of injuries and deaths resulting from fires including the maximum available information on the specific causes and nature of such injuries and deaths, and information on property losses;

(3) information on the occupational hazards of firemen including the causes of death and injury to firemen arising directly and indirectly from firefighting activities;

(4) information on all types of fire prevention activities including inspection practices;

(5) technical information related to building construction, fire properties of materials, and other similar information;

(6) information on fire prevention and control laws, systems, methods, techniques, and administrative structures used in foreign nations;

(7) information on the causes, behavior, and best method of control of other types of fires, including, but not limited to, forest fires, brush fires, fires underground, oil blow-out fires, and waterborne fires; and

(8) such other information and data as is judged useful and applicable.

(b) In the conduct of the comprehensive fire data and information program the Director is authorized to develop standardized data reporting methods and to encourage and assist State, local, and other agencies, public and private, in developing and reporting information.

(c) In the conduct of the comprehensive fire data and information program the Director is authorized to make full use of existing data gathering and analysis organizations, both public and private.

(d) The Director shall insure dissemination of such fire data to the maximum extent, and shall make the data available in appropriate form to Federal agencies, State and local governments, private organizations, industry, and business, and other interested persons.

FIRE TRAINING AND EDUCATION

SEC. 107. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Commerce, as part of the Bureau, a United States Fire Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") which shall have the mission of advancing the professional development of fire service personnel, civil defense personnel, and related safety personnel.

(b) The Academy shall be headed by a Superintendent who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall be responsible to the Director of the Bureau.

(c) The Academy shall consist of such buildings and facilities and have such teaching staff and other personnel as the Superintendent determines to be necessary or appropriate for purposes of this section. The Superintendent shall have authority to enter into such contracts and take such other actions as may be necessary in carrying out the preceding sentence.

SEC. 108. The Academy shall be located on

such site or sites as the Secretary selects subject to the following provisions:

(a) The Secretary is authorized to appoint a Site Selection Board consisting of the Academy Superintendent and two other members to survey the most suitable sites for the location of the Academy and make recommendations to the Secretary.

(b) The Site Selection Board and the Secretary, in making their recommendations and final selection, shall give consideration to the training and facility needs of the Academy, the accessibility and travel distance to the site from all parts of the country, environmental effects, the possibility of using a surplus Government facility, and such other factors as are deemed important and relevant.

SEC. 109. In furtherance of the mission of the Academy, the Superintendent is authorized to—

(a) conduct courses and programs of training and education in—

(1) the techniques of fire prevention, fire inspection, firefighting, and fire and arson investigation for members of the firefighting forces of the Nation;

(2) the tactics and command of firefighting for present and future fire chiefs and commanders of subordinate fire units;

(3) the administration and management of fire departments and fire services;

(4) such other subjects including civil defense related subjects and fields of study as are deemed necessary or desirable; and

(5) the training of present and future instructors in all of the above subjects;

(b) develop and administer a program of correspondence courses to advance the knowledge and skills of fire service personnel;

(c) encourage new and existing programs of education and training by local fire units and departments, State and local governments, and private institutions by supplementing and supporting—

(1) vocational training in the techniques of fire prevention, fire inspection, firefighting, and fire and arson investigations;

(2) the establishment of fire training courses and programs at junior colleges; and

(3) the support and encouragement of the number of four-year degree programs in fire engineering at colleges and universities found necessary by the Superintendent to provide an adequate number of graduates;

(d) provide stipends to students attending courses and programs approved by the Academy at universities and colleges in amounts up to 75 per centum of the cost of attendance; and

(e) encourage and assist in the inclusion of fire prevention and detection technology and practices in the education and professional practice of architects, builders, city planners, and others engaged in design and planning affected by fire safety problems.

SEC. 110. The Superintendent shall conduct a continuing study of the needs and contents of the educational and training programs needed at the Academy and elsewhere to educate, train, and maintain the Nation's fire forces. He shall coordinate these studies with appropriate officials of the Civil Defense Staff College.

SEC. 111. The Superintendent shall establish a Committee on Fire Training and Education which shall inquire into and make recommendations regarding the desirability of establishing a mechanism for accreditation of fire training and education programs and courses, and the role which the Academy should play if such programs are recommended. The Committee shall consist of the Superintendent as chairman and eighteen other members appointed by the Superintendent from among individuals and organizations possessing special knowledge and experience in the field of fire training and education or in related fields. The Committee shall submit to the Superintendent for

transmission to the Secretary within one year after its appointment a full and complete report of its findings and recommendations; and upon the submission of such report the Committee shall cease to exist. Each appointed member of the Committee shall be reimbursed for any expenses actually incurred by him in the performance of his duties as such.

SEC. 112. The Superintendent shall admit to the courses and programs of the Academy individuals who are members of the firefighting, rescue, and civil defense forces of the Nation and such other individuals, including candidates for membership in these forces, as he determines can benefit from attendance. Students shall be admitted from any State in the Nation (as defined in section 401) with due regard to the adequate representation in the student body of all geographic sections of the country. In selecting students the Superintendent shall seek nominations and advice from fire departments, civil defense organizations, and other organizations who wish to send students to the Academy.

SEC. 113. The Superintendent may establish fees and other charges for attendance at courses and programs offered by the Academy.

SEC. 114. The Superintendent is authorized to provide stipends to students attending Academy courses and programs in amounts up to 75 per centum of the cost of attendance as established by the Superintendent.

SEC. 115. The Superintendent is authorized to provide scholarships to students attending full time at a fire engineering program of a two-year junior college or the last two years of a four-year engineering program at college or university.

SEC. 116. The Superintendent is authorized to make, or to enter into contracts to make, payments to institutions of higher education for loans, not to exceed \$2,500 per academic year for any individual, to individuals enrolled on a full-time basis in undergraduate or graduate programs in fire research or engineering recognized by the Superintendent. Loans under this paragraph shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Superintendent and each institution involved may jointly determine.

SEC. 117. The Superintendent is authorized to conduct short courses, seminars, workshops, conferences, and similar education and training activities in all parts and localities of the United States.

SEC. 118. The Secretary shall appoint a Board of Visitors to the United States Fire Academy. The function of the Board of Visitors shall be to review annually the program of the Academy and make comments and recommendations to the Secretary regarding the operation of the Academy and any improvements therein which the Board of Visitors deems desirable. The Board of Visitors shall consist of eight individuals designated by the Secretary including persons who are representatives of the fire service community or who otherwise possess special knowledge and experience in fire prevention or fire training or in related fields or who are active in the field of education generally. Of the members first designated three shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for terms of two years, and two for terms of three years. Persons designated thereafter shall serve for terms of three years, except that if a member of the Board of Visitors dies or resigns, a successor shall be designated for the unexpired portion of the term. Each member of the Board shall be reimbursed for any expenses actually incurred by him in the performance of his duties as such.

SEC. 119. (a) Each fire district or department that engages in the fighting of a fire on Federal property may file a report with the Bureau setting forth—

(1) the amount of losses and expenses incurred by such district or department as a result of fighting such fire;

(2) the total cost of operation for such district or department during the year in which the report is filed and during the preceding year; and

(3) the estimated total cost of operation for such district or department during the year following that year in which the report is filed.

(b) Upon receipt of a report filed under subsection (a), the Director shall pay to each such district or department a sum which shall represent the cost to such district or department of fighting such fire, less a pro rata share of the payments in lieu of taxes for fire protection services, if any, for the period between the beginning of the annual payment period until the time of the fire, as determined by the Director.

SEC. 120. For the purposes of this title there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

TITLE II

FIRE RESEARCH CENTER

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Commerce a Fire Research Center (hereinafter referred to as the "Center") which shall have the mission of performing and supporting basic and applied research on all aspects of fire with the aim of providing scientific and technical knowledge applicable to the prevention and reduction of fires.

(b) The Center shall conduct directly or through contracts or grants a program of basic and applied fire research aimed at arriving at an understanding of the fundamental processes underlying all aspects of fire. Such program shall include scientific and field investigations of—

(1) the physics and chemistry of combustion processes;

(2) the dynamics of flame ignition, flame spread, and flame extinguishment;

(3) the composition of combustion products developed by various sources and under various environmental conditions;

(4) the early stages of fires in buildings and other structures, structural subsystems, and structural components and all other types of fires, including, but not limited to forest fires, fires under ground, oil blowout fires, brush fires, and waterborne fires with the aim of improving early detection capability;

(5) the behavior of fire involving all types of buildings and other structures and their contents (including mobile homes and high-rise buildings, construction materials, floor and wall coverings, coatings, furnishings, and other combustible material); and all other types of fires (including forest fires, fires under ground, oil blowout fires, brush fires, and waterborne fires);

(6) the unique aspects of fire hazards arising from the transportation and use in industrial and professional practices of combustible gases, fluids, and materials;

(7) design concepts for providing increased fire safety consistent with habitability, comfort, and human impact, in buildings and other structures; and

(8) such other aspects of the fire process as are deemed useful for pursuing the mission of the fire research program.

(c) The Center shall conduct directly or through contracts or grants research into the biological, physiological, and psychological factors affecting the human victims of fires and the performance of the individual members of fire protection forces. Such research shall include—

(1) the biological and physiological effects of toxic substances encountered in fires;

(2) the trauma, cardiac conditions, and other hazards resulting from exposure to fires;

(3) the development of simple, reliable tests for the determination of the cause of death from fires;

(4) improved methods of providing first aid to the victims of fires;

(5) the psychological and motivational characteristics of persons who engage in arson, and the prediction and cure of such behavior;

(6) the conditions of stress encountered by firefighters, their effects, and their alleviation or reduction;

(7) such other biological, physiological, and psychological effects of fire as may have significant for purposes of this section.

Sec. 202. The Director shall insure that the results and advances arising from the work of the Center are disseminated and encourage the incorporation of these results and advances into the relevant building codes, fire codes, model codes, and other relevant codes, test methods, and standards. The Director is authorized to encourage and assist in the development and adoption of uniform codes, test methods, and standards aimed at reducing fire losses and costs of fire protection.

Sec. 203. For the purposes of this title there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

Sec. 204. Title I of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 (Act of March 1, 1968, 82 Stat. 34; 15 U.S.C. 278f and 278g) is hereby repealed, and sections 201 and 202 of this Act are inserted as sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (15 U.S.C. 278f and 178g).

TITLE III

VICTIMS OF FIRE

Sec. 301. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to establish, within the National Institutes of Health and in cooperation with the Secretary, an expanded program of research on burns, treatment of burn injuries, and rehabilitation of victims of fires. The National Institutes of Health shall—

(1) sponsor and encourage the establishment throughout the Nation of twenty-five additional burn centers, which shall comprise separate hospital facilities providing specialized burn treatment and including research and teaching programs, and twenty-five additional burn units, which shall comprise specialized facilities in general hospitals used only for burn victims;

(2) provide training and continuing support of specialists to staff the new burn centers and burn units;

(3) sponsor and encourage the establishment in general hospitals of ninety burn programs, which comprise staffs of burn injury specialists;

(4) provide special training in emergency care for burn victims;

(5) augment sponsorship of research on burns and burn treatment;

(6) administer and support a systematic program of research concerning smoke inhalation injuries; and

(7) sponsor and support other research and training programs in the treatment and rehabilitation of burn injury victims.

(b) For purposes of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

FIRE PROTECTION ASSISTANCE

Sec. 302. Section 232 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715w) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) The Secretary is authorized upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe to make commitments to insure loans made by financial institutions to nursing homes and intermediate care facilities to provide for the purchase and installation of fire safety equipment necessary for com-

pliance with the 1969 edition of the Life Safety Code of the National Fire Protection Association, as modified in accordance with evaluation by the Secretary of Commerce under the Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 or which are recognized by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as conditions of participation for providers of services under title XVIII and title XIX of the Social Security Act, as modified in accordance with evaluations by the Secretary of Commerce under such Act.

"(2) To be eligible for insurance under this subsection a loan shall—

"(A) have a principal amount not to exceed \$50,000;

"(B) bear interest at a rate not to exceed the rate prescribed by the Secretary;

"(C) have a maturity satisfactory to the Secretary, but not to exceed twelve years from the beginning of the amortization of the loan or three-quarters of the remaining economic life of the structure in which the equipment is to be installed, whichever is less; and

"(D) comply with other such terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, may prescribe.

"(3) The provisions of paragraphs (5), (6), (7), (9), and (10) of section 220(h) shall be applicable to loans insured under this subsection, except that all references to 'home improvement loans' shall be construed to refer to loans under this subsection.

"(4) The provisions of subsections (c), (d), and (h) of section 2 shall apply to loans insured under this subsection, and for the purpose of this subsection references in such subsections to 'this section' or 'this title' shall be construed to refer to this subsection."

TITLE IV

ADMINISTRATIVE AND RELATED PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. For purposes of this Act the terms "State" and "United States" include the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Sec. 402. The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to its activities under this Act for the purpose of audit or to determine whether a proposed activity is in the public interest.

Sec. 403. All property rights with respect to inventions or discoveries made in the course of or under contract with any Government agency pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the basic policies set forth in the President's Statement of Government Patent Policy issued August 23, 1971, or such revisions of that Statement of Policy as may subsequently be promulgated and published in the Federal Register.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 17, after line 13, add the following new subsection to section 119: (c) In each instance where the Director makes pay-

ment under subsection (b), the President shall take such steps as are necessary to insure that the Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over the Federal property where the fire occurred shall reimburse the Director within 30 days for the amount paid to the fire district or department. Such payment shall be credited to the appropriation from which the Director made payment to the fire district or department and shall remain available until expended.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I would have to say that the real author of this amendment is my colleague from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON). It arose out of the fact that a fire of considerable proportions occurred out in St. Louis. I know that every Member of Congress will remember that fire, because so many military records were destroyed in the course of it.

At this time I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) for an explanation regarding this amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman very much for this opportunity and for his steady leadership on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, what the fire at the GSA installation in St. Louis showed us, just as we were preparing this legislation, was that it was quite possible for a major Federal fire to occur in a local fire district. Of course, the local fire district is responsible to put out that fire regardless of what arrangements it might have with the Federal Government for taking care of the bills.

In this particular case, there were no arrangements, and it was a very, very costly fire in terms at least of the local districts involved. I think it cost them about \$26,000 to put it out, 40 different fire districts, hundreds of firefighters, 5,000 gallons of fuel, and 50 million gallons of water.

When that occurred, the committee took a look around the country to see to what extent the Federal Government had installations in States and communities which were protected by local fire districts. There were a great many, and a large part of them without any compensatory arrangements with the Government.

Therefore, we thought it would be only reasonable to include in a bill of this kind provision for Federal reimbursement to the local fire districts through the GSA. Then, it occurred to us that the Federal agency actually operating the structure ought to reimburse the GSA.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know if there are any World War I veterans here with us today, but if there are, I am sorry to have to say that perhaps the records of those individuals were destroyed in that fire. Something like 20 million veterans' records are gone forever, but a great many millions of others were saved by the prompt and sustained efforts of the St. Louis area firefighters.

As it turned out, the sprinkler system that had been so long advocated by our fire chiefs had never been installed; files which were improperly stacked in cardboard cartons in spite of the urgent and repeated requests by local fire officials to put them back where they belonged in

metal containers contributed to the rapid spread of the blaze. That being the case, we decided on the committee that from now on, when there is a Federal fire, there ought to be accountability to the people of the local district, the taxpayers, for putting that fire out. It was this consideration that moved us to include these provisions in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 17, line 16, add at the end of section 120 authorizing appropriations for title I: "and such sums as may be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the situation regarding this language is as follows: The Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology, Dr. Betsy Ancker-Johnson, has already appeared before the Committee on Appropriations and has laid plans for the placing in operation, in a very early stage, the operation of the National Bureau of Fire Safety.

However, any appropriation cannot be used unless there is some authority for using that appropriation. Fiscal year 1974 is almost over, so very little money could be spent between now and the end of this fiscal year. All this amendment does is to authorize the expenditures of such moneys as may be appropriated for fiscal 1974.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is the gentleman taking out the \$2 million in this section and making it open ended?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No, this has nothing to do with the \$2 million.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman is making it open ended; is that right?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Only for 1974, only for fiscal year 1974, which will be over at the end of June.

Mr. GROSS. They could get away with \$10 million if they wanted to from now until the end of June.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think our Committee on Appropriations can be relied on not to give them \$10 million.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know about that, but this does make it open ended as to amount.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. For that length of time, just until the end of June, that is all.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has seen a lot of agencies, bureaus, and departments of Government rush in to commit money before the end of the fiscal year, has he not?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I cannot say that I have. I will say this, that I have never seen the Committee on Appropri-

ations work so promptly as they have this year. I appreciate it, but this is one time they got ahead of us and held the hearings on the appropriation before this bill could be scheduled. But as I say, there is mighty little of fiscal year 1974 left, and we have a reputable and able Committee on Appropriations. I am not worried about anything there.

Mr. GROSS. There are also plenty of bureaucrats who are pretty fast with a dollar too near the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. They cannot vote in this House. They do not serve on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. But they can spend the money, once it is made available. This is what we are talking about.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we need to worry about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 22, at line 3, delete subparagraph (b), lines 3, 4, and 5.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do with the colloquy that was had among the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN), and myself, in which I agreed that their committee would indeed be the proper committee to do the authorizing.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to leave the rest of that title III in as language in order to recognize the need for assistance. This amendment that is being offered deletes the \$2 million.

Mr. Chairman, I will say that the \$2 million was allocated to the NIH, over which our committee has no jurisdiction. But I agreed with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NELSEN) to delete the \$2 million from this bill. That is what this amendment does.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 22 delete lines 6 through 25 and on page 23 delete lines 1 through 22, removing section 302—"Fire Protection Assistance".

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is one of those situations in which our committee properly considered the question of installing sprinkler systems in nursing homes, making the cost of such installations subject to an FHA loan. But it was one of those cases where the right hand did not know what the left hand was doing. The Banking Committee had identically the same bill before it, or worded it so nearly identically as to serve the same purpose. Since it is already the law, we see no point in leaving it in this

bill. Therefore, this simply deletes the section which has already been enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Page 24, after line 7, insert the following new section (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly):

Sec. 402. For purposes of this Act, the term "fire department" means (and the terms "fire prevention," "fire fighting", and "fire control" relate to activities conducted by) any organization consisting of personnel, apparatus, and equipment under the direction of a chief officer for the principal purpose of protecting property and maintaining the public's safety and welfare from the inherent dangers of fire. The personnel of any such organization may be salaried, volunteer, or a combination thereof; and the location of the organization and its responsibility for extinguishment and suppression of fire shall include (but not be limited to) a city, town, borough, parish, county, fire district, fire protection district, or rural fire district.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify the identity of the different agencies that can become involved in the efforts of fire prevention and firefighting.

I will have to give credit for the thought that produced this amendment to my colleague from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE), who worked hard, diligently, and well on this bill. Although he does not serve on our committee, he has been keenly interested in it, and we are indebted to him for his efforts in that regard.

If the gentleman would like to comment on this amendment, I will be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. STEELE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman for those kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I want to rise in support of this amendment.

It is important completely to clarify the fact that this entire bill is directed toward the health of both paid and volunteer fire departments of all kinds throughout the United States.

I support the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be modified by correcting the word "combinatination" to "combination." This is just a typographical error.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Davis of Georgia: On page 24 add a new section 404 to give general contract and grant authority:

Sec. 404. Any of the activities carried out under the provisions of Titles I and II and Sec. 301 of Title III of this Act may be carried out directly or through contracts or grants.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as the amendment plainly states, this simply gives the Fire Bureau the authority to make grants or contracts in pursuance of the function of the Fire Bureau.

Somebody asked me awhile ago why all of this was not done in committee before we go to the floor of the House. I would simply like to say that you just cannot work this fast in a committee.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. How is this working? Are you giving them the money or loaning them the money or what?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes, it works the same way as any other Government agency does.

Mr. GROSS. I was afraid of that, but go ahead.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. They have no authority to make any contract or any grant without this clarifying amendment. But there are many things that need to be done out of house rather than in house. This is true of NASA, it is true of most Government agencies. This simply gives them that authority.

Mr. GROSS. To either do it by contract or by grant?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Those are the words, is that right?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Davis).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, in the first place I wonder how in the world this bill ever got to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. There are no astronautics involved that I know anything about unless it is proposed to put firemen in the air someplace.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The way it happened was that the oversight, or overview of the National Bureau of Standards was given to the Committee on Science and Astronautics several years ago. It is employed almost entirely in matters of technical or scientific nature.

As this bill was originally drawn it was put under the National Bureau of Standards, but it was felt wiser to establish a sister bureau to the National Bureau of Standards so that it would be dealing solely with fire. This came as a result of the recommendations of practically every fire association in this country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the gentleman from Georgia can answer a more mundane question.

This bill provides for the establishment of a fire academy, is that correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It does.

Mr. GROSS. You are going out somewhere—do you know where as yet?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No.

Mr. GROSS. And you are going to build a fire academy?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. Where does the gentleman think it will be built?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It will have to be built in a spot where the population is not dense, because a good part of the training of a fireman is creating a fire, and that creates smoke.

I visited the academy in England. They have a very fine one, one of the finest fire academies in the world over there. That came about as a result of the incendiary bombs that Hitler sent across the channel, which caused so many fires to happen in England. They are miles ahead of us on this.

However, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Iowa that this is a bill not only for establishing a fire academy, but that the bill as a whole is a bill that will save the public money. Here is why—

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows that there is never a rock turned over by Congress that will not save someone some money. I would state to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, that I would rather he not try to sell me on this bill on the basis that it is going to save money for somebody.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield further, let me give the gentleman the reasoning.

The Law Enforcement Act did not save anybody any money, the battle was over whether we would compensate a person for his injuries, or whatever he might have suffered. But in this case, if we can cut down the number of fire losses—

Mr. GROSS. If you do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Which we will do.

Mr. GROSS. If you do.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is what we aim to do—then this will lower the insurance premiums for all citizens affected by it, in every State.

Mr. GROSS. That was to be my next question: What does the gentleman from Georgia anticipate will be the lowering of the insurance rates? Can the gentleman give us any kind of a percentage on the lowering of premiums on fire insurance?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I can only say that if the experience on fire losses drops then the rates will certainly drop.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman seems to be using an "if" about every other word.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, that may be.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that the Bureau of Standards had been investigating this for years, and have we not been spending a good deal of money on the commission that produced the report that resulted in this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The Bureau of Standards has been doing a technical, scientific, laboratory type of job. The job of firefighting is far broader than that. It involves personnel, public rela-

tions, there are many, many things involved in it.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me: Is this academy going to be located in the Midwest, the South, the Northeast, or Northwest, or where?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The bill provides for a site selection committee. I have not the faintest notion of what site will be selected.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to be out of a job pretty soon.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think the gentleman from Iowa would make an excellent firefighter.

Mr. GROSS. At \$150 per diem and transportation, that could keep one occupied; could it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I will entertain the gentleman's resumé.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Georgia does not know where the academy is going to be located?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not.

Mr. GROSS. And we are going to have a National Bureau of Fire Safety to go along with it? In other words, a brand new set of bureaucrats.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is parallel to the National Bureau of Standards.

Mr. GROSS. And we are going to spend what? Set up in this bill, if I read the figures correctly on page 19, is about \$100 million to carry this to fiscal year 1979.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Gross was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is a projection that extends to fiscal year 1979. It is not in the bill.

In this bill we have taken \$2 million out. It was \$7½ million; it is \$5½ million now.

Mr. GROSS. I know you took \$2 million out of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. But that is a projection only.

Mr. GROSS. Where does the gentleman anticipate getting the money to liquidate this obligation of \$100 million in the next few years?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the program is successful, it will earn its way.

Mr. GROSS. But that will not put the money back into the till; will it?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; it would not.

Mr. GROSS. We would have to increase taxes to do that; would we not?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I suppose we would.

Mr. GROSS. We would have to increase taxes to recover the \$100 million and more that will go into this. I cannot conceive that the gentleman is going to build an academy from the ground up and do it within these figures; and I do not think the gentleman thinks that he will get that job done for that money.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I think so.

Mr. GROSS. It would be the first academy ever built and equipped within the figures originally set forth.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The one in England was built at the site of an old, abandoned airfield. We are dotted with those all over the country.

Mr. GROSS. Especially in the South.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. There are also a lot of other military bases in the South that would have to be closed in order to save the money to pay this bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We have a lot of factory-owned land that will not cost much money.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware, is he not, that productivity in this country has gone down 6½ percent?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I know that it went down.

Mr. GROSS. That the prime interest rate is now 11½ percent, and inflation is still running away with the country?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is.

Mr. GROSS. Still the gentleman brings this bill here today to start a brand new academy from the ground up and establish a new bureaucracy. I have not yet heard anyone say how many people this new bureau is going to employ. Has the gentleman any idea of how many payrollers will be required for this new addition to the Federal bureaucracy?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We have not asked for any in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Where are we going to get the money to do all of these things? Tomorrow somebody else will turn over a rock and find that Congress failed to put \$100 million under it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I will say to the gentleman that this is one bill that I did not expect a long sermon on from the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Why did the gentleman from Georgia not expect a sermon on it from the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is the most economical bill that has been before this House in a long time.

Mr. GROSS. Since when is more than \$100 million economical, or to be taken lightly?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. There are only \$5½ million in this bill and 1 year of authority.

Mr. GROSS. Has the gentleman from Georgia looked at page 19 in his report?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is not the bill; that is the projection.

Mr. GROSS. Of the cost. A projection of the cost; is that not correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. That is what the gentleman is proposing by way of obligating the taxpayers 5 years hence?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We are not doing that.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, the gentleman is.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We cannot do that.

Mr. GROSS. Of course the gentleman is, because the report projects authorizations for the next 4 fiscal years.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. This bill has a life of 1 year. The gentleman has got the committee report in his hand, not the bill.

Mr. GROSS. What would the gentleman expect me to read in addition to the bill if not the committee report? Does the gentleman not stand back of his committee report?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly, I do. But I am not saying this bill represents

\$100 million. I do not know whether it will or not.

Mr. GROSS. I am not very good at mathematics but I do not have to be good or even have a sharp pencil to figure at least \$100 million as the ultimate cost. It would be impossible to build an academy and carry out other provisions of legislation for less so let us face facts.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. There is a publication called "America Burning" which has a projected annual U.S. fire cost.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has referred to that in his report. I do not think if he builds an academy in the North, South, East, or West, or all four areas, that he is going to stop fires and I do not think the gentleman thinks so either.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Talking about annual productivity, our annual loss there is \$3.5 billion loss in productivity.

Mr. GROSS. We cannot have very much of a loss in the Nation's productivity and finance projects of this kind, and when productivity goes down 6.5 percent the economy is sharing signs of sickness. Is that not so?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And how then are we going to finance this new bureau and this new academy? No matter how meritorious some of the projects may be, the economy, the finances, and the taxpayers of this country can take only so much abuse. My opposition to this bill is that we simply do not have the millions it will require now and in the immediate future.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLFF

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLFF: on page 13 line 9, subsection (e) of section 109 should be relettered to be subsection (f) and a new subsection (e) inserted to read as follows:

"(e) Provide assistance to state and local fire service training programs through grants, contracts or otherwise; and . . .

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 11989, which is cosponsored by Mr. GILMAN of New York, the Fire Prevention and Control Act.

My amendment is, for all practical purposes, a technical amendment designed to clarify the expressed intent and declaration of policy contained in the bill of which I am a cosponsor.

Section 3 of H.R. 11989 declares it to be the policy of the United States to "supplement rather than supplant existing programs of research and training, and to encourage new and improved local programs of research and training, and to encourage new and improved local programs in these areas." The committee report states that—

The role of the Academy in supplementing the system is to fill the gaps where there is no activity, and to improve existing programs where necessary. To accomplish this, the Academy will have three separate activities: There will be courses of study given at Academy facilities; there will be correspondence courses offered by the Academy; and there will be assistance to existing and new local programs.

It is obviously the intent of H.R. 11989 to provide assistance to State and local fire service training programs; however, the bill contains no section which specifically authorizes grants or contracts to help support State and local training programs. The bill is clearly not intended to create any discrimination against State or locally sponsored and funded training programs, yet it will have this effect if an amendment is not adopted to clarify the intent of the bill.

Therefore, I am offering an amendment which specifically states that the superintendent of the U.S. Fire Academy will be authorized to provide grants or contracts to State and local fire service training programs including volunteer fire organizations which are: National Fire Prevention Association; New York City Fire Department; Nassau County Fire Marshall; Vocational Education and Extension Board of Nassau County; and New York State Office for Local Government.

The amendment recognizes that it is the intent of the bill to take full advantage of State and local training programs that already exist and to help further State and local efforts to step up training in fire prevention and control. I have been advised that there is no objection to this amendment by the chairman or ranking minority member. I urge my colleagues to give it careful consideration.

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

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I previously indicated my strong support for the Fire Prevention Act.

I now rise in support of this clarifying amendment which I am cosponsoring with the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF), which authorizes grants of contracts to help support State and local programs, including voluntary fire training programs.

This amendment has the support of the New York State's Office of Local Government. It will help make this measure even more effective by extending its assistance to our local governmental bodies. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEELE

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEELE: Page 6, line 16, after "oil and gasoline fires," insert the following: "aircraft fires and crash rescue, fires occurring aboard water-borne vessels."

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the committee bill to specifically authorize the Director of the National Bureau of Fire Safety to conduct a continuing program of development, testing, and evaluation of special clothing and equipment needed

to combat aircraft fires, as well as fires on boats and other maritime vessels.

It is a tragic fact that fire has been and still is one of the most dangerous hazards associated with aviation and water transport on our Nation's rivers, lakes, and on the oceans.

One of the most recent tragedies was the Brazilian jetliner crash which took the lives of 122 people. A fire in the rear toilets raced the length of the plane and in seconds engulfed the passengers in a dense and lethal smoke produced by the burning materials and fabrics. The accounts of the disaster aboard the Boeing 707 indicate that attempts to control the fire by use of fire extinguishers proved useless and that even though rescue operations were undertaken immediately, only 12 crewmen in the forward section of the plane survived. This accident near Orly Airport in France was not the first where passengers perished in a postcrash fire after impact.

In my own State of Connecticut, 26 passengers and 2 flight crewmembers died in an aircraft crash and fire at Tweed-New Haven Airport in June 1971. A letter I received from the State's chief medical examiner stated:

The 26 passenger fatalities all died from the effects of the post-crash fire and exhibited second and third degree burns and evidence of smoke inhalation . . .

Further medical examination disclosed that the blood samples from 17 of the passenger fatalities indicated the presence of cyanide. The New Haven crash could have been a survivable crash, since the chief medical examiner's findings suggested the presence of impact trauma in only one of the 26 passengers who died in this tragic air disaster. However, our ability to meet the problem of aircraft fires has been greatly hindered by the failure to develop and utilize advanced technology and advanced fire resistant protective outerwear to enhance passenger rescue operations in postcrash fires.

I think it is important to note that last year Congress passed the Airport Development Acceleration Act of 1973 which raised the Federal participation for funding of firefighting and crash rescue equipment required by the Secretary of Transportation for airport certification from 50 to 82 percent.

It is my belief that if Congress is going to spend more money on airport firefighting and safety equipment, then it is important that we use some of this money to transfer existing advanced technology and to develop and utilize new technology to reduce the airport fire problem.

The new National Bureau of Fire Safety can play a major role in the development of this technology and I believe it is important that the legislation before us today clearly mandates such action.

Mr. Chairman, I have seen first hand the accomplishments that can be made when the Federal Government puts its energies in the task of development of such equipment. Just last September I had the privilege of presenting to the Connecticut State Fire Fighters Association two space age firefighting suits, de-

veloped by NASA at the Houston Space Center, which allow firefighters to work in extremely high temperatures during firefighting and rescue operations involving aircraft.

To illustrate the point further, the Navy and Coast Guard fire technology R. & D. program has developed a plastic helmet easily slipped over a man's head which provides a supply of air for up to 20 minutes. While this light mobile air system was originally designed for use aboard military aircraft carriers, it could easily be transferred into the private sector for use on all maritime vessels.

What is now needed is a firm commitment by the Federal Government to continue and speed up the development of this kind of aircraft and maritime firefighting technology. I believe that my amendment would provide this specific commitment and I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STEELE

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a second amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEELE: Page 12, after line 7, insert the following new paragraph (and redesignate the succeeding paragraphs accordingly):

(4) the tactical training of personnel in the specialized field of aircraft fire control and crash rescue and the field of fires occurring aboard water-borne vessels;

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to the committee bill to specifically authorize the superintendent of the National Fire Academy to conduct courses and programs in the tactical training of personnel in the specialized field of aircraft fire control as well as in the field of fire control aboard ships and other maritime vessels.

It is all too often that we read about passengers and crew members either dying or becoming severely injured as a result of fire occurring aboard aircraft and ships.

It is a sad fact that many of these incidents could have been avoided or lives saved and injuries averted if firefighters had the opportunity for advanced training in aircraft and maritime fire control and emergency rescue.

Under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, the FAA has authority to prescribe minimum standards to be met by airport firefighters and crash rescue organizations. However, lack of a strong national uniform training program aimed at the unique hazards and controls in aircraft postcrash fire situations has hindered the ability of the FAA to mandate and enforce tougher, more comprehensive training standards. In the past, independent development of such training courses might have proved to be too expensive to make this available to most firefighters. But the resources of the new Academy would make possible a low cost development of such special programs.

In addition to the unique hazards confronting fire control personnel in aviation disasters, equally dangerous situations have to be faced when fire develops aboard maritime vessels. This amend-

ment would authorize the academy to conduct courses to train fire control personnel in new techniques and procedures for battling fires or explosions occurring aboard ships. The training program could also offer specialized training to individuals not directly employed in fire control, but whose safety may depend on being able to react to fire situations. This course teaching para-firefighting skills could include dock workers, longshoremen, and vessel and other harbor related personnel.

I believe that it is extremely important that the legislation before us today specifically authorize the superintendent of the academy to conduct programs in the tactical training of personnel in the specialized fields of aircraft and maritime fire control.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Why is this bill being written on the House floor?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Does the gentleman address that question to me?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, to anyone who cares to answer.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. We cannot work this fast in the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I guess that is as good an answer as any, and regardless of the content of the bill the money will be spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. STEELE).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the purpose of defining "Fire Department" and related activities conducted by such organizations. As one who has worked closely with him in this matter, I would like to commend the gentleman for his clarifying amendment.

I believe that we are all aware of the need to have extremely precise legislative language in bills passed by the Congress. Often definitions can be the most important aspect of a piece of legislation. Thus I believe it would be most appropriate—indeed, virtually essential—to include a definition of the term "Fire Department" in the legislation before us today, for such action could forestall unnecessary problems in the future.

While it is true that the committee report accompanying this bill states that the committee intends that the term "Fire Department" wherever it appears in the bill or in this report include fire protection districts or any other recognized firefighting organizations, the amendment before us would clearly express the intent of the committee and the Congress in this regard. Inasmuch as I have long fought to provide adequate assistance to our Nation's volunteer firefighters, as well as our paid firefighters, I am particularly concerned about the need to make it absolutely clear that volunteer fire departments would be eligible to receive the benefits of this legislation. It must be clear from the start that the National Bureau of Fire Safety is responsible for assisting all segments of the national fire service.

Mr. Chairman, I have a quick question I would like to address to the chairman or the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MOSHER) regarding section 115 and section 116 of the bill.

Section 115 gives to the superintendent of the Fire Academy, in the language of the bill, the authority "to provide scholarships to students attending full time at a fire engineering program of a 2-year junior college or the last 2 years of a 4-year engineering program at college or university."

Similarly, section 116 provides:

The Superintendent is authorized to make, or to enter into contracts to make, payments to institutions of higher education for loans, not to exceed \$2,500 per academic year for any individual, to individuals enrolled on a full-time basis in undergraduate or graduate programs in fire research or engineering recognized by the Superintendent.

Am I correct in assuming that the definitions of engineering and research in these two sections are meant to be construed broadly to include, for example, courses of instruction in fire technology and fire administration, as well as programs spelled out to the academy in section 109(a)?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would say the answer to the gentleman's question is "yes." I would like to point out the language on line 5, page 13 of the bill, which is rather broad in its scope:

(d) provide stipends to students attending courses and programs approved by the Academy at universities and colleges in amounts up to 75 per centum of the cost of attendance.

Also, on page 15, section 114:

Sec. 114. The Superintendent is authorized to provide stipends to students attending Academy courses and programs in amounts up to 75 per centum of the cost of attendance as established by the Superintendent.

Therefore, I think in general that the intent is certainly broad.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

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

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my own comment in response to the gentleman's question. Yes, that would very definitely be my interpretation.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11989) to enhance the public health and safety by reducing the human and material losses resulting from fires through better fire prevention and control, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 352, nays 12, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 190]

YEAS—352

Abdnor	Conyers	Hanrahan
Abzug	Corman	Hansen, Idaho
Adams	Cotter	Hansen, Wash.
Addabbo	Coughlin	Harrington
Anderson,	Cronin	Harsha
Calif.	Culver	Hastings
Anderson, Ill.	Daniel, Dan	Hays
Andrews, N.C.	Daniel, Robert	Hébert
Andrews,	W., Jr.	Hechler, W. Va.
N. Dak.	Daniels	Heckler, Mass.
Annunzio	Dominick V.	Heinz
Archer	Davis, Ga.	Helstoski
Arendis	Davis, S.C.	Henderson
Armstrong	Davis, Wis.	Hicks
Ashbrook	de la Garza	Hillis
Ashley	Delaney	Hinshaw
Aspin	Dellums	Hogan
Baker	Denholm	Holifield
Barrett	Dent	Holt
Bauman	Derwinski	Holtzman
Beard	Dickinson	Horton
Bennett	Donohue	Hosmer
Bevill	Downing	Howard
Biaggi	Drinan	Huber
Blester	Duncan	Hudnut
Bingham	du Pont	Hungate
Boggs	Edwards, Ala.	Hunt
Boland	Edwards, Calif.	Jarman
Bolling	Elberg	Johnson, Calif.
Bowen	Esch	Johnson, Colo.
Brasco	Eshleman	Jones, Ala.
Bray	Evans, Colo.	Jones, N.C.
Breaux	Evins, Tenn.	Jones, Okla.
Breckinridge	Fascell	Jones, Tenn.
Brinkley	Findley	Jordan
Brooks	Fisher	Karth
Brotzman	Flood	Kastenmeier
Brown, Mich.	Foley	Kemp
Broyhill, N.C.	Ford	Ketchum
Broyhill, Va.	Forsythe	King
Buchanan	Fountain	Koch
Burgener	Frenzel	Kuykendall
Burke, Fla.	Frey	Kyros
Burke, Mass.	Fröhlich	Lagomarsino
Burleson, Tex.	Fulton	Landrum
Burlison, Mo.	Fuqua	Latta
Burton	Gaydos	Leggett
Butler	Gettys	Lehman
Byron	Gialimo	Lent
Camp	Gibbons	Long, La.
Carney, Ohio	Gilman	Long, Md.
Cederberg	Ginn	Lott
Chamberlain	Goldwater	Lujan
Chappell	Gonzalez	Luken
Clancy	Grasso	McClory
Clark	Gray	McCollister
Clausen,	Green, Oreg.	McDade
Don H.	Green, Pa.	McEwen
Clawson, Del	Griffiths	McFall
Clay	Grover	McKay
Cleveland	Gude	McKinney
Cochran	Gunter	Macdonald
Cohen	Guyer	Madden
Collins, Ill.	Hamilton	Madigan
Conable	Hammer-	Mahon
Conlan	schmidt	Mallory
Conte	Hanley	Maraziti

Martin, Nebr.	Rallsback	Stephens
Martin, N.C.	Randall	Studds
Mathias, Calif.	Rangel	Sullivan
Mathis, Ga.	Rees	Symington
Matsunaga	Regula	Taylor, Mo.
Mayne	Rhodes	Taylor, N.C.
Mazzoli	Riegle	Thompson, N.J.
Meeds	Rinaldo	Thomson, Wis.
Melcher	Robinson, Va.	Thone
Metcalfe	Robison, N.Y.	Thornton
Mezvisinsky	Rodino	Tiernan
Michel	Roe	Towell, Nev.
Miller	Rogers	Traxler
Mills	Roncallo, Wyo.	Treen
Minish	Rosenthal	Udall
Mink	Roush	Ullman
Minshall, Ohio	Rousselot	Van Deerlin
Mitchell, Md.	Roy	Vander Veen
Mitchell, N.Y.	Roybal	Vanik
Mizell	Runnels	Veysey
Moakley	Ruppe	Vigorito
Mollohan	Ruth	Waggonner
Montgomery	Ryan	Wahle
Moorhead,	St Germain	Wampler
Calif.	Sandman	Ware
Moorhead, Pa.	Sarasin	Whalen
Morgan	Sarbanes	Whitehurst
Mosher	Satterfield	Whitten
Moss	Scherle	Widnall
Murphy, N.Y.	Schneebell	Williams
Murtha	Schroeder	Wilson, Bob
Natcher	Sebelius	Wilson,
Nedzi	Seiberling	Charles H.,
Nichols	Shipley	Calif.
Obey	Shoup	Wilson,
O'Brien	Shriver	Charles, Tex.
O'Hara	Shuster	Winn
O'Neill	Sikes	Wolf
Owens	Skisk	Wright
Parris	Skubitz	Wyatt
Passman	Slack	Wydler
Pepper	Smith, Iowa	Wylle
Perkins	Smith, N.Y.	Wyman
Pettis	Snyder	Yates
Peyser	Spence	Yatron
Pike	Staggers	Young, Alaska
Poage	Stanton,	Young, Fla.
Podell	J. William	Young, Ga.
Powell, Ohio	Stanton,	Young, Ill.
Preyer	James V.	Young, Tex.
Price, Ill.	Stark	Zablocki
Price, Tex.	Steed	Zion
Pritchard	Steele	Zwach
Quile	Steelman	
Quillen	Steiger, Ariz.	

NAYS—12

Collier	Erlenborn	Landgrebe
Collins, Tex.	Goodling	Mann
Crane	Gross	Rarick
Dennis	Hutchinson	Symms

NOT VOTING—69

Alexander	Eckhardt	Patman
Badillo	Fish	Patten
Bafalis	Flowers	Pickle
Bell	Flynt	Reid
Bergland	Fraser	Reuss
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	Roberts
Blatnik	Gubser	Roncallo, N.Y.
Brademas	Haley	Rooney, N.Y.
Broomfield	Hanna	Rooney, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Hawkins	Rose
Brown, Ohio	Ichord	Rostenkowski
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Pa.	Steiger, Wis.
Carey, N.Y.	Kazen	Stokes
Carter	Kluczynski	Stratton
Casey, Tex.	Litton	Stubblefield
Chisholm	McCloskey	Stucky
Danielson	McCormack	Talcott
Dellenback	McSpadden	Teague
Devine	Milford	Vander Jagt
Diggs	Murphy, Ill.	Waldie
Dingell	Myers	White
Dorn	Nelsen	Wiggins
Dulski	Nix	Young, S.C.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Reid.
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Casey of Texas.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Carey of New York with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Kazen with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Dulski with Mr. McCloskey.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Dellenback.

Mr. Stratton with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Teague with Mr. Young of South Carolina.

Mr. Stubblefield with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Litton.
Mr. Bergland with Mr. Fish.
Mrs. Chisholm with Mr. Waldie.
Mr. Diggs with Mr. Ichord.
Mr. Stuckey with Mr. Johnson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Bafalis.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Haley with Mr. Devine.
Mr. McSpadden with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Myers.
Mr. Danielson with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Steiger of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Burke of California with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Flynt with Mr. Talcott.
Mr. Milford with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Vander Jagt.
Mr. Reuss with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Roncallo of New York.
Mr. White with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Rose with Mr. Eckhardt.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1769) to reduce the burden on interstate commerce caused by avoidable fires and fire losses, and for other purposes, a bill similar to H.R. 11989 just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF GEORGIA

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1769 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H.R. 11989, as passed by the House, as follows:

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974".

FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that—

(1) the United States today has the highest per capita rate of death and property loss from fire of all the major industrialized nations in the world;

(2) the losses of life and property resulting from fire which are now being experienced in the United States are entirely unacceptable;

(3) while fire prevention and control is and should remain a State and local responsibility, the Federal Government can be of invaluable assistance in attaining significant reduction in fire losses;

(4) the firefighting and civil defense programs in each locality can both benefit from closer cooperation;

(5) there is a need for professional training and education primarily oriented toward improving the effectiveness of fire departments, developing leadership for fire prevention, and reducing firefighter injuries;

(6) the state-of-the-art in fighting and in protecting persons and property from combustion hazards, requires additional research and development in the area of fire safety;

(7) there is a need for a national fire data

collection, analysis, and dissemination system to establish priorities for research and action;

(8) the number of specialized medical centers for the treatment of burns which are properly equipped and staffed to save lives and rehabilitate the victims of fires is severely limited in the United States;

(9) the Federal Government's role in fire research and development, information collection and dissemination, and education needs to be further strengthened in order that the effectiveness of the Nation's dedicated firefighting forces may be increased.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 3. It is therefore and hereby declared that the policy of the United States shall be to—

(1) reduce the Nation's losses caused by fire through better efforts to prevent fires from starting and by improving the efforts and means for suppressing fires;

(2) supplement rather than supplant existing programs of research, training, and education, and to encourage new and improved programs and activities by State and local governments;

(3) place the responsibility for the Federal share of this fire reduction effort on the Secretary of Commerce of the United States;

(4) encourage increasing cooperation between the Nation's firefighting and civil defense forces at all levels;

(5) carry out an enhanced public education effort aimed at improving the understanding by every citizen of the methods and techniques of fire prevention, fire rescue, and firefighting;

(6) develop and provide for the widest possible use of new approaches, techniques, and improvements in fire prevention and control;

(7) establish a United States Fire Academy to provide training and education beyond the basic training level;

(8) establish an integrated and comprehensive fire data system; and

(9) direct the National Institutes of Health to conduct an intensified program of research into the treatment of burn and smoke injuries and the rehabilitation of victims of fires.

TITLE I

NATIONAL BUREAU OF FIRE SAFETY

SEC. 101. There is hereby established within the Department of Commerce a National Bureau of Fire Safety, hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau".

SEC. 102. The Bureau shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Director shall serve subject to the provisions of section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 103. (a) It shall be the function of the Bureau, under the general direction of the Secretary of Commerce, hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary", and in cooperation and coordination with State and local governments and the private sector, to improve the Nation's efforts in fire prevention and control through public education, advanced technology, training, and education, improved statistics, and other relevant efforts.

(b) The Director shall insure that results and advances arising from the work of the Bureau are disseminated and shall encourage their use, where applicable, to further fire safety activities and to improve the effectiveness of firefighting and prevention activities.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

SEC. 104. The Director shall undertake, in collaboration with existing public and private organizations, including Civil Defense organizations, a continuing and extensive program of public education in fire prevention and fire safety which shall include specialized information aimed at those particularly vulnerable to fire hazards such as the

young and the elderly, and shall sponsor and encourage research into new methods of public education in fire prevention.

FIRE TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 105. (a) The Director shall conduct a program of continuing development, testing, and evaluation of equipment for use by the Nation's fire, rescue, and civil defense services with the aim of making available improved suppression, protective, auxiliary, and warning devices incorporating the latest technology. In the conduct of this program, the standardization, compatibility, and interchangeability of fire equipment shall be given strong attention. Such development, testing, and evaluation activities shall include—

(1) safer, less cumbersome articles of protective clothing including helmets, boots, and coats;

(2) breathing apparatus with the necessary duration of service, reliability, low weight, and ease of operation for practical use;

(3) safe and reliable auxiliary equipment for use in firefighting such as fire location detectors, visual and audio communications equipment, and new types of mobile equipment;

(4) special clothing and equipment needed for brush and forest fires, oil and gasoline fires, aircraft fires and crash rescue, fires occurring aboard water-borne vessels, and other special firefighting situations;

(5) fire detectors for residential use having high sensitivity and reliability and low cost and maintenance to insure wide acceptance and use;

(6) in-place fire prevention systems of increased reliability and effectiveness;

(7) methods of testing fire alarms and fire protection devices and systems on a noninterference basis;

(8) the development of purchase specifications, standards, and acceptance and validation test procedures for all such equipment and devices;

(9) operation tests, demonstration projects, and fire investigations in support of the activities set forth in this section;

(10) such other development, testing, and evaluation activities deemed necessary to accomplishing the purposes of this section.

(b) The Director shall not engage in the manufacture or sale of any such equipment or device except as may be necessary to develop, test, and evaluate it.

(c) The Director shall perform studies of the operations and management aspects of fire departments and services using quantitative techniques including operations research, management economics, cost effectiveness studies, and such other techniques as are found applicable and useful. Such studies shall include, but not be limited to, the optimum location of fire stations, the manner of responding to alarms, the operation of citywide and regional fire dispatch centers, the effectiveness, frequency, and methods of building inspections, and firefighting under conditions of civil disturbance. In the conduct and support of such studies the Director is authorized to perform operational tests, demonstration projects, and fire investigations.

(d) The Director shall conduct research on problems concerning productivity measurement of fire department personnel, analysis of job categories and skills required under varying conditions, reduction of injuries to fire service personnel, the most effective fire prevention efforts by fire service personnel.

(e) In the conducting of the program under this section, the Director shall take full advantage of the applicable technological developments which have been made in other departments and agencies of the Federal Government, in State and local governments, and in business and industry.

FIRE DATA

Sec. 106. (a) The Director shall operate directly or through contracts an integrated, comprehensive national fire data program based on the collection, analysis, publication, and dissemination of fire information related to the prevention, occurrence, control, and results of fire of all types. The program shall be designed to provide an accurate national picture of the fire problem, identify major problem areas and assist in setting priorities, determine possible solutions to problems, and monitor progress of programs to reduce fire losses. To carry out these functions, the program shall include—

- (1) information on the frequency, causes, spread, and extinguishment of fires;
- (2) information on the number of injuries and deaths resulting from fires including the maximum available information on the specific causes and nature of such injuries and deaths, and information on property losses;
- (3) information on the occupational hazards of firemen including the causes of death and injury to firemen arising directly and indirectly from firefighting activities;
- (4) information on all types of fire prevention activities including inspection practices;
- (5) technical information related to building construction, fire properties of materials, and other similar information;
- (6) information on fire prevention and control laws, systems, methods, techniques, and administrative structures used in foreign nations;
- (7) information on the causes, behavior, and best method of control of other types of fires, including, but not limited to, forest fires, brush fires, fires underground, oil blow-out fires, and waterborne fires; and
- (8) such other information and data as is judged useful and applicable.

(b) In the conduct of the comprehensive fire data and information program the Director is authorized to develop standardized data reporting methods and to encourage and assist State, local, and other agencies, public and private, in developing and reporting information.

(c) In the conduct of the comprehensive fire data and information program the Director is authorized to make full use of existing data gathering and analysis organizations, both public and private.

(d) The Director shall insure dissemination of such fire data to the maximum extent, and shall make the data available in appropriate form to Federal agencies, State and local governments, private organizations, industry, and business, and other interested persons.

FIRE TRAINING AND EDUCATION

Sec. 107. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Commerce, as part of the Bureau, a United States Fire Academy (hereinafter referred to as the "Academy") which shall have the mission of advancing the professional development of fire service personnel, civil defense personnel, and related fire safety personnel.

(b) The Academy shall be headed by a Superintendent who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall be responsible to the Director of the Bureau.

(c) The Academy shall consist of such buildings and facilities and have such teaching staff and other personnel as the Superintendent determines to be necessary or appropriate for purposes of this section. The Superintendent shall have authority to enter into such contracts and take such other actions as may be necessary in carrying out the preceding sentence.

Sec. 108. The Academy shall be located on such site or sites as the Secretary selects subject to the following provisions:

(a) The Secretary is authorized to appoint a Site Selection Board consisting of the Academy Superintendent and two other

members to survey the most suitable sites for the location of the Academy and make recommendations to the Secretary.

(b) The Site Selection Board and the Secretary, in making their recommendations and final selection, shall give consideration to the training and facility needs of the Academy, the accessibility and travel distance to the site from all parts of the country, environmental effects, the possibility of using a surplus Government facility, and such other factors as are deemed important and relevant.

Sec. 109. In furtherance of the mission of the Academy, the Superintendent is authorized to—

(a) conduct courses and programs of training and education in—

(1) the techniques of fire prevention, fire inspection, firefighting and fire and arson investigation for members of the firefighting forces of the Nation;

(2) the tactics and command of firefighting for present and future fire chiefs and commanders of subordinate fire units;

(3) the administration and management of fire departments and fire services;

(4) the tactical training of personnel in the specialized field of aircraft fire control and crash rescue and the field of fires occurring aboard water-borne vessels;

(5) such other subjects including civil defense related subjects and fields of study as are deemed necessary or desirable; and

(6) the training of present and future instructors in all of the above subjects;

(b) develop and administer a program of correspondence courses to advance the knowledge and skills of fire service personnel;

(c) encourage new and existing programs of education and training by local fire units and departments, State and local governments, and private institutions by supplementing and supporting—

(1) vocational training in the techniques of fire prevention, fire inspection, firefighting, and fire and arson investigations;

(2) the establishment of fire training courses and programs at junior colleges; and

(3) the support and encouragement of the number of four-year degree programs in fire engineering at colleges and universities found necessary by the Superintendent to provide an adequate number of graduates;

(d) provide stipends to students attending courses and programs approved by the Academy at universities and colleges in amounts up to 75 per centum of the cost of attendance; and

(e) provide assistance to State and local fire service training programs through grants, contracts or otherwise; and

(f) encourage and assist in the inclusion of fire prevention and detection technology and practices in the education and professional practice of architects, builders, city planners, and others engaged in design and planning affected by fire safety problems.

Sec. 110. The Superintendent shall conduct a continuing study of the needs and contents of the educational and training programs needed at the Academy and elsewhere to educate, train, and maintain the Nation's fire forces. He shall coordinate these studies with appropriate officials of the Civil Defense Staff College.

Sec. 111. The Superintendent shall establish a Committee on Fire Training and Education which shall inquire into and make recommendations regarding the desirability of establishing a mechanism for accreditation of fire training and education programs and courses, and the role which the Academy should play if such programs are recommended. The Committee shall consist of the Superintendent as chairman and eighteen other members appointed by the Superintendent from among individuals and organizations possessing special knowledge and experience in the field of fire training and

education or in related fields. The Committee shall submit to the Superintendent for transmission to the Secretary within one year after its appointment a full and complete report of its findings and recommendations; and upon the submission of such report the Committee shall cease to exist. Each appointed member of the Committee shall be reimbursed for any expenses actually incurred by him in the performance of his duties as such.

Sec. 112. The Superintendent shall admit to the courses and programs of the Academy individuals who are members of the firefighting, rescue, and civil defense forces of the Nation and such other individuals, including candidates for membership in these forces, as he determines can benefit from attendance. Students shall be admitted from any State in the Nation (as defined in section 401) with due regard to the adequate representation in the student body of all geographic sections of the country. In selecting students the Superintendent shall seek nominations and advice from fire departments, civil defense organizations, and other organizations who wish to send students to the Academy.

Sec. 113. The Superintendent may establish fees and other charges for attendance at courses and programs offered by the Academy.

Sec. 114. The Superintendent is authorized to provide stipends to students attending Academy courses and programs in amounts up to 75 per centum of the cost of attendance as established by the Superintendent.

Sec. 115. The Superintendent is authorized to provide scholarships to students attending full time at a fire engineering program of a two-year junior college or the last two years of a four-year engineering program at college or university.

Sec. 116. The Superintendent is authorized to make, or to enter into contracts to make, payments to institutions of higher education for loans, not to exceed \$2,500 per academic year for any individual, to individuals enrolled on a full-time basis in undergraduate or graduate programs in fire research or engineering recognized by the Superintendent. Loans under this paragraph shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Superintendent and each institution involved may jointly determine.

Sec. 117. The Superintendent is authorized to conduct short courses, seminars, workshops, conferences, and similar education and training activities in all parts and localities of the United States.

Sec. 118. The Secretary shall appoint a Board of Visitors to the United States Fire Academy. The function of the Board of Visitors shall be to review annually the program of the Academy and make comments and recommendations to the Secretary regarding the operation of the Academy and any improvements therein which the Board of Visitors deems desirable. The Board of Visitors shall consist of eight individuals designated by the Secretary including persons who are representatives of the fire service community or who otherwise possess special knowledge and experience in fire prevention or fire training or in related fields or who are active in the field of education generally. Of the members first designated three shall be designated to serve for terms of one year, three for terms of two years, and two for terms of three years. Persons designated thereafter shall serve for terms of three years, except that if a member of the Board of Visitors dies or resigns, a successor shall be designated for the unexpired portion of the term. Each member of the Board shall be reimbursed for any expenses actually incurred by him in the performance of his duties as such.

Sec. 119. (a) Each fire district or department that engages in the fighting of a fire

on Federal property may file a report with the Bureau setting forth—

(1) the amount of losses and expenses incurred by such district or department as a result of fighting such fire;

(2) the total cost of operation for such district or department during the year in which the report is filed and during the preceding year; and

(3) the estimated total cost of operation for such district or department during the year following that year in which the report is filed.

(b) Upon receipt of a report filed under subsection (a), the Director shall pay to each such district or department a sum which shall represent the cost to such district or department of fighting such fire, less a pro rata share of the payments in lieu of taxes for fire protection services, if any, for the period between the beginning of the annual payment period until the time of the fire, as determined by the Director.

(c) In each instance where the Director makes payment under subsection (b), the President shall take such steps as are necessary to insure that the Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over the Federal property where the fire occurred shall reimburse the Director within 30 days for the amount paid to the fire district or department. Such payment shall be credited to the appropriation from which the Director made payment to the fire district or department and shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 120. For the purposes of this title there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and such sums as may be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974.

TITLE II

FIRE RESEARCH CENTER

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Commerce a Fire Research Center (hereinafter referred to as the "Center") which shall have the mission of performing and supporting basic and applied research on all aspects of fire with the aim of providing scientific and technical knowledge applicable to the prevention and reduction of fires.

(b) The Center shall conduct directly or through contracts or grants a program of basic and applied fire research aimed at arriving at an understanding of the fundamental processes underlying all aspects of fire. Such program shall include scientific and field investigations of—

(1) the physics and chemistry of combustion processes;

(2) the dynamics of flame ignition, flame spread and flame extinguishment;

(3) the composition of combustion products developed by various sources and under various environmental conditions;

(4) the early stages of fires in buildings and other structures, structural subsystems, and structural components and all other types of fires, including, but not limited to forest fires, fires underground, oil blowout fires, brush fires, and waterborne fires with the aim of improving early detection capability;

(5) the behavior of fire involving all types of buildings and other structures and their contents (including mobile homes and high-rise buildings, construction materials, floor and wall covering, coatings, furnishings, and other combustible materials); and all other types of fires (including forest fires, fires underground, oil blowout fires, brush fires, and waterborne fires);

(6) the unique aspects of fire hazards arising from the transportation and use in industrial and professional practices of combustible gases, fluids, and materials;

(7) design concepts for providing increased fire safety consistent with habitability, com-

fort, and human impact, in buildings and other structures; and

(8) such other aspects of the fire process as are deemed useful for pursuing the mission of the fire research program.

(c) The Center shall conduct directly or through contracts or grants research into the biological, physiological, and psychological factors affecting the human victims of fires and the performance of the individual members of fire protection forces. Such research shall include—

(1) the biological and physiological effects of toxic substances encountered in fires;

(2) the trauma, cardiac conditions, and other hazards resulting from exposure to fires;

(3) the development of simple, reliable tests for the determination of the cause of death from fires;

(4) improved methods of providing first aid to the victims of fires;

(5) the psychological and motivational characteristics of persons who engage in arson, and the prediction and cure of such behavior;

(6) the conditions of stress encountered by firefighters, their effects, and their alleviation or reduction;

(7) such other biological, physiological, and psychological effects of fire as may have significance for purposes of this section.

SEC. 202. The Director shall insure that the results and advances arising from the work of the Center are disseminated and encourage the incorporation of these results and advances into the relevant building codes, fire codes, model codes, and other relevant codes, test methods, and standards. The Director is authorized to encourage and assist in the development and adoption of uniform codes, test methods, and standards aimed at reducing fire losses and costs of fire protection.

SEC. 203. For the purposes of this title there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

SEC. 204. Title I of the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1968 (Act of March 1, 1968, 82 Stat. 34; 15 U.S.C. 278f and 278g) is hereby repealed, and sections 201 and 202 of this Act are inserted as sections 16 and 17 of the Act of March 3, 1901 (15 U.S.C. 278f and 278g).

TITLE III

VICTIMS OF FIRE

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized and directed to establish, within the National Institutes of Health and in cooperation with the Secretary, an expanded program of research on burns, treatment of burn injuries, and rehabilitation of victims of fires. The National Institutes of Health shall—

(1) sponsor and encourage the establishment throughout the Nation of twenty-five additional burn centers, which shall comprise separate hospital facilities providing specialized burn treatment and including research and teaching programs, and twenty-five additional burn units, which shall comprise specialized facilities in general hospitals used only for burn victims;

(2) provide training and continuing support of specialists to staff the new burn centers and burn units;

(3) sponsor and encourage the establishment in general hospitals of ninety burn programs, which comprise staffs of burn injury specialists;

(4) provide special training in emergency care for burn victims;

(5) augment sponsorship of research on burns and burn treatment;

(6) administer and support a systematic program of research concerning smoke inhalation injuries; and

(7) sponsor and support other research and training programs in the treatment and rehabilitation of burn injury victims.

TITLE IV

ADMINISTRATIVE AND RELATED PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. For purposes of this Act the terms "State" and "United States" include the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

SEC. 402. For purposes of this Act, the term "fire department" means (and the terms "fire prevention", "fire fighting", and "fire control" relate to activities conducted by) any organization consisting of personnel, apparatus, and equipment under the direction of a chief officer for the principal purpose of protecting property and maintaining the public's safety and welfare from the inherent dangers of fire. The personnel of any such organization may be salaried, volunteer, or a combination thereof; and the location of the organization and its responsibility for extinguishment and suppression of fire shall include (but not be limited to) a city, town, borough, parish, county, fire district, fire protection district, or rural fire district.

SEC. 403. The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to its activities under this Act for the purpose of audit or to determine whether a proposed activity is in the public interest.

SEC. 404. All property rights with respect to inventions or discoveries made in the course of or under contract with any Government agency pursuant to this Act shall be subject to the basic policies set forth in the President's Statement of Government Patent Policy issued August 23, 1971, or such revisions of that Statement of Policy as may subsequently be promulgated and published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 405. Any of the activities carried out under the provisions of Titles I and II and Sec. 301 of Title III of this Act may be carried out directly or through contracts or grants.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To enhance the public health and safety by reducing the human and material losses resulting from fires through better fire prevention and control, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 11989) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE CARL THOMAS DURHAM

(Mr. FOUNTAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I announce to the House

on behalf of the North Carolina delegation the passing away early this morning of our former colleague, Congressman Carl Thomas Durham of Chapel Hill, N.C.

Congressman Durham was elected as a Democrat to the 76th and 10 succeeding Congresses. He served with great distinction from January 3, 1939, until January 3, 1961, when he retired.

He was not a candidate for renomination in 1960. Since his retirement he has lived in Chapel Hill, the seat of the University of North Carolina.

Mrs. Fountain and I extend our heartfelt sympathies to his loving companion and widow, Mrs. Durham, and to other members of his family during the time of sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask for a special order in the near future so that all who care to will have the privilege of paying their own personal tributes to our departed former colleague, Carl Durham.

COUNTDOWN ON CONTROLS

(Mr. STEELMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. STEELMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Stabilization Act must be allowed to expire tomorrow with no provisions for wage and price controls to be continued on either a selective or standby basis. These controls have only aggravated inflation by created dislocations and shortages in the economy. The National Association of Manufacturers conducted a survey of its member firms concerning the effects of wage and price controls at the end of last year, and the overwhelming conclusion was that wage and price controls have not and will not stabilize the economy. The highlights of this survey follow:

NAM INDUSTRY SURVEY ON WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

The highlights of this survey included:

Almost two out of three companies indicated that removal of price controls would encourage them to increase their productive capacity. One out of every three companies have postponed or cancelled plant and equipment expenditures due to controls.

Approximately 50% of all firms acknowledging cutbacks indicated that production was interrupted or curtailed because of the unavailability of raw materials. In the greater majority of cases, these shortages resulted in production interruptions and reductions rather than in total curtailments. Slightly more than 44% attributed the cutbacks to uneconomical production where economic return does not justify production activity in light of controls. The remaining 6% of firms gave other reasons for these actions.

A total of 89.1% of small firms (under \$50 million in annual revenues) and 97% of large firms (more than \$50 million in annual revenues) reported that they have experienced unusual difficulty in obtaining their requirements of important materials or surplus.

The largest single factor contributing to the supply shortage situation has been the price control program itself.

Some 45% of the firms said controls are damaging the U.S. competitive position in foreign trade. Approximately 40% were "uncertain" and only 15% didn't feel controls hurt.

Some 95% of all firms responding to the survey predicted a serious worsening of shortages if controls continued, and at the same time 84% of all firms said that there would be an improvement in shortages problems if controls were promptly ended.

Three out of five small firms and four out of five large companies said that controls adversely affected corporate earnings.

Some 84% of all firms said "no" when asked if controls had any beneficial effects on the conduct of their business.

When asked if controls themselves have reduced the level of inflation, 14.7% said "yes", 51.7% said "no", while 33.6% were "uncertain".

Some 97% of the large companies and almost 92% of the small firms favored a prompt termination of controls.

All companies were asked: "Do you feel that, in the long run, consumers will end up paying more for products they purchase because of controls?" More than 76% of the small firms and almost 87% of the large companies said "yes".

WHO ME? YES, YOU!

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, 2 days from now the Economic Stabilization Act expires. Inflation continues to escalate; the Congress and the President stand by washing their hands of any responsibility, saying to one another, "Who me?" "Yes you," says the American people. Both are responsible for the death of any effective legislation to cope with inflation.

When John Dunlop, Director of the Cost of Living Council, appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee urging the removal of all controls except in two areas, health services and the construction industry, I had an exchange with him, which appears on page 345 of the transcript of hearings of March 6 through 8, 1974:

Mr. KOCH. Let me ask you this: If you have the free market—and in my gut I know you are wrong but let me finish—if you have the free market which you are espousing, what do you do with the pensioners and retirees? We are talking now about an abnormal situation, not the normal free market that applies when you don't have this abnormal inflation?

I noticed two crises over the past 2 years because I eat a lot of cookies and a lot of tuna fish. I noticed that a can of tuna fish in the last year, a 3½-ounce can, went from 31 cents to 41 cents, and a 13-ounce bag of Keebler cookies went from 49 cents to 71 cents. A Congressman's salary permits the purchase of those without any problem. But a pensioner's salary does not.

What I am asking you is what are you doing with respect to the pensioners and the retirees who cannot afford the huge increases that have taken place in the area of necessities? How is your free market proposal going to affect them?

Dr. DUNLOP. Let me make one comment about phase 2 that I forgot to make that is central. Phase 2 could not have lasted. It was breaking down at the time and some change had to be made.

The issue was not whether phase 3 was the only solution, perhaps, but whether phase 2 could have been continued, and it could not in my view. That is first.

Now about your question on cookies and tuna fish. I support the answer that I would have to give to you is that the appropriate

Government policy should be simply to try to increase the supply not only of cookies and tuna fish given demand for these items, but also more importantly, of the basic raw materials out of which those and other products are made.

Mr. KOCH. Is there any question in your mind, Dr. Dunlop, that when your program goes into effect, if it does, that tuna and cookies are going to increase in price in the next 6 months to a year?

Dr. DUNLOP. Yes, there is.

Mr. KOCH. There is a doubt in your mind?

Dr. DUNLOP. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. You think that those two items, using those for the purpose of illustration, have a chance of going down in the next 6 months to a year?

Dr. DUNLOP. Yes.

Mr. KOCH. When you come back a year from now, as I suspect you will, I will ask you about tuna and cookies.

Dr. DUNLOP. I will be happy to tell you about them at that time. These primary prices are at a stage where they cannot continue at the levels they are.

In the case of many items, the prices must come down. By the time we talk again we will have a new set of crops which should help bring down those prices, certainly.

But even if they can't I will say this to you: No amount of price controls can do anything more than to insure that we will have less cookies and tuna fish.

Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday I went to the same store where I buy my groceries and the same cookies are now 89 cents and the can of tuna fish is 45 cents. And, Mr. Speaker, a quart jar of mayonnaise which not too long ago sold for 79 cents is now \$1.19.

I discussed this with a member of my staff this morning, a young woman who shops for herself. She describes inflation in the following way: she was able about a year ago to physically carry no more than \$12 in groceries when she went to the store. Today she has no trouble at all in carrying \$16 worth.

Mr. Speaker, it is not too late for this Congress to protect the American people by extending the Economic Stabilization Act. And it is not too late for the President to carry out that legislation effectively and stop the inflation. If both fail in their responsibilities it is the American people who will pay at the store and the public officials who failed that public who will pay at the polls. Congress and the President fiddle while the people burn.

COAL RESEARCH FUNDS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the House adopted my amendment to the NASA authorization bill adding \$3.9 million for stepping up ongoing NASA research in combustion of coal, and transfer of space-related technology to improve mine safety, extraction of coal, and improving efficient methods of burning coal.

I encourage your support of an amendment I intend to offer to the special energy research and development appropriations bill on Tuesday, April 30,

to add \$3.9 million for the above purpose.

For several years, the Lewis Research Center, Ames Research Center, and other NASA Centers have been carrying on research which is directly related to the mining and combusting of coal and improvement of the safety of mining operations. For example, the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., is presently working with the Bureau of Mines in testing General Electric hydrocarbon detectors designed to detect hydrogen leaks in launch vehicles, for use in detecting methane in coal mines more effectively.

NASA has had considerable experience with the development of high temperature materials and technology needed for more efficient ground power systems, and indicates a capability of utilizing a portion of the additional funds in this area. The great expertise which NASA has developed in the use of magnetic fluids can also be transferred to the separation of scrap from coal. Further transfer technology can be applied in the miniaturizing of highly efficient, low weight nickel-zinc batteries for use in mine vehicles and miner safety equipment. Additional technology transfer is possible in suppressing fires in mines, and in the entire area of protecting miners in a hostile environment as has been developed by NASA, especially since the disastrous Apollo fire which killed three astronauts.

It is understandable that the Bureau of Mines and other Department of the Interior agencies should be the lead agencies with respect to coal. However, the energy appropriations bill already contains funds for coal liquefaction appropriated directly to the Atomic Energy Commission, funds for coal combustion techniques appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, and coal-related funds appropriated to the National Science Foundation. Therefore, my amendment is not designed to fragment the coal research program, but to insure that early utilization of coal be achieved in greater measure just as soon as possible.

LET US FACE THE FACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, no matter how we may feel about it, all the provisions of the Economic Stabilization Act will expire. I know these controls have been regarded as bitter medicine. We know so well that many charges have been made about the inequities, particularly in the field of health care. We know of some instances particularly among retail clerks whose wages have not kept pace with prices. Truly there has been a great deal of disenchantment.

But, Mr. Speaker, many of our constituents have asked why we did not tell them in advance, for example, about the energy crisis. They say to me why did you

not tell us about the energy crisis and when it was going to happen. Mr. Speaker, sometime later this summer or maybe this fall some of our constituents will be asking us why oh why prior to the expiration of the wage and price controls, we failed to make some effort to control inflation?

There simply must be some kind of standby authority or some kind of tools to provide a measure of control. Maybe we should continue the Cost of Living Council, or if by some other name a monitoring device to conduct the job of monitoring when inflation passes from a one digit increase to two digit rate of inflation—then it will really be rough.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to stress that later today or tomorrow I intend to introduce some kind of standby authority and some comparable legislation to the effort by the Banking and Currency Committee to authorize a continuation of the Cost of Living Council.

We must all recognize the chairman of our Banking and Currency Committee is engaged in necessary activities outside of Washington. I would hope that on his return there might be some hearings which would provide for the continuation of some kind of economic controls.

I know these views are not popular. Just about everybody seems to be against any type of controls. Labor feels with quite a bit of justification that wages have not kept pace with prices. Big business feels their profit levels have not been equitable and fair.

Small business, I suppose, opposes the redtape. But let us not forget there is a great unrepresented constituency. They have not had much to say up until now. I am talking about the many millions of Americans who are on fixed incomes, either on social security or at the social security level. They are the ones for whom some provision must be made. Yes, maybe controls have been bitter medicine. But without some kind of monitoring or without some extension of the Cost of Living Council, we may very well be in deep trouble.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Is it not true that the whole Congress and the Joint Economic Committee and several other committees of this Congress could, in fact, act as monitors for this whole economic situation? Maybe we should not always delegate away the responsibility to someone else in the executive branch. Is that not a continuing problem?

Mr. RANDALL. I think that is right and I am glad that the gentleman from California has participated in these comments.

I would say that the point of the gentleman from California is well taken. Let us keep something for Congress. On the other hand, 435 men on this side of the Capitol and 100 men on the other side cannot administer or cannot execute. I think we must delegate authority downtown to the executive branch.

I am not of a suspicious nature. Yet I can very well envision that later on we are going to hear from downtown, "You

took the tools away from us. You gave me nothing to work with to control inflation."

I would inquire of the gentleman, What kind of answer can we supply to such a charge?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I would be delighted to try to answer that. First of all, if the administration does take the absolute position that the gentleman has just mentioned, I think that they would have to share in the responsibility of high prices. There has been no real effort on their part to continue wage and price controls. Basically, our former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Shultz has opposed the concept. So did others in the administration.

Our own Committee on Banking and Currency of the House voted 21 to 10 to not in any way continue wage and price controls. The committee tabled three bills that were before us.

Now, the answer to the gentleman's question, I say, is this: it is too difficult if not impossible for anyone in this country to try to manage wage and price controls at the Federal level. There are too many avenues of decisionmaking that go into the process.

I notice in Business Week magazine—April 27—and in some of the union publications they adequately describe why it is an impossible task for any central authority to attempt to undertake.

Mr. RANDALL. I would ask the gentleman, what was his view about the legislation of the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STANTON; did he oppose the continuation of the Cost of Living Council?

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Yes, I did. I certainly did. It was my opinion that the standby Cost of Living Council machinery could add little.

Mr. RANDALL. I would hope there would be an opportunity to reconsider such proposal. I had the privilege to discuss his proposal with the gentleman from Ohio today.

Now we are on the next to the last day of the expiration. As late as it is this does not mean that some action cannot be taken even tomorrow or sometime in the near future. If we do not I submit to the gentleman that he and all the rest of us are going to have a difficult time explaining the responsibility which we had and we did not exercise. So I say regardless of the onerous burden, regardless of the differences that exist we must do something. We are talking about administration. We are also talking about some tools. Also we are taking the tools away from the Chief Executive if and when we let controls expire. The President may not use controls. That is his prerogative; but we have the opportunity, if we rise to it.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDALL. Well, if you can be brief.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I think that the free market system we have developed in this country does make the consumer "king." I think the ultimate decision is to be made by the consumer in what he buys or does not buy in the way of products and services. He is the one who does it; that is, supports or does not support

high prices. When wage and price controls were removed from chickens, if the gentleman will remember, immediately after they were taken off prices went way up; but then as supplies began to come into the marketplace the consumer benefited, because prices were forced down by competition and by a full supply in the marketplace; so the answer to the gentleman is that it is my opinion the alternative is in letting the free market system work its will.

I am grateful to the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this subject up. I think we probably should have debated it more thoroughly on the floor, although I assure the gentleman that we debated it thoroughly in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am always indebted to the gentleman from California and have the highest regard for him.

Mr. Speaker, of course we speak well of the free enterprise system, meaning the laws of supply and demand. I suspect these laws will work. But if they work it will be 6 or 8 months from now.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is correct on that point.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it may not be the first of the year, things may level off, but I am thinking during that interim of 3, 4, 5, or 6 months, what response can we give to those dear folks, and I am speaking of our senior citizens, 35 or 40 million of them, who are going to be helpless without some kind of controls or some kind of agency to monitor.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the House advisedly and considerately, that if there is one thing that has been helpful is the mandatory allocation act. It helped us. If we did not have some controls, on petroleum products the price of propane and the price of gasoline would be higher than now. Thank goodness they will be in effect after midnight, tomorrow night.

HOW TO CUT THE GASOLINE SHORTAGE IN HALF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. WYMAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday there is scheduled for floor action a split-off from the earlier energy conference report called the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act (H.R. 14368). This legislation presents a long needed opportunity to this Congress to modify excessively and unnecessarily restrictive standards in the Clean Air Act of 1970 as they relate to automobile emissions controls.

At the appropriate time I shall offer an amendment, the text of which is included in these remarks, to provide that cars registered to residents of those parts of the United States having no significant air pollution from auto emissions shall not be required to have such equipment until September 1977 or the end of the energy crisis, whichever is later. The affected area comprises better than 90 percent of the geographical United States, and includes at least 70 percent of the Nation's cars.

Implementation of this amendment would save billions of gallons of gasoline a year. It would cut the gasoline shortages in this country in half at the very least, and it would be effective immediately. In addition, it would save purchasers of new cars who reside in unpolluted areas hundreds of millions of dollars in the price they must pay for their new cars as well as in operating costs thereafter.

The most recent EPA study on this subject indicates an existing fuel penalty on cars equipped in conformity with 1974 emissions controls which ranges from 18 percent in the larger and heavier cars on a declining scale to the smallest cars, but with an admitted fuel penalty average for all cars in excess of 10 percent. This is a wastage of at least 1 gallon in every 10 when it is recognized that in most States there is no significant air pollution from automobile emissions and no public health problem therefrom, present or prospective.

The areas in which there is significant auto emissions pollution are specified in general terms in the amendment with authority and direction to the Administrator of EPA to specify their precise limits within 60 days. Thereafter persons who reside in these areas must continue to operate emissions controls equipped vehicles, but all other residents of the United States may have and purchase cars without such controls for at least the next 3 years. Statistics show conclusively that the in-and-out traffic into designated air quality regions will not materially adversely affect the ambient air quality of those regions.

In this way, this country can adopt a sensible two-car policy that will save billions of gallons of gasoline, not harm a soul, and meaningfully protect both the general public and consumer interests throughout the Nation. There is no earthly sense in requiring all of the cars in the entire United States to cost much more and suffer a heavy additional fuel burden when there is auto-related air pollution only in very small concentrated locations, for example, from Boston, Mass., to Richmond, Va.; Chicago, Los Angeles, and on some days, Phoenix-Tucson.

As public indignation mounts over the waste and unreasonableness of existing requirements for auto emissions controls, it is the responsibility of this Congress to meet this problem and provide a workable solution. This amendment does just this and I urge its support in the public interest.

The amendment follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 14368 OFFERED BY Mr. WYMAN

On page 20, insert immediately after line 9 the following: I. TEMPORARY SUSPENSION IN DESIGNATED AREAS

(a) Section 203 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857f-2) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) (1) During and after the period of partial suspension of emission standards (as defined in paragraph (3) (A))—

"(A) it shall be unlawful for any person to register within an area designated in paragraph (3) (B) a new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine which is manufactured during the period of partial suspension of emission standards and which is not labeled

or tagged as covered by a certificate of conformity under this part, and

"(B) no State shall permit any person to register a motor vehicle in violation of subparagraph (A).

"(2) During the period of partial suspension of emission standards

"(A) subsections (a) (1) and (4) of this section shall be inapplicable;

"(B) it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer to sell, offer to sell, or introduce or deliver for introduction into commerce (or for any person except as provided in regulations of the Administrator, to import into the United States), any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine which is labeled or tagged as covered by a certificate of conformity unless such new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine is covered by a certificate of conformity issued (and in effect) under this part, or unless such new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine was manufactured prior to the period of partial suspension;

"(C) subsection (a) (3) shall not apply to any motor vehicle or engine attached thereto which is registered outside an area described in paragraph (3) (B) of this subsection;

"(D) it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer (1) to sell or lease any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine which is labeled or tagged as covered by a certificate of conformity unless such manufacturer has complied with the requirements of sections 207 (a) and (b), or (ii) to fail to comply with subsection (c) or (d) of section 207 insofar as such sections apply to motor vehicles or motor vehicle engines to which subsection (a) (1) of this section applies or applied or which are labeled or tagged as covered by a certificate of conformity;

"(E) it shall be unlawful for any dealer to sell any new motor vehicle or new motor vehicle engine which is not labeled or tagged as covered by a certificate of conformity to an ultimate purchaser unless such purchaser provides such dealer with a signed statement that such purchaser will not register such vehicle in an area designated under paragraph (3) (B), and

"(F) it shall be unlawful for any ultimate purchaser to provide a statement described in subparagraph (E) knowing such statement to be false.

"(3) (A) For purposes of this subsection and section 209(C) the term 'period of partial suspension of emission standards' means the period beginning sixty days after enactment and ending on the later of September 30, 1977, or 12 months after the date on which the President determines that there is no longer any significant shortage of petroleum fuels in the United States. Any such determination shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(B) Within sixty days after the date of enactment of this subsection and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall designate, subject to the limitations set forth in this subparagraph, geographic areas of the United States in which there is significant auto emissions related air pollution. The Administrator shall not designate as such area without subsequent legislative authorization, any part of the United States outside the following air quality control regions as defined by the Administrator as of the date of enactment of this paragraph:

- "(i) Phoenix-Tucson, intrastate.
- "(ii) Metropolitan Los Angeles, intrastate.
- "(iii) San Francisco Bay Area, intrastate.
- "(iv) Sacramento Valley, intrastate.
- "(v) San Diego, intrastate.
- "(vi) San Joaquin Valley (California), intrastate.
- "(vii) Hartford-New Haven (Connecticut)-Springfield (Massachusetts), interstate.
- "(viii) National Capital (District of Columbia-Maryland-Virginia), interstate.
- "(ix) Metropolitan Baltimore, intrastate.

"(x) New Jersey-New York-Connecticut, interstate.

"(xi) Metropolitan Philadelphia (Pennsylvania-New Jersey and Delaware), interstate.

"(xii) Metropolitan Chicago (Illinois and Indiana), interstate.

"(xiii) Metropolitan Boston, intrastate.

For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'significant auto emissions related air pollution' means the persons of air pollutants from automobile emissions at such levels and for such durations as to cause a demonstrable and substantial adverse impact upon public health.

"(C) For purposes of this subsection and section 209(c) a motor vehicle shall be considered to be registered in a geographic area—

"(i) in the case of a motor vehicle registered by an individual if the individual's principal place of abode is in that area, or

"(ii) in the case of a motor vehicle registered by a person other than an individual, if the State of registration determines that such vehicle will be principally operated in such area.

"(D) Each State shall not later than sixty days following enactment of this Act, submit to the Administrator a plan for implementing subsection (d) (1) (B) of this section. Such plan shall contain provisions which give assurance that such State has one or more adequately financed agencies with sufficient legal authority to enforce such subsection (d) (1) (B) as determined in accordance with regulations of the Administrator."

(b) (A) Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act is amended by inserting "and section 203(d)" after "subsection (b)".

(B) (1) Section 203(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "The following" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise provided in subsection (d) of this section, the following:"

(2) Section 203(b) (2) of such Act is amended by inserting "or (d) (2) (A)" after "subsection (a)".

(C) Section 204(a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period the following: "or section 203(d)".

(D) Section 205 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 205.", by inserting "or paragraph (1) (A) or (2) of section 203(d)" after "section 203(a)", and by adding at the end of such section the following new subsection:

"(b) If a State fails to submit a plan under section 203(d) or if the Administrator determines (after notice and opportunity for hearing) that such State is not adequately enforcing such a plan, then such State (including any political subdivision thereof) shall lose its entitlement to and may not thereafter receive any Federal grant or loan assistance under this Act or under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act."

(E) Section 206(b) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "being manufactured by a manufacturer" and inserting in lieu thereof "which are being manufactured by a manufacturer and which are covered by a certificate of conformity".

(F) The second sentence of section 209(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "No State" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in sections 203(d) (1) (B) and 203(a), no State".

(G) Section 209(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "Nothing" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, nothing"; and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(d) During the period of partial suspension of emission standards (as defined in section 203(d) (3) (A))—

"(1) no State may (in an applicable implementation plan or otherwise) adopt or attempt to enforce any standard relating to the control of emissions of motor vehicles

(including engines attached thereto) registered outside of any area designated under section 203(d) (3) (B), and

"(2) no State may (in an applicable implementation plan or otherwise) adopt or attempt to enforce any law or regulation prohibiting any person from removing or rendering inoperative any device or element of design installed in compliance with regulations under this title in or on a motor vehicle (including any engine attached thereto) which is registered outside of any area designated under section 203(d) (3) (B), and

"(3) the Administrator may not promulgate any implementation plan which contains a provision prohibited by paragraph (1) or (2)."

(c) Willful and deliberate violation of section 203(d) (1) (A) of the Clean Air Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this amendment, shall be punishable by a fine of up to one thousand (\$1,000) dollars, or imprisonment up to one year, or both.

(d) Motor vehicles registered in areas other than those designated in paragraph (3) (B) herein on the date of expiration of this amendment shall not be required to be retrofitted with emissions control devices nor to comply with emissions control standards or regulations issued pursuant to the Act of 1970 (42 U.S.C. 1857f) as amended.

(e) This amendment shall take effect sixty days after passage.

TERRORISM THREATENS U.S. INTERNAL SECURITY AS CONGRESS PONDERES ABOLITION OF HOUSE INTERNAL SECURITY COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed ironic, if not unbelievable, that while an Atomic Energy Commission report cites the possibility of "a rise of urban terrorist groups in this country of a sort without precedent in our history," the House of Representatives will soon consider abolishing the one House committee which has been probing such groups for several years—the House Committee on Internal Security—HCIS.

As if to point up the irony, the April 27 issue of the Washington Post ran an item entitled: "Hill Study Warns Terrorists Could Get Own A-Weapons."

The lead paragraph stated:

The world-wide increase in terrorist groups' activity, the rash of political kidnappings and the proliferation of nuclear power plants raises a serious threat that uranium might be stolen in large enough quantities for terrorists to build their own atomic weapon.

The cause of concern was an Atomic Energy Commission study prepared for a Senate subcommittee which warned that present safeguards against the theft of uranium and plutonium for the manufacture of homemade atomic bombs was "entirely inadequate." To make matters worse, the AEC report noted the "increasing professional skills, intelligence networks, finances, and level of armaments of terrorist groups throughout the world," which, along with the possible availability of homemade atomic bombs infinitely increase the capabilities of violence. Stated the report:

It is our opinion that the kidnapping of Patricia Hearst does not represent an iso-

lated and passing incident, but is rather the precursor of a wave of such incidents.

If not firmly and competently met, these kidnappings may lead to a rise of urban terrorist groups in this country of a sort without precedent in our history.

The report was referring, of course, to the Symbionese Liberation Army—SLA—which was the subject of a recent report by HCIS and reported on by the Chicago Tribune on March 4 (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 21, 1974, p. 7832).

It is interesting to note the part played by prison revolutionaries in SLA. As pointed out in the SLA report of the committee, several prison groups were involved with SLA, some of which were reviewed by the committee in its 1973 report, "Revolutionary Target: The American Penal System." In its prison hearings, HCIS sought to substantiate that revolutionary elements did seek to influence prisoners with their radical propaganda and visitations. At present a California State legislative subcommittee on civil disorders is investigating terrorist revolutionary groups in and out of California prisons.

The findings of the subcommittee should throw additional light on how the revolutionaries are seeking to foment trouble in the prisons. It should also prove interesting to learn to what extent the Revolutionary Union and the Venceremos Organization, both of which have been investigated by HCIS, contributed to prison unrest and dissension.

A summary of the committee's investigations and reports in recent years appears on page E219 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1974. The Venceremos Organization and the Revolutionary Union are but two groups whose violence-prone inclinations illustrate the capacity for terror of certain elements in the United States. Other groups to which HCIS has directed congressional and public attention in the past included the Black Panther Party, the Progressive Labor Party, and the SDS, among others.

As in the case of the committee's prison hearings, other hearings by HCIS attempted to make public certain conditions and circumstances that could eventually result in trouble and violence. Of special significance are the hearings on SDS early in 1969. Almost a year before the tragic deaths at Kent State in 1970, HCIS had noted via its hearings that SDS agitation at that institution had caused disruptions with but 15 to 20 hardcore members of SDS out of an enrollment of more than 21,000 responsible for the trouble. Four disturbances two of which were violent, resulted from this carefully planned agitation, aided by films, pamphlets, newsletters, and directives by the Ohio regional SDS office in Cleveland some 30 miles away.

One SDS manual directed that:

Beginning with guerrilla theater actions in dorms, we can escalate to disrupting classes, street marches, quick assaults on buildings, etc., before moving to the major confrontation of the struggle.

One SDSer, quoted in the Daily Kent Stater during the disruptions in 1969—months before the 1970 slayings—stated that:

Sitting on the grass in front of the administration building is not fighting. They used guns at Cornell, and they got what they wanted. It will come to that here!

Contrary to a New York Times report had happened at Kent State since a 1958 panty raid, HCIS hearings on the SDS activities in 1969 at Kent State proved that that peaceful campus could be stampeded into disruption. Unfortunately, the prediction by the SDSer quoted above concerning the use of guns was soon to be tragically true.

On a broader scale HCIS, in August of last year, called attention in a report to the threat of political kidnappings, listed cases in various countries and named various groups involved. While most of the activity was abroad, the HCIS report noted that of 42 attempted or successful major political kidnappings, 21 involved U.S. citizens, and of 13 deaths, 6 were Americans. As noted by the Herald-News of Passaic, N.J., on March 6, Chairman ICHORD drew public attention to this threat in these words:

I am, like most Americans, appalled by the brutish insensitivity of political kidnappings. Whether this tactic is carried out in the United States or not, it is my belief that the committee in calling attention to this situation is carrying out its duty of informing the Congress and the American public of a matter that warrants their attention.

At the present time HCIS is conducting hearings on the subject of terrorism and I have introduced legislation which seeks to cope with this burgeoning threat. The committee will soon release a study on terrorism which, like the reports and hearings cited above, should help provide information on the scope of the danger and the various tactics and organizations involved.

On March 3, 1974, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor-in-chief of the Hearst Newspapers, stated in a lengthy editorial supporting HCIS:

In the case of HUAC, and its less clumsily named successor, the most serious attacks have been the many congressional attempts at downright abolition. It makes no difference to its foes in Congress that the committee is acclaimed by our law enforcement officials everywhere as an invaluable source of continually updated information on radical groups of all descriptions, left and right alike. The committee must go.

Mr. Hearst was referring, of course, to the hearings, studies, and reports of the committee, which, like those cited above and many others, have provided information for law enforcement officials throughout the country. Reciprocally, police officials and employees over the years have appeared before HCIS and its predecessor, the House Committee on Un-American Activities to help inform both Congress and the public on various current threats to the internal security of the Nation. Law enforcement witnesses have appeared before HCIS and HCUA in connection with the riot hearings in the 1960's, the 1968 Chicago Democratic Convention disruptions, hearings on the Progressive Labor Party, the Young Socialist Alliance, to name but several instances. Needless to say, there is a mutuality of interests between the committee and the many law en-

forcement agencies throughout the country. In addition, testimony was recently received from an official of the International Association of Chiefs of Police on the many ramifications of the terrorist threat.

On the legislative side, the committee on many occasions has heard from representatives of veterans organizations on specific legislative proposals. Incidentally, my office has been receiving an increasing volume of correspondence in support of the continuation of the committee, and it is reassuring to be able to report on the overwhelming endorsements by many organizations, including the solid, patriotic veterans whose members carried the load in wars past and who today represent the managerial backbone of middle-class America in times of peace.

The following are but a few examples of the welcome support accorded HCIS which I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues, particularly those who stood up on April 1 and voted to support the committee's 1974 appropriation.

THE AMERICAN LEGION

The Legion has recently informed us that its biyear resolution No. 405 of 1972 is still valid. That statement resolved that HCIS "continue vigorously" in its work which it had "so well undertaken in years past".

On April 8, 1974, its National Commander, Robert E. L. Eaton, has stated the Legion's position as follows:

We are deeply concerned . . . about the proposal to abolish the Committee on Internal Security and transfer its jurisdiction to the Committee on Government Operations.

The American Legion has long supported the work of the Committee on Internal Security. We believe this standing Committee of the House has rendered valuable service to the Congress and to the Nation. The phase-out of surveillance operations in the Executive Branch makes its work more important than ever before. We believe that the increased activity of terrorist organizations in recent months makes it imperative that the American people be reassured that work in the field of internal security is vigorously pursued.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

The VFW's 1973 National Resolution No. 102 is also still in effect. It stated in part:

Our Commander-in-Chief commends the painstaking effort of the great majority of the House Committee on Internal Security for its fair-minded and comprehensive efforts to enhance our internal security without any valid witchhunting charges being brought against them.

Currently the VFW has issued an unmistakably clear message in April 1974, by its Commander-in-Chief, Ray Solden, to key Congressmen on the threat faced by HCIS particularly in the form of a packaged proposition:

On behalf of your many friends in the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I urge you to support the continued existence of the House Internal Security Committee and not permit this irreplaceable national asset to disappear through any legislative sleight-of-hand or "package" proposal.

CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

The CWV have long supported the activities of the House Internal Security

Committee, wrote Mr. Neil G. Knowles, its national commander, to HCIS chairman, Congressman RICHARD ICHORD. He said:

The mere transfer of functions, without your files, would seal valuable records and make unavailable to the new subcommittee, the work of many years and, not to forget people, would mean that the present staff with inestimable value by reason of experience and background would be spread to the four winds.

The Commander concluded:

We urge you to continue your efforts to see that the work of the Committee is not hindered or reduced.

THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION

The FRA has also corresponded with the House leadership and other senior House Members on behalf of HCIS urging them to "fully support the retention and continuance of a viable House Committee on Internal Security." Mr. Marvin Silverman, FRA's national president, stated that:

As concerned Americans we oppose the transfer of the duties and responsibilities of the Internal Security Committee to other House committees.

NON-COMMISSIONED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

NCOA passed a resolution supportive of HCIS at its recent convention in San Antonio, Tex., April 19, 1974. It resolved that:

Members of the Congress of the United States be petitioned by the Non-Commissioned Officers Association of the U.S.A. to reject any legislative efforts that will provide for the restructuring or abolishment of the House Committee on Internal Security.

Mr. James O. Duncan, president of NCOA, warned in Stars and Stripes, on March 28, 1974, that well meaning but uninformed liberals are out to toll the death peal for HCIS.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNIFORMED SERVICES

Brig. Gen. Hallett D. Edson, executive vice president, stated the position of this veterans' group on April 17, 1974, in correspondence with key House Members when he wrote that NAUS was "most concerned with various proposals that would tend to reduce the effectiveness of the House Committee on Internal Security." He added,

Reorganizing the Committee system to reassign the HCIS as a subordinate element of any other committee, particularly the already overworked Judiciary or Government Operations Committee, would be tantamount to emasculating its true effectiveness.

AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSOCIATION

Donald L. Harlow, retired Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force, in correspondence with selected House leaders, wrote that,

The insidious attempt to eliminate the effectiveness of the House Internal Security Committee by integrating it with the already overworked Judiciary Committee is ludicrous in view of the terrorism already prevalent in the United States today.

These are but a few of the many organizations which, I am sure, view the issue of internal security as an integral part of our national security—both in peace and in time of conflict.

In the journalistic field, not all news-

papers or journalists agree with our two local dailies, the Post and the Star-News, both of whom would be happy to see the committee abolished. I have quoted from the editorial, "Watchdog Committee" by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., who advises his readers to write their Congressmen and "make it strong and brief and do it right away." The Chicago Tribune of April 14 editorially labels the abolition move "A Sneak Attack." In an editorial on February 5, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat cites the Committee for a commendable job and asks that the committee be saved. On March 5 the Nashville Banner comments editorially that "Terrorism Threat Requires Vigilance in Congress" and notes that:

At a time when terrorism threatens to undermine the future stability of the United States and its citizens, Congress is considering abandoning an investigative unit designed to keep tabs on subversive activities.

The very knowledgeable and alert newsweekly, "Human Events" noted on April 6:

For over 35 years, through both HCUA and HCIS, the House has led Congress in investigating Nazis, Fascists, Communists, KKKers and other subversive elements in proposing effective internal security laws and in obtaining needed security action at the executive level.

As a clipping service would be needed to survey the sentiment in the journalistic field as to the future of HCIS, these references to press support should not be considered indicative. Suffice it is to say, that support from some responsible news sources has been forthcoming. Similarly, the endorsements of syndicated columnists Bill Buckley, Victor Lasky, Alice Widener and Victor Riesel are of significance because they are all especially intimate with the issues of internal security and have written in this area extensively. On this basis, their support of the committee's efforts is especially indicative.

Finally, as we consider the proposals of the so-called "Bolling Committee" to restructure the House committee system, let us not be lulled into making what could well be a fatal mistake in dismantling the House Committee on Internal Security by abolishing it and transferring its "functions" to the House Committee on Government Operations. This proposal is every bit as noxious as the proposal originally advanced by the Bolling Committee in December of 1973 to transfer the jurisdiction of the Internal Security Committee to the Judiciary Committee. Both Judiciary and Government Operations are already entrusted with enough work—far too much, in fact, to enable them to continually investigate subversion with a view to recommending needed and constitutionally sound legislation to cope with it.

As ranking minority member of the HCIS, I know that we need a standing and independent Committee on Internal Security. We need it now, perhaps, more than we ever have. All Americans are concerned with the alarming increase in terrorism and political kidnapping in this country. But how can we reasonably expect a subcommittee with a necessarily small staff—which also necessarily

means inadequate research files—to maintain the sort of expert oversight needed to investigate such activities knowledgeably?

For that matter, as I read the Bolling report, how can we even expect that there will be a subcommittee established, as the report merely recommends transfer of jurisdiction, not the explicit establishing of a standing subcommittee?

The Bolling report states rather patronizingly that the broadening of the Internal Security Committee's mandate would not justify even a "second tier" status as a standing committee. This statement betrays the bias of the Bolling Committee staff as well as their ignorance of the subject with which Internal Security deals.

Internal Security's mandate is purposefully narrow, as the field in which we investigate is highly sensitive. There are first amendment considerations in trying to investigate and recommend legislation in the internal security field, and our membership and staff are only too well aware of this. Indeed, only a trained staff of experts really conversant with the relevant court pronouncements in this area can be counted on to do this job effectively and properly. To transfer this function to an already overburdened committee with a staff that is not expert in this field is to work a great disservice on the Congress, the people, and the courts.

Furthermore, the Bolling report says that transfer to Judiciary is not recommended because of that committee's "heavy workload," but what of Government Operations, which has also a "heavy workload?" We are, in effect, asked to approve transfer of Internal Security's "functions" to one already overworked committee rather than to another. This is interesting argument, but only as a provision of elementary logic.

As for the report's assertion that our "legislative workload is light," what has this to do with anything? We are an investigative committee, which means that we are supposed to conduct continuing oversight inquiry not only to demonstrate the need for new laws, but also to see whether existing laws are sufficient and/or are being adequately enforced. Such inquiry also encompasses government personnel security practices and, this year, executive branch domestic intelligence gathering.

This last subject is of particular sensitivity, especially in view of the furor surrounding the intelligence activities of certain agencies and individuals during the past 2 years. I think it is reasonable to state that such a delicate subject should be entrusted only to a committee staffed with people who are experts in the field. This is no subject for part-timers or dilettantes.

Mr. Speaker, the last few years have seen much of this Government's internal security structure wiped out by dilettantes and special pleaders and others with perhaps more harmful motivations. The military intelligence community has been emasculated by systematic wrecking operations conducted by certain congressional committees and some of our most influential newspapers and broadcast

journalists. The Subversive Activities Control Board has ceased to exist. The Justice Department has eliminated its Internal Security Division by incorporating it into the Criminal Division. The Attorney General's list has fallen into disuse. And now the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has had to sustain a huge slash in its appropriation, a slash that may well cripple its operation.

All of this may make the Communists and other revolutionaries happy, and all of it may make certain of our more myopic liberals happy, but I doubt that the people of this country would be happy if they were fully aware of it. The unpleasant fact is that if the House Internal Security Committee is abolished—by whatever stratagem—the Nation will have lost virtually the only functioning agency left that can gather and disseminate information of the sort that we need in order to comprehend the threat posed by those groups and their camp-followers that work to undermine this country.

We cannot, as some liberals like to tell us, "leave it to the FBI," for the simple reason that the FBI does not gather and disseminate information as does a congressional committee. It is the investigative arm of the Justice Department. It does not have the informing function that a congressional committee legitimately possesses.

No, we need a standing House Committee on Internal Security. We need to know who is working to destroy this Nation. We need to develop information in a reasoned and expert manner, a manner that can be assured only by retaining the Internal Security Committee as a standing committee with adequate staff and funds to do the job that the people want and need to have done.

MORE SUPPORT TO EASE REGRESSIVE PAYROLL TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to file my bill again with five additional cosponsors bringing the bill's total cosponsorship to 125. Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. LUKE, Mr. SHoup, and Mr. BOB WILSON of California join me in filing this legislation today.

In addition, Senator WILLIAM HATHAWAY from Maine has taken the lead in filing this bill in the Senate. It is my hope that our combined efforts will attract sufficient support to bring about a reduction in the payroll tax during tax reform. I believe there is growing sentiment in both House and Senate and among Democrat and Republican alike to submit the editorial to the CONGRESS on low- and middle-income individuals.

Last week, WBZ-TV and Radio, channel 4 in Boston, ran an editorial endorsing my bill. I am taking this opportunity to relieve the burden on the payroll tax

OVERHAULING THE PAYROLL TAX
Tax reform should soon be in the limelight again in Congress. And we'd like to

put in a strong plug for one basic change proposed by Congressman James Burke of Milton. The Burke bill, which now has 122 co-sponsors, deals with Social Security—a subject that's generally overlooked in all the talk about tax reform.

Social Security has a much better image than other government tax and service programs. So more and more we've been relying on the Social Security payroll tax to finance basic government income and health programs. And ironically the Social Security tax hits hardest at the lower income people who have the greatest need for help.

With the latest changes, Social Security takes 5.85 per cent of all your earnings up to \$13,200. So the total bite for people in that middle income range is \$772—an increase of over \$300 in the past two years. The way the system works, people in the lower income brackets pay that full 5.85 per cent on every penny they make. Upper income people pay on only a fraction of their earnings. So in essence the \$25,000 a year executive pays only a little over three per cent. At \$50,000, the effective rate falls to 1½ per cent.

Congressman Burke's bill would cut the rate to 3.9 per cent, but at the same time increase the earnings base up to \$25,000. It would also have a third of the overall Social Security paid for by a general government contribution. That would automatically shift part of the burden to the fairer income tax. We know all this is tough to grasp in a few lines. But our Editorial Department would be glad to provide you with more information if you'll drop us a card or a letter. So let's hear from you. And remember we're always ready to air opposing views.

HEARING ON THE FOOD-PRICE CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mrs. HECKLER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as I informed my colleagues last week on April 24, I recently conducted a daylong public hearing on soaring food costs and their effects on the lives of the people of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts.

Those who participated as witnesses during this hearing, which was held in Natick on April 18, were spokesmen in behalf of various diverse institutions and organizations, representing the elderly, the poor, and the middle-income segments of our society.

I am certain that my colleagues in the House will find these statements valuable as sources of not only statistical data but as personal accounts of the seriousness of the inflation problem pointing out the need for remedial action on the part of Congress:

STATEMENT OF JOAN E. SECHER, SELECTWOMAN FROM MANSFIELD, MASS.

I would like to thank you first of all for supplying this excellent forum for various testimonies throughout your Tenth Congressional District to be presented and hopefully, have some positive effects on the astronomical food prices in this area especially.

I would like first of all to read a formal letter that our Board of Selectmen in Mansfield voted upon last evening to certainly endorse your efforts in this endeavor. "Dear Mrs. Heckler, This letter is to voice our strong objection to the rise in food prices and their effect upon consumers and institutions in the Town of Mansfield. These spiraling costs have had a devastating effect

on the local economy, especially on the elderly and others with fixed incomes. The unending host of price changes daily in the area markets indicate the need for new national legislation to improve profit incentives for farmers and processors as well insuring a plentiful supply of food stuffs in line with changing consumer demands. Mansfield Board of Selection heartily endorse the efforts of your subcommittee to review your findings.

I have a few letters here that were written by Mansfield residents to certainly elaborate upon their specific problems with regard to their life styles. One that I think was particularly interesting was from a mother of six children. . . "How does the housewife of today keep her food budget within her means and yet supply her family with the same nutritious meals they were accustomed to eating?" and she does cite examples of increases in prices in her specific weekly shopping list. But, it summarizes, "with six growing children whose appetites are on the increase it is a challenge, to say the least. We are planting a vegetable garden in hopes of lessening the burden for the summer at least. However, it is our honest opinion that our government is not handling correctly the current supply and demand in the food market. What about all those acres of land that we're paying the farmer not to plant crops on? What about the greedings of the cattlemen lowering the quantity which they produce, so that demand becomes far greater than the supply? Hopefully, somebody will find a solution to the situation before we all die of starvation on the road to the poor house."

And again, not to be repetitious, certainly I think we can see the detrimental effect in all levels of society not only in the little Town of Mansfield, Massachusetts, but I think with a forum of this nature based on the variety of testimony—hopefully, when you go back to Washington, you'll have some concrete examples.

STATEMENT BY PHILIP SAPONARO, DIRECTOR OF THE SENIOR CENTER, NATICK, MASS.

Thank you Mrs. Heckler for this opportunity to articulate a little bit. You're very kind and I think you are quite timely because the problem of prices, high prices, is a problem that has plagued this nation of ours, this affluent, beautiful nation of ours, for many, many years. And I am not deluding myself that you with the wave of your little pinky hand can cure it overnight.

We are going to spur you on because Congress does need a Heckler—one which will stir up your fellow Congressmen, because I'm afraid they need a little bit of stirring up and I hope you bring back this message to the chambers when you tackle this severe problem. This problem is besetting all our senior citizens particularly, because most of them are on severely fixed incomes. At the present time, the SSI program gives a lot of them supplements up to a near moderate standard of living. That was a great step forward and just yesterday one lady came to me and thanked me with tears in her eyes for helping her with her application for Supplementary Security Income, a matter of twenty-five to thirty dollars a month extra . . . it meant that much.

Well, now, your subject this morning is food prices. Anyone that's ever walked into a food market, anyone that's ever picked up a newspaper, knows that prices are skyrocketing and everyone is shrugging their shoulders "what can we do about it." I don't know. You're looking for answers, but the fact remains, the stark real fact remains that something must be done about it no matter how drastic, no matter how unpalatable it may be to you and to me and to the rest of the country. Something must be done to hold prices within the reach of the average American. They must be held back. No matter

what we think about it or what we don't like about the methods.

The last couple of days we had a couple of group meetings at the Natick Senior Center and I discussed your letter inviting me to come here and say a few words. I told them that I appreciated this opportunity and I wanted to make this a joint effort. I would like very much for them to express a few opinions through me to you. I have about a hundred letters here which I twisted their arms to write yesterday or the day before. I'm going to leave these with you, to look at at your leisure, when you have time. Let your staff look at them also. They're all worried, worried sick.

I would like to read a paragraph from several letters, if I may.

"Dear Mrs. Heckler, as a concerned member of the Natick Council on Aging, I urge you to act on behalf of all senior citizens in the matter of escalating costs of living, particularly food and utilities. These people are on fixed incomes for the most part, and can barely eke out an existence. Today, the Department of Public Utilities of Massachusetts granted Boston Edison, another increase which will place an intolerable burden on all residents in the Boston area. Meat, the best source of protein, is not within reach of a large portion of the population, particularly the elderly. The fact that price controls were lifted from food stuffs this past week means that a declining standard of living will decline further. Sincerely, E. M. Sullivan."

I wanted you to hear that. Here's another dear little lady.

"Dear Mrs. Heckler, I, for one, thought going through the depression years was bad enough, but now its worse for my husband had to retire at 62 which doesn't give him a big social security and owning your own home is all right, but paying high taxes and paying such high prices for food—it is pretty rough on us citizens who had looked forward to our golden years to be a little nicer. Now at times we feel how can we keep going on with these outrageous prices. Every week it seems food goes up and up. How much higher can it go? It sure bothers me and any help we can be to you just call—for I am one who is concerned. Mrs. Lena Sauro."

This is a five liner, I said, "Give me anything, even five lines," and she did.

"Honorable Heckler, We find prices of food too high for persons living on a fixed income especially the elderly. I am working with the elderly who are having a hard time making ends meet. Mrs. Adams."

I think that's all I need to read. I'll give the rest to you.

STATEMENT OF FELIX JULIANI

My name is Felix Juliani, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen from the Town of Wellesley.

I would like to preface my remarks by saying that I concur wholeheartedly with testimony expressed by the previous speakers.

We are called Town Fathers, but we cannot help our family of 29,000 citizens that are all concerned with existing spiraling high prices, the unemployment that now exists, the numerous businesses that have closed, etc.

Wellesley may be labeled an affluent community—but over 10 per cent of this group are retired older people living on fixed incomes—this inflationary price runaway has left them to reduce their balanced diet and eating habits to unhealthy substitutes or foregoing meals which will—and in some cases has—affected their health. They do not have the necessary financial stability of income to compensate for these increases. Also, may I add, they do not desire and are too proud to seek help in any form or become involved within Welfare roles of the community. This also concerns the younger people starting families and attempting to pay for their homes. They too, are concerned.

All facts of concern expressed here today by previous speakers prevail throughout the country. Our Administration should show more concern for our own people in this country rather than becoming involved with selling our wheat and other commodities to other countries—apparently ignoring our economic plight.

I am an advocate that charity begins at home. Then and only then should we help other countries.

This inflationary situation has also caused mass unemployment. This ought to be reversed by instituting protective measures by export controls as early as possible. I am seriously concerned with increased property taxes and I emphasize the fact that action speaks louder than words. I sincerely hope that our Administration and Congress will give us a fair shake and I endorse your efforts completely and wholeheartedly.

A PROGRAM FOR TAX EQUITY AND ECONOMIC STABILITY—PART 2

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. ADAMS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to outline to the House of Representatives the second part of my program for Tax Equity and Economic Stability—a proposal for the establishment of economic stability through curtailment prices.

NIXONOMICS

In my view, the Nixon Administration has not done an adequate job of attending to the economy. When Mr. Nixon became President, the Consumer Price Index was rising at 4.2 percent a year and unemployment was at 3.6 percent. After 4 years in office, 2 million more workers are unemployed and inflation during 1973 increased by 8.8 percent, which is the highest annual rate of increase since 1947.

The Congress was aware that economic problems were on the horizon as President Nixon took office, and shortly thereafter passed the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, to give him discretionary powers over wages and prices to deal with those economic problems. As you may remember, the President failed to act for well over a year. A freeze can be effective when it is put on at the right time and removed at the right time.

When Mr. Nixon finally invoked some of his control authority, the country went through a series of freezes and phases that were too often applied too late and with an uneven hand. Overall after the program started the administration moved toward holding the line on wage earners while allowing business to increase prices and thus profits.

Although the administration started an effective control system under their phase II, a new Secretary of Treasury, George Shultz, was appointed and promptly began a campaign to abolish controls, which he knew Mr. Nixon inherently disliked. As columnist Clayton Fritchey has written:

The controls were so effective in reducing inflation, however, that Mr. Shultz did not prevail until early 1973. His "victory" turned into a disaster of still unknown proportions.

At the time the phase II controls were abandoned, the inflation rate was down to 3 percent annually. Then phase III arrived. What Walter Heller, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, has said of the 1969 economic era applies to phase III:

The school's out, hands-off policy announced by Mr. Nixon early in 1969 touched off a rash of price increases and let a vicious wage-price spiral propel inflation upward even while the economy was moving downward.

A year ago, when the bill granting the President discretionary wage and price control authority was up for renewal, I voted against it because the discretionary authority had been badly used. The President's discretionary authority was extended, nevertheless, and the economic turmoil of the past year confirms my position that the discretionary authority would not be properly applied.

Last Thursday, when I introduced part 1 of my tax equity and economic stability program—consisting of a payroll tax cut for wage earners and the self-employed, and a closing of some of the tax loopholes enjoyed by the wealthy and the oil industry—I set forth some statistics for the first quarter of 1974 that paint just how bleak the picture really is. I repeat them now:

The GNP has fallen at an annual rate of 5.8 percent, the largest decline since 1958.

Inflation has risen at an annual rate of 10.8 percent, the steepest rate since 1951.

The Consumer Price Index rose in March at an annual rate of 14.5 percent.

Real spendable earnings of most of the work force have dropped 4.7 percent since last March.

The prime interest rate is running at almost 11 percent, a record high.

The Federal Reserve Bank has just raised the discount rate to a record 8 percent.

Demand for housing and automobiles, two of America's largest industries, is drastically down.

Nobel Prize winning economist Paul Samuelson has referred to our economic problems as follows:

The economic experts were right in saying last spring that the U.S. was then moving into a "growth recession." Since last Easter, we shifted down from boom expansion to far below the 4 percent annual rate of real growth that is the par needed to provide jobs for a growing labor force in a technologically progressive economy. The unemployment rate is on the rise, and by next fall the odds favor its being nearer to 6 percent than 5½ percent.

The experts were right who predicted that 1974 would be a year of "stagflation"—stagnation along with serious inflation. Price increases have been accelerating and spreading. This quarter's rate of inflation is hovering just below the 10 percent level. And the end is not yet in sight. I have been talking recently with businessmen all over the land. And virtually all tell me they are panting for an upward adjustment in their prices—to compensate them for what they consider a profit-margin squeeze as their raw material costs have soared. I presume that a survey of trade-union officials would show a similar desire on the part of workers for a "catch-up" in their wages.

It is clear that the President's idea of

controls has not worked. His policies have worked neither for the consumer nor for the wage earner. Consequently, those groups want no further controls. On the other hand, businesses can hardly wait to have controls taken off so they can increase prices even higher although profits are at a record high for most of big business.

The problems with controls have been duly noted here on Capitol Hill by the House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over the soon to expire Economic Stabilization Act. After listening to the witnesses at the hearings, the committees decided against reporting a bill to extend the President's discretionary control authority.

However, with the economy reeling, it seems irresponsible to me for the Congress to take no action.

There is great danger of rampant inflation in the next 2 years if those held back try to catch up the real income they have lost to farmers in food costs, to Arabian and U.S. oil companies in fuel costs, and to other nations through devaluation which among other things is causing an increase in the cost of raw materials. If we fail to create some kind of control mechanism, I am afraid that we will see inflation destroy the purchasing power of wage earners and those living on fixed incomes—the people who have already borne the brunt of increased prices.

A PROGRAM TO ATTACK INFLATION

I am, therefore, introducing today legislation to create an independent Economic Stabilization Board to act as a monitoring agent over our economy, with the authority to institute price controls if the Board finds that they are required in order to keep inflation and unemployment within stated objectives. These objectives are to reduce inflation to an annual rate not to exceed 5 percent by the end of 1974, and 4 percent by the end of 1975; and to reduce unemployment to an annual rate of not more than 4.5 percent by the end of 1974, and 3.5 percent a year later.

Since experience has shown us we cannot give the President the authority in this area, I have provided for an independent Board.

The Board also is required to report quarterly to the Congress on the state of the economy and any controls it has instituted.

It is my hope that in limiting the scope of this bill to the direct control of prices—and not wages—we can strengthen the collective bargaining process and, most importantly, leave it in the private sector where it belongs.

As a result of the unevenly administered controls under the Nixon administration, I believe there have been unwarranted profits retained by some businesses, with the collective bargaining process not working as it should due to the restraints imposed to wages under the Economic Stabilization Act. Now the worker will have the opportunity through collective bargaining to better his lot. The employer, through his knowledge that he will not automatically be able to pass wage increases through to the consuming public, will act

as a restraining influence on wage increases.

I would like to quote extensively from an article Walter Heller has written recently, "The Untimely Flight From Controls," because I believe he outlines succinctly the problems we face:

With demand softening and shortages easing in large segments of the economy, the old rules of the marketplace would suggest that inflation is bound to moderate. And the odds are that it will—but how fast, how, far, and how firmly is another matter. And that's where a price-wage monitor with a firm statutory base is badly needed. It could play a significant role in inducing big business to break the heady habit of escalating prices and in forestalling big labor's addiction to double-digit wage advances.

Industry after industry has gotten into the habit of raising prices on a cost-justified basis as energy, food, and raw material prices skyrocketed. De-control will reinforce that habit....

Congress and the White House are taking undue risks if they rely entirely on market forces to achieve this end, especially in those large areas of the economy where competitive forces are not strong enough to protect the consumer. To serve as his ombudsman and to help prevent the picking of his pocket by a management-labor coalition, the consumer needs a watchdog agency that will bark and growl and occasionally bite. Such an agency—which could accomplish a good deal by skillful exercise of the powers of inquiry and publicity and much more if it were able to draw, sparingly, on powers of suspension and rollback when faced with gross violations and defiance—could provide substantial insurance against inflation by habit.

In addition to Mr. Heller's observations, I think it is instructive that even Dr. John T. Dunlop, Director of the Cost of Living Council, has warned of the probability of runaway inflation if certain sectors of our economy are not watched. Dr. Dunlop, who apparently has been preparing his own economic forecasts, says that the administration's economic projections are too low. He has said that the increase in prices in the second quarter "is not likely to be much different" from the torrid pace of the first quarter—the worst in 23 years. Further, Dr. Dunlop feels that the price bulge after economic restraints are lifted will be large.

As Dr. Dunlop stated in testimony before the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress:

The Federal Government must have a continuing and deep concern with the rate of inflation, even apart from the primary tools of fiscal and monetary policy. Since [mandatory] wage and price controls are not adjudged to be an effective instrument for restraining inflation in the period ahead, there should be in the government an institutional focus of concern and activity applied to particular sectors to restrain inflation.... The government can and should use its influence and leadership with private parties, and State and local governments, to restrain prices and costs and to increase productivity.

My bill gives an independent board authority to impose price controls where needed to control rampant inflation.

I submit that the country needs a watchdog over inflation. The President and his chief advisers have proven incapable of controlling inflation. Therefore, I believe it is imperative that we establish this independent watchdog agency, which will be solely devoted to

holding down the present enormous rate of inflation which is riddling our economy, soaking up our spendable income, devouring our savings, and seriously weakening our position within the international economic and political arena.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, many times, in speaking about the takeoff of prices after controls are off I can envision that this may very well be like the sign which we sometimes see at the top of that first big incline of a roller coaster. The wording is something like this: "Hold your hats but don't stand up."

Mr. Speaker, it could very well be just that serious. I am delighted to see this interest demonstrated by the gentleman from Washington.

Let me tell you that in the area of gasoline prices, the subcommittee which we are privileged to chair called Dr. Dunlop to the Hill a week or so ago. We said to him: "What did you do on each of these cost passthroughs, in 1973, on gasoline during the big climb from 28 cents to 30 cents and then on up to 50 cents? Did you ask for documentation of the justification of the cost passthroughs that were applied for?"

Then we called in the GAO who told us that nothing had been done. But then at least we had Dr. Dunlop or someone down there who had the responsibility to do something about cost passthroughs. But after midnight tomorrow night, there will be no one with any responsibility. That could very well be a sad, sad situation, and one that should concern all of us.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. I think his remarks are very well taken, and I think if we look at it in the context of the current world situation, where there are many shortages—and this has been aggravated by the devaluation of the dollar—we are going to see material costs in the United States rising, and we are going to see a continuation of the rise in prices that is going to occur because of the oil shortage, because this covers an enormous number of basic commodities.

Mr. Speaker, if there is not a monitoring agency and an ability to move into certain sections of the economy and apply controls or at least make the public aware of whether price increases are justified because of increases in material costs and not just simply because someone has control over a sector of the market, we are going to be in real trouble, and the people, as the gentleman mentions, are going to be extremely unhappy, when they awaken to this situation, with their representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman's remarks are very well taken, and I am pleased that he made his remarks today, because I had planned to do so also. I wish we could have planned on debating it at great length before the House tomorrow.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield for a final point?

Mr. ADAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the gentleman in the well and this Member may well be regarded as two voices crying out in the wilderness. But come June, July, or August or maybe September, there will be many, many others who wished they had made some comment today.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman, and that was one of the reasons I introduced the bill today, so a vehicle will be available when they decide to do the job.

DISAPPOINTMENT AT THE UNITED NATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. PODELL) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, in a most discouraging turn of events, last week the United States joined with a majority of the members of the U.N. Security Council to condemn Israel for her raids into Lebanon.

Forgotten was the fact that these raids were in retaliation for the brutal guerrilla attack by Palestinian terrorists on the Israeli town of Qiryat Shemona, in which 18 Jews were killed in coldblood. Most of them were women and young children.

Forgotten was the fact that Israel has been literally bending over backward to avoid escalation of the current fighting along the Golan Heights.

Forgotten is the fact that Israel has met the Egyptians more than halfway in attempting to work out a peace settlement.

Forgotten is the fact that the Palestinian terrorists who attacked Qiryat Shemona are supplied and armed, and given whatever succor and assistance they need by the Governments of Lebanon, Syria, and Libya.

In voting with the majority of the Security Council on this resolution condemning Israel for being so bold as to defend herself from the attacks of bloodthirsty murderers, the United States doublecrossed Israel. Our Government had stated before the resolution came up for consideration, that we would veto any resolution that was one-sided, that is, that did not equally condemn the terrorist raid on Qiryat Shemona.

To be sure, the United States put forth an alternative resolution that was even in its condemnation of both Israel and the terrorists, and this resolution was closely defeated. However, I cannot see how Israel can be condemned for acting in her self-defense. For years, terrorist raids have been launched against Israeli border settlements from Lebanon and Jordan. Israeli raids into Jordan cleaned out the terrorist encampments there, and forced the Jordanian Government to take strong action against the Palestinian terrorists. Israel's actions with regard to Lebanon were no different in nature or scope.

Every time Israel seeks to reassert her independence and sovereignty, every time she takes action to protect the lives and property of her citizens, she is roundly condemned by the Security Council. Have

they forgotten in the last 26 years that it was the United Nations who was responsible for the existence of a modern State of Israel?

The Israeli action could not be anything other than self-defense. The raids were highly limited in scope. They were not launched until days after the terrorists murdered at Quiryat Shemona. They lasted only long enough to clean out the hell-holes from which the terrorists launched their attack. They did not go any farther than the goal of teaching the terrorists the lesson that they could not move against Israel with impunity.

Had Israel's goal been other than self-defense, she would have launched a preemptive strike, or she could have carried the raids much farther into Lebanon to teach the Lebanese Government a lesson as well. I think that Israel's self-restraint under the circumstances, particularly when there were strong pressures from the survivors of the massacre to take the raids further, was quite remarkable.

I cannot understand how the United States could betray Israel on this question. Are we now so fearful of antagonizing the Arabs that we will blind ourselves to the murders committed under their auspices? Are we trying so hard to be evenhanded in the Middle East that we are in effect destroying a mutually profitable relationship with one of our firmest and most trustworthy allies?

The current state of affairs in the Middle East is not so precarious that the United States need sell out its self-respect and integrity. It is unthinkable for us to have told the Israelis that we would support them by vetoing a one-sided resolution, and then turning around and voting for a resolution that condemned only the Israelis.

If we are afraid of what the Arabs would think of us, I believe that this could do us more harm than good in our position in the Middle East. For if the Egyptian and Syrian Governments see how readily we abandon the cause of an old and trusted friend, why should they think that we will take their part with any greater consistency?

The United States is not a country whose vote in the United Nations should be sold to the highest bidder. At the very least, we should have abstained, as did Iraq and China. Neither one of those nations is particularly fond of Israel, and yet they did not vote as observers would have expected them to. Surely we could have done no less.

The vote cast by Ambassador Scali was a black mark on the record of American-Israeli relations. With that one vote, I fear we may have done more damage to the cause of peace in the Middle East than would have been done if we had kept our promise to veto the resolution. Nobody, neither Israel nor the Arabs, will want to deal with a go-between who cannot be trusted to keep promises. The respect that America has lost because of this ill-conceived vote may never be regained. And I fear that with it will be lost the ability of the United States to act as an effective in-

termediary in bringing peace to the Middle East.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 14434 TO BE OFFERED BY MR. HECHLER OF WEST VIRGINIA

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 I intend to offer the following amendment to the special energy research and development appropriation bill, H.R. 14434:

Page 2, line 21, strike the amount "\$8,935,000" and insert in lieu thereof the amount "12,835,000".

Page 2, lines 22 through 24, strike all after the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

ABC NEWS CLOSEUP

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH, Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern about the invasion of privacy by governmental agencies and corporations who have information on individuals—concern about what information is held, how it is used, and who has access to that information.

Last Thursday evening, April 25, ABC Closeup had an hour long documentary entitled "The Paper Prison: Your Government Record." Recordkeeping activities that were shown in the areas of school records, criminal arrest records, and veterans records should cause most people to wonder about what records exist on them—and how they are used.

For those who were unable to see the "Paper Prison," I am appending a copy of the transcript of that show which they will find worth reading.

I want to take this opportunity also to congratulate Mr. Paul Altmeyer, producer and writer of the script, who did an extraordinarily effective job in a visual and informative way in presenting a problem that concerns each and every one of us:

ABC NEWS CLOSEUP: THE PAPER PRISON: YOUR GOVERNMENT RECORDS

Produced and Written by: Paul Altmeyer.
Correspondent: Frank Reynolds.

PROLOGUE

Frank Reynolds. For twenty-seven years, this man was erroneously listed in FBI files as a fugitive from justice.

HARRY WACHTER: You know, it's hard to say, over the years, how this might have affected my life.

FRANK REYNOLDS. If you've ever been arrested you can be marked for life. Even though you may have been found not guilty, that crucial fact may not catch up with your arrest record at the FBI's mammoth record-keeping center... Why?

Your children's school record may contain a confidential file with information that is inaccurate and damaging.

MARK ISAACS. The only way I can be given the opportunity to challenge it is to know that it exists, and to be given access to it.

FRANK REYNOLDS. But in many states the police and other agencies have a better

chance of seeing your child's school record than you do... Why? If you're a veteran discharged before March 22, 1974, take a close look at your discharge papers, especially this one... It's called DD-214.

TONY ARGANDA. A DD-214 turns into a paper prison which a veteran has to be in for the rest of his or her life.

FRANK REYNOLDS. There's a three letter code there. You may not know what it means but prospective employers do... Why?

In the next hour, ABC News will attempt to answer these questions as we examine government records from your neighborhood school to the FBI, records that are being kept on you and your family.

PART I

FRANK REYNOLDS. We begin with the premise that all institutions, governments included, must maintain records. What we propose to examine in the next hour is—how much record-keeping is enough? Is there unwarranted and unnecessary record-keeping? ... And perhaps, most importantly, is there unauthorized access to these records?

How vast is government record-keeping?

Well, this study, an exhaustive four-year effort by the Senate Sub-committee on Constitutional Rights, and released here for the first time, will give you some indication. Senator Sam Ervin, Chairman of the Sub-committee.

Senator SAM ERVIN. They admit that they're operating 910 computer data banks which contain information about individuals. The Committee estimates that these 910 data banks contain at least one billion, fifty-two million different records.

ANNOUNCER. Document: Further findings from the Sub-committee's four-year study... The Treasury Department—names of two million coin collectors... Selective Service—files on fourteen million, eight hundred sixty thousand persons...

The Air Force—religious files on at least one million Air Force Personnel... The Small Business Administration—statements of personal history on five hundred thousand persons... Internal Revenue Service—two hundred and twenty thousand intelligence files... The White House—seven computer data banks, one containing the names of fifteen thousand, two hundred and four persons whom the President addresses by their first names.

FRANK REYNOLDS. This ABC Closeup is concerned not with the records of friends or enemies, but with the records kept by government agencies on you and your family, on a majority of Americans.

Our starting point... the neighborhood school.

JOEL CRAUSMAN, school psychologist, Montgomery County, Md. The thing about the schools, the school systems of America, is that they hold in their records and in their files the most, the vastest, the most comprehensive data bank, on every man, woman, and child educated in this country that any institution does. We make the IRS and the FBI pale by comparison.

FRANK REYNOLDS. It may well be that America's school children are the victims of the most wide-spread invasion of privacy in the country.

All school systems keep records. Many keep confidential files. We discovered that just about anything can be put into these files by just about anybody, and that often, outsiders have an easier time seeing the records than do parents.

The National Committee for Citizens in Education has just completed an extensive fifty-state study of school record keeping practices. It is released here for the first time. The Senior Associates of the Citizens' Committee, Carl Marburger and William Rioux.

WILLIAM RIOUX. There are only four states in the country where we found that specifi-

cally the state stipulates that the parents have access to those records.

CARL MARBURGER. Anyone in the school staff, including the school secretary, the principal, the superintendent, the teacher, the counselor, can put something into the record. And by being unsupervised, no one ever pulls anything out, and no one ever knows precisely what goes in, and the parent himself is often denied access to what's in the record.

FRANK REYNOLDS. ABC News examined at random school districts around the country . . . Wheaton, Maryland. Mr. and Mrs. Richard Dean, parents of two boys, discovered a confidential file at their son's school.

RICHARD DEAN. Seventy-six different items that were in at least eight different locations . . .

FRANK REYNOLDS. The Dean's case provides some insight into what goes into these files and how widely they're distributed.

Mrs. RICHARD DEAN. There were remarks in this file that related to the family, and to us as parents.

ANNOUNCER. Document: From the Dean's confidential file, a description of one of the parents . . . Quote, "tense, domineering, intelligent, perfectionist-type person."

JOEL CRAUSMAN. Any individual can write something on a piece of paper, put it into a file folder, and those comments can follow a youngster through his public school career. I have seen notes in youngsters' files which were put there by cafeteria workers.

FRANK REYNOLDS. It took the Deans more than a year to track down every item in the confidential file, and to get the school to agree to destroy them.

Mrs. RICHARD DEAN. About six months later, even though we had all the assurance of the Assistant Superintendent and all the school officials, we decided to just make a spot check . . . So we went into school and asked to see the files on all of our children. And, lo and behold, there appeared another document that supposedly had been destroyed.

JOEL CRAUSMAN. There is no real assurance that confidential files are destroyed in their entirety, when they are supposed to be. A confidential file goes where the child goes . . .

FRANK REYNOLDS. Can parents get to these files to have potentially damaging material removed? Menlo Park, California . . . These are the children of Mrs. Gladys Halperin. One of them suffers from a neurological handicap. Mrs. Halperin and a private neurologist challenge the accuracy of a psychological evaluation that has become a permanent part of the record of one of the children. It took Mrs. Halperin more than a year to gain access to this school file. She is now trying to have it expunged.

GLADYS HALPERIN. This is incorrect and it's potentially stigmatizing, and we have no assurances from the school that this information is protected.

FRANK REYNOLDS. We asked school board official, T. W. Stevens if the psychologist should share information with the parent.

T. W. STEVENS. He should share with the parents the observations that he had made, but certain terms that he would use, he would not share because they're going to be misleading.

GLADYS HALPERIN. It's necessary for psychologists to take the time to explain the full situation because parents are the ones that have the prime responsibility for the child.

CARL MARBURGER. We have built up a jargon. We have built up a cult of secrecy in the profession that we feel that the average parent cannot interpret.

MARK ISAACS. I felt a sense of outrage. The person who's described in these papers is not the boy I knew.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Perkaskie, Pennsylvania . . . This is the family of David Isaacs. An adopted eight-year-old, David was killed by an automobile just outside his home.

Court action followed, and it came to light that a confidential file had been kept on David from kindergarten through the third grade.

ANNOUNCER. From the confidential file on David Isaacs: quote, "David's feelings of superiority, if they do exist, are bolstered through parent attitudes. This could result in some negative attitudes towards school. The preceding statements are just observations."

MARK ISAACS. Balderdash . . . Because this is nonsense. I'm trying to figure out what he talked about. I tried . . . I read that . . .

FRANK REYNOLDS. Mark and Maggie Isaacs, David's step-parents.

MAGGIE ISAACS. That may be another way of saying, a negative way of saying, that we tried to give the kid pride in being an individual, being himself. He was David Isaacs. This was important.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Dr. William Keim, Superintendent of Schools, Pennridge School District.

Dr. WILLIAM KEIM. In that particular case it sounds like a psychologist, if that's who it was in a case like that who was conducting that interview, was making an observation.

MARK ISAACS. Anybody has a right to make mistakes. He can make an improper observation on my kid, your kid, anybody's kid. It goes in the record. But the thing I'm objecting to is it stays there. I should have the right to say, "This man is wrong."

Dr. WILLIAM KEIM. Do they know that? Do they know these records are completely open to them?

Well, if in our society, we issued a booklet of what everyone may do, and what is available, and what isn't available, I mean, we would end up, you know, with a Sears and Roebuck catalogue.

MARK ISAACS. There's such a thing as formal secrecy which says, no, I don't have the right, and effective secrecy, which doesn't say a word. It denies me the right by not telling me that these things exist.

A member of the school board told me that he did not think that the records of a school should be open to untutored eyes, and now, my reply to that was—everybody's eyes are untutored in most things . . . That, if I go . . . a trial by jury is a trial by twelve pairs of untutored eyes. Untutored eyes is the key to democracy.

Dr. WILLIAM KEIM. We would keep anything in the folder that we think would in any way help us guide their educational career.

MAGGIE ISAACS. I think one of the best things that parents can do about their children's records is to ask to see them in the first place, ask to see them regularly, and then challenge anything that they don't like, or don't agree with.

Mrs. RICHARD DEAN. We feel that every parent should have the right to request the removal of any material that they consider irrelevant, that has nothing to do with the educational benefits to be gained by the child.

MARK ISAACS. Something should be done legislatively . . . Not just that the parents have permission to look at the school records, but that parents have a positively expressed right.

FRANK REYNOLDS. In only twenty states do parents now have that right, and even in those twenty states, it is not always clear to which record they can gain access.

These are police records, records kept on youngsters, many of whom have not even been accused of a crime. The children are part of something called a pre-delinquent program.

These are records kept on youngsters in something called a delinquent diversion program. These records can track a child from one end of the country to the other.

These types of programs, funded by fed-

eral money, are quietly mushrooming around the country. We examined some of them in California.

The Bell Gardens, California Police Department claims it has significantly reduced the number of juveniles entering the criminal justice system. But, at the same time, it has started, within that system, a vast new file of records on many youngsters not even accused of a crime. Bell Gardens Police Chief, Ferice Childers . . .

FERICE CHILDERS. The age brackets that we deal with range from a babe in arms to a person eighteen, primarily. Everything that we do within this particular program, every action, every contact, is documented, and is entered in our computerized system of record keeping, and all the agencies here share the same files. They work together as a team.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Money for these programs comes from one of the least-known agencies of the Federal government, the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Administrator of LEAA is Donald Santarelli.

DONALD SANTARELLI. We are the last line of defense in a sense, the net which catches the foul ball only. We can't take every pitch. The pitch is to be taken by such institutions as the family, the community, the church and the school.

FRANK REYNOLDS. What is a pre-delinquent?

DONALD SANTARELLI. I'm not sure I can answer that question. That's a question you should ask an authority on juvenile delinquency. I'm managing for the Congress and the Executive branch a support program designed to make local government more responsive.

PAUL ALTMAYER. But your organization has spent fifty-five million dollars on pre-delinquency programs.

DONALD SANTARELLI. I can't answer that with any specificity.

FRANK REYNOLDS. In Orange County, twenty-one police departments refer children to this center run by the County Probation Department. At the Newport Beach Police Department, we asked Juvenile Officers Bob Hardy and Mike McEwen what kind of youngster is being recommended for this program?

Officer BOB HARDY. This could be the child who is unable to cope with maybe his physical stature, being smaller or too large or is immature for his age and is unable to cope with his age peer group, because of his immaturity.

PAUL ALTMAYER. And he need not have any police record?

Officer BOB HARDY. This is correct.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Dr. Charles Wiand, Director of the Behavior Assessment and Treatment Services Center.

Dr. CHARLES WIAND. They are not given specific, confidential information about various aspects of family conflict because it would be of little use to them, for one thing.

PAUL ALTMAYER. These progress reports . . . what do they say?

Officer BOB HARDY. A typical one will say that we have assessed the problem, that there is a sibling rivalry within the family between the brother and sister.

Dr. CHARLES WIAND. Some kind of notations are made, but it's not, in my opinion, injurious.

Officer BOB HARDY. If the juvenile moves out of the area to another jurisdiction and we, they want to take the benefit of the information that we've gathered on the subject before, and we will pass this information along.

PAUL ALTMAYER. So, if the child were to move from Newport Beach, California to Pennsylvania this record would stay then.

Officer BOB HARDY. It would stay with us until it was requested. But it would be available to them.

FRANK REYNOLDS. If your child does get in trouble with the law, a record may follow the child, even though it was supposed to have been destroyed or sealed.

ABC News examined record-keeping practices in one big-city juvenile court—Los Angeles. Most juvenile courts throughout the country, have provisions to allow a youngster who has a court record, and who then is rehabilitated, to have that record permanently sealed. But is it sealed? Robert Overton, head of Juvenile Court Services, Los Angeles.

ROBERT OVERTON. The petition is filed with the Superior Court and then an investigation is conducted, and if that investigation proves satisfactory, the Superior Court will then order the records sealed.

PAUL ALTMAYER. But does that person know all of the agencies who have a copy of that record?

ROBERT OVERTON. Not necessarily. FRANK REYNOLDS. William Hogoboom, Presiding Judge of the Los Angeles Juvenile Court.

Judge WILLIAM HOGBOOM. It's always possible that they can be other places. There is no record system that I've ever heard of that is absolutely fail-safe proof.

FRANK REYNOLDS. We also learned that when the Juvenile Court orders the Los Angeles Board of Education to seal a child's school record, the so-called sealed record is actually stored on microfilm along with unsealed records.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Do you think that that's a good policy?

Judge WILLIAM HOGBOOM. Well, it's a difficult policy for them to get back and seal the record.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Did you envision it as being on microfilm?

Judge WILLIAM HOGBOOM. Yes, I don't think it's important from my standpoint whether it's on microfilm or on . . .

PAUL ALTMAYER. With unsealed records?

Judge WILLIAM HOGBOOM. Well, I thought you indicated that there was one record, that each record was separate, but it was on microfilm . . .

PAUL ALTMAYER. No, they are mixed together, unsealed and sealed.

Judge WILLIAM HOGBOOM. Oh, no, it would be not a particularly good system.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Do you think it should be changed?

Judge WILLIAM HOGBOOM. I would think it should, yes.

PART II

FRANK REYNOLDS. If you're a veteran you have a coded number following you that you may not know about. Look at your discharge form DD-214. If you were discharged before March 22, 1974, there is a three number code in Box 11-C. It's called a Separation Program Number or "SPN." It's the coded reason for your discharge. Even if your discharge is honorable, your SPN code may hurt you.

TONY ARGANDA. One of the reasons I haven't been able to get a job in my chosen, well, in my field, electronics, is possibly because there was a number on my discharge.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Since 1967 alone, more than two hundred thousand veterans with honorable discharges have been labeled with damaging SPN numbers. There were more than five hundred such numbers. One could label you "a shirker." Another could say you had an "apathetic attitude." Another that you were a "marginal producer." Vague descriptions, but clearly unfavorable. We spoke with several honorably discharged vets around the country. Paul Cox, an ex-Marine.

PAUL COX. I got several awards. I got a Combat Gallantry Award and a whole bunch of, you know, a whole chestful of ribbons. I made Sergeant. I worked my way up. I did my job. But now I've got this SPN number 305 early separation, it says. It's something strange, "for the convenience of the govern-

ment," on my discharge paper, after supposedly serving my country well.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Some veterans feel the SPN codes were used to punish legal political activity. James Mohler won the Navy Achievement Medal in Vietnam. However, he began circulating a legal petition to Congress to end the war. Mohler was then released from the Navy early, with an honorable discharge, but was given the SPN code, 302, for "substandard personal behavior."

Representative JOHN SEIBERLING. This is a rather interesting case of Mr. Mohler. I'm looking at his reports from the Navy . . .

FRANK REYNOLDS. Congressman John Seiberling of Ohio . . .

Representative JOHN SEIBERLING. One that says RD 2 Mohler has developed very effectively as the leading radar man . . . Mohler is an outstanding RD . . . Mohler has a great deal of initiative concerning work in his rating . . . And similar complimentary statements.

Then we get to his discharge papers and they have a 302 Separation Program Number or SPN number, as it's called, and that stands for "substandard performance." And yet there's nothing in his records that show any basis for that kind of a rating.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Despite the fact that these SPN lists were clearly marked "For Official Use Only," we found major corporations use them to screen prospective employees. ABC News learned that the following corporations have SPN lists: Firestone, the Chrysler Corporation, Standard Oil of California, Republic Steel, Sperry-New Holland, Boeing, McDonnell-Douglas and Honeywell.

RENE RAMIREZ. Since certain veterans have honorable discharges and have adverse SPN codes, employers tend to look, only look, at the SPN codes because the SPN codes give you the actual reason for discharge.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Rene Ramirez was a company commander in both Korea and Vietnam. A disabled veteran, winner of the Purple Heart, he has just completed law school, where he did an intensive study of SPN codes.

RENE RAMIREZ. When you had weak charges against a man, that you knew the charges would not sustain a court martial, and you didn't want him to see a lawyer, so what we would do is we would offer the man a general discharge, coerce him into accepting the general discharge, and get him out of the service that way. Now, the reasons we put down on their paper work, for their discharge, would be coded, when they were out of the service and put on their DD-214's. And they're carrying these numbers around now, and some of them don't even know what these numbers mean or why they were given to them.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Isn't the Army really using a SPN number to punish a man?

Col. VICTOR DEFIORI. That's not the intent, no, sir.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Is that the effect?

Col. VICTOR DEFIORI. It's not the intent. It may be the effect.

FRANK REYNOLDS. We asked the Pentagon for a response and on March 14, 1974, spoke with Colonel Victor DeFiori.

Col. DeFiori, why does the Department of Defense need SPN numbers?

Col. VICTOR DEFIORI. You must realize that for the past five or six years, the Department of Defense has been discharging about nine hundred thousand men and women per year. So we face the dilemma of trying to recognize meritorious service. And when we do recognize meritorious service, we are forced to at least acknowledge that some men and women do not perform meritorious service.

FRANK REYNOLDS. During the course of our investigation into SPN numbers, and after we had questioned Colonel DeFiori, the Defense Department announced it would stop placing SPN codes on a veteran's DD-214 form. We returned to the Pentagon and spoke with General Leo Benade.

General Benade, why is it now possible to drop the SPN codes, when only last month Col. DeFiori told us it was necessary to keep them?

Gen. LEO BENADE. I think it's a good illustration, Mr. Reynolds, of a system that was well intended, and for good reasons. But it became so painfully apparent that we were not succeeding in explaining the system, and a great deal of misinformation was flying about.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Do you still believe, then, General Benade, that it was a good system, that you merely had difficulty in, as you say, explaining it?

Gen. LEO BENADE. Anything that hurts people—and there is no question the other system did hurt some—this was never intended as such I can assure you. The military services have no desire to be vindictive or to pursue a veteran who has departed service. By May first, we hope to be set up everywhere with proper instructions out, and everyone trained, and then every veteran who desires to have a new form 214 be issued to him, need only apply to his parent service.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Congressman Edward Koch of New York has been one of the leading congressional critics of SPN numbers.

Representative EDWARD KOCH. The Department says that a veteran who has a SPN number on his discharge paper now, if he submits it, they will replace it with a new discharge paper. We think that there will be tens of thousands of veterans who are unaware of the SPN numbers and who will not make the effort and who will go through life stigmatized. And therefore Congressman Aspin and myself have requested the Pentagon to issue new papers to every veteran, and all of these discharges since 1955 bear SPN numbers, so they should all be replaced—automatically.

FRANK REYNOLDS. More than eleven million veterans have been honorably discharged since 1960. It is estimated that more than half a million of them still carry bad SPN numbers on their records.

PART III

Attorney General WILLIAM SAXBE. I had a lawyer come in from Columbus for a convention of some kind, and he got in some difficulty with the police, and when they took him to the police station—he was drunk and disorderly—asked for his name, and he told them that he was William B. Saxbe, the Attorney General of Ohio. And even though he had other cards in his pocket, they booked him that way. I had a dickens of a time getting my name off that docket, the police blotter.

Chief JOSEPH McNAMARA, Kansas City Police Department. We're aware of the concerns about privacy and we're staying on top of that problem. We would hate to see the police utilization of the computer curtailed. And I think we very much agree with FBI Director Clarence Kelley's stand that criminal records must be open to law enforcement officers for purposes of assisting in investigations of crimes.

FBI Director CLARENCE KELLEY. And I hold up as an example of effective, fair, and efficient multi-state and federal cooperation on a criminal justice information system, the National Crime Information Center. . . .

FBI Tour Guide. Approximately a hundred and twenty-thousand inquiries will come to us each day. . . .

FRANK REYNOLDS. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is the largest known repository of arrest information in the world. The FBI's Identification Division alone contains more than twenty million arrest records. But many of these records do not contain the disposition of the case—whether the person was found guilty or not guilty, or had the charges dropped or dismissed. These manual records move freely between the FBI and the nation's police departments, state and local

licensing agencies, and in some cases—although they are not supposed to—to credit agencies and private businesses.

Now, the FBI has collected about five hundred thousand computerized arrest records at its National Crime Information Center. By 1984, the FBI expects to have five million computerized arrest records, and any one of these will be available to thousands of police departments in five seconds.

HARRY WACHTER. Now, since 1947, it's hard to say how many jobs I might have lost . . .

FRANK REYNOLDS. Harry Wachter, an insurance salesman, moved from Arkansas to Virginia in 1947. An Arkansas associate thought Wachter ran out on a business deal, and swore out a warrant for Wachter's arrest. It was a misunderstanding. The warrant was then withdrawn. But it was only last year that Wachter discovered that that crucial fact had not been entered on his record for nearly thirty years.

HARRY WACHTER. A report came back stating that there was an FBI record that I was a fugitive from justice back in 1947, and nothing else was said on the FBI report. I have this record from the Arkansas Police Department, and it says, "We show no records whatsoever on this man."

It seems to be like, if the FBI gets a report that I have been arrested for a specific, for a definite matter, that they should have followed through with a disposition.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Professor Alan Westin headed a National Academy of Sciences project which studied the National Crime Information Center.

ALAN WESTIN. The courts themselves are in a morass as far as effective record keeping practices are concerned, so that the, very frequently, police departments and courts having other priorities and being under a great deal of pressure simply do not keep these dispositions properly reported and keep them up to date.

FRANK REYNOLDS. The FBI places full responsibility for the accuracy of its arrest information on state and local police departments. But surveys show that up to twenty percent of state files are inaccurate or outdated.

Producer Paul Altmeyer and I spoke with FBI Director Clarence Kelley.

Mr. Kelley, most of us, I think have the impression of the FBI as a super efficient organization. Why is it not possible for you to include disposition of arrests and charges made against people on records that are submitted around the country, to these various law enforcement agencies?

CLARENCE KELLEY. I'm very thankful that you make the statement that we're reputed to be super efficient, and I assure you that when we get a disposition, we do put it on the man's record. But we have had extreme difficulty in getting anywhere near one hundred percent compliance with our request that all dispositions come in. The law enforcement organizations just simply do not respond as they should.

ANNOUNCER. A study of the FBI's National Crime Information Center . . . from a letter from the Comptroller General of the United States . . . Quote, "Data is not available to indicate how computerized criminal information history has been used."

CLARENCE KELLEY. Yes, there is some dispute as to the security and to the breadth of the information within that data bank which is under some dispute.

FRANK REYNOLDS. What can you do about it?

CLARENCE KELLEY. I think that there should be, of course, a recognition of individual rights, and you should confine yourself to that information which is helpful in the performance of your duty as a law enforcement person.

FRANK REYNOLDS. But is it your view that mainly a record of serious crimes or serious offenses should be kept, let's say, in the NCIC?

CLARENCE KELLEY. In the NCIC, they are serious crimes.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Well, how serious is a serious crime, Mr. Kelley?

CLARENCE KELLEY. May I, in this event, ask an authority to answer it, and Mr. Wason Campbell is the Assistant Director in charge of our computer operations. And would you answer that, Mr. Campbell?

WASON CAMPBELL. I'd be happy to. Yes, the offenses, of course, are . . . it is limited to serious offenses.

PAUL ALTMAYER. It's my understanding that there are four hundred and twenty crimes under serious crimes, and these include such things as non-support and non-payment of alimony. Is that true?

WASON CAMPBELL. They are there yes, now. We are in the process of looking at the offenses which should be included, or to put it another way, offenses that perhaps should not be.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Massachusetts created a Privacy and Review Board to screen the information in its own system, after it discovered more than seventy-five state and private agencies, and other individuals, had access to criminal history records. We spoke with Governor Francis Sargent who has refused to allow his state to share criminal history information with the FBI until safeguards are built into the system.

GOV. FRANCIS SARGENT. We found a number of mayors that were directly going to the records. We found local housing authorities that were going directly to the record, a variety of different insurance companies in Massachusetts could go directly to the records, and all sorts of credit companies. And I don't think this is what criminal history records are all about.

FRANK REYNOLDS. What were the mayors going to the records for?

GOV. FRANCIS SARGENT. I can't understand. I can't understand why they would or why they should.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Well, these records really are a potential source of blackmail, aren't they?

GOV. FRANCIS SARGENT. They are conceivable, yes.

FRANK REYNOLDS. The case of Bill McLain, a former administrative assistant to Congressman Barry Goldwater, Jr., has amazed McLain and Goldwater, and has puzzled the FBI. McLain returned with us to this Los Angeles Federal Building, where he and Congressman Goldwater had earlier been invited to the FBI Field Office. The then Special Agent in Charge, Wesley Grapp, asked McLain for his driver's license number and punched it into a terminal.

BILL MC LAIN. And to my great shock and amazement, back out of that teletypewriter came a long laundry list of my whole life's history. It listed specific things like where I'd lived.

I lived in San Diego and San Francisco and here in Los Angeles; had every address while I was in school; every address, apparently since I was eighteen years old; had my wife's background, where she had lived; my children, where they were born and where they lived; it had information about, detailed information about my education; it had information regarding my military activity which I was even more surprised to see, because military service jackets are supposed to be confidential information; it had information about government loans, which, again, by statute, are supposed to be confidential; it had information about my California driver's, driving history.

Representative BARRY GOLDWATER, JR. (R-CAL.) : I was impressed by the thoroughness and efficiency of the FBI in the job that they have to do, but it wasn't until later that it really struck home, and I really sat down and started thinking about the implications of the computerability of the FBI or any agency of the government.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Now it is proper for the FBI to have all of this information?

CLARENCE KELLEY. Where did this information come from?

PAUL ALTMAYER. That's the question.

CLARENCE KELLEY. I mean, but where? Over some sort of a computer network?

FRANK REYNOLDS. Yes.

CLARENCE KELLEY. Well, I frankly don't see how anything like that could possibly come over our computer network.

WASON CAMPBELL. That just could not be. We do not have that kind of information. It is not computerized. And the story is a bad one.

Representative BARRY GOLDWATER, JR. The Bill McLain incident fired the, or fueled the fire that made me convinced that we in the Congress need to establish standards and regulation to prevent the potential abuse.

WASON CAMPBELL. I will be pleased to pursue it and show you wherein it has no basis.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Does a data bank such as that exist, with information on it, such as that?

WASON CAMPBELL. I do not know that.

CLARENCE KELLEY. I'm not going to say that it's not true, but I'm going to say that it is highly unlikely.

FRANK REYNOLDS. We went back to McLain and Congressman Goldwater and told them of the FBI's reaction. Congressman Goldwater then wrote to us: "Let me once again verify the tour. An extensive list of information came back. Amongst the information was his driving record, some historical data on his wife, and information on a contested will." We then again contacted the FBI. They said such information is not stored at the NCIC, adding that—quote—"We have no explanation for the basis of their claim."

Prof. ALAN WESTIN: If you think about all the files that are kept by the criminal justice and law enforcement agencies, one way to think about it is that it's kind of an hors d'oeuvres tray of information. Depending on who you are in the criminal justice system, and what kind of access you have, you can pick and choose what kind of information you want to get.

FRANK REYNOLDS. In researching this ABC Closeup, and prior to filming, Associate Producer Richard Gerda, visited the FBI's computer center where he saw one drawer on a computer program file, labeled "Security Index." When ABC News went back to film, the label had been removed. It is the middle drawer on the right.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Mr. Kelley, what is the "Security Index?"

CLARENCE KELLEY. The Security Index is a listing of persons who may well be considered as possible security subjects or who have been convicted of security violations.

PAUL ALTMAYER. How many people are on that list?

CLARENCE KELLEY. I do not know. There is nothing ominous about it at all. It is just that within the organization there is a classification of various offenses.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Does one have to have a criminal conviction to make the Security Index?

CLARENCE KELLEY. No . . . no . . . no.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Who makes the judgment, then, Mr. Kelley? Is it sufficient . . . ?

CLARENCE KELLEY. Well, of course, you're in . . . actually, the determination as to whether or not a person is a suspect in this type of thing is one wherein it, it goes through several levels, from the agent who first has the information through the supervisor through the assistant agent in charge, on through to people here at the Bureau. We realize that sometimes this has an impact which is not warranted by actual facts. And we're looking this over. As a matter of fact we're looking over the entire security field, to bring it more in line with, with the observance of the rights and privileges of people. We should not be a part of anything that might put a taint on a person carelessly.

And I'll admit that, well, this may have been the impact but it certainly wasn't the intention.

FRANK REYNOLDS. After this interview, the FBI informed us Director Kelley had been in error. The FBI says that the Security Index was discontinued in 1971, and that the computer program file contained blank cards. The Security Index listed those people who would be arrested and interned in the event of war or "an internal security emergency."

ABC News examined the computerized record keeping system of one big city police department, Kansas City, Missouri.

Project Alert, as it's known, is considered one of the leading police computer systems in the country.

Designed as a municipal system, by then Police Chief Clarence Kelley, it has grown into a vast regional network, covering about ten thousand square miles of western Missouri and eastern Kansas. It links local, county, state and federal law enforcement agencies. We inquired about information gathered on four categories of persons—"mentals," "militants," "activists" and "associates." Melvin Bockelman, Manager of the Project Albert Computer System.

MELVIN BOCKELMAN. "Militants" . . . I think we have to recognize that we've gone through some trying times in our history. And during this period when the crime indices were rising back in the 1960's, they were very active, and it was considered useful information to computerize this.

PAUL ALTMAYER. But a "militant" need not have been convicted of a crime?

MELVIN BOCKELMAN. No, that is correct.

FRANK REYNOLDS. In the course of ABC News' examination of Project Alert, persons classified as "mentals," "militants," or "activists" were removed from the computer. Kansas City's new Police Chief, also established a committee to review on a monthly basis, information stored in the Project Alert computers . . . Chief Joseph McNamara. . .

CHIEF JOSEPH MCNAMARA. One example that comes to mind is that the hospitals had requested that we keep certain information on people who had received treatment for mental problems, and mental disorders. Now, we had an embarrassing situation when we discovered that, inadvertently, these people had been listed as escapees from mental institutions, when, in fact, that was not true at all. And so we just purged all of that information from the computer. The initial tendency of course, is to put in all of the information, feeling that we're using it for a legitimate and beneficial purpose of public protection.

FRANK REYNOLDS. This is a "Field Identification Card." It is made out by Kansas City Police on someone called an "associate." It contains room for more than two hundred fifty personal entries. We rode one night with Sgt. Gary Schmidt, and asked about the "Field Identification Card."

SGT. GARY SCHMIDT. If I stop a car out here, like this car right ahead of me here, and find out that he is a convicted felon, we have a procedure whereby we fill out an FIC card, stating where we stopped him, what he was doing, and the associates that were with him.

PAUL ALTMAYER. A convicted felon is supposed to associate only with law-abiding citizens. Isn't it creating a stigma on a law-abiding citizen?

SGT. GARY SCHMIDT. Well, not really, I don't think. I don't think it creates a stigma on the law-abiding citizen. . . .

PAUL ALTMAYER. . . . to be known as an associate of a convicted felon?

SGT. GARY SCHMIDT. Yes . . . like I said, I don't know whether this information, when it goes into the computer, but if it would go into the computer, and the man that was riding in the car had never been arrested or never had a record, I don't think I would condone that.

FRANK REYNOLDS. In the course of ABC News' examination, the information gathered on "associates," persons perhaps not convicted or even accused of any crime, was removed from the computer. But we discovered that the records on "associates" are still maintained in written form here at the department's Criminal Intelligence Center. Chief McNamara. . . .

CHIEF JOSEPH MCNAMARA. We feel that this is appropriate for law enforcement to do things like this, to have certain information. We have a great need to know about certain information even though it's not based on past criminal convictions.

FRANK REYNOLDS. The second area we examined—the security of the Kansas City system. This is Lenexa, Kansas. In 1970, the Lenexa Police Department joined the Kansas City Police Department's Project Alert. The then police chief went to major businesses and apartment house owners and offered to check out prospective employees and tenants for criminal history records. At least thirty-two people were barred from working or living in Lenexa. Former Lenexa Police Chief, David Gellatly.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Were you reprimanded by the Kansas City Police Department?

DAVID GELLATLY. No.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Was any suggestion ever made that Lenexa would be removed from Project Alert?

DAVID GELLATLY. No, sir.

ANNOUNCER. Document: Testimony from Clarence Kelley at his confirmation hearing as Director of the FBI, commenting on the Lenexa incident.

Quote . . . "he was reprimanded for that and they were advised that any further such violation would mean that the terminal would be taken away from the Lenexa Police Department."

FRANK REYNOLDS. Mr. Kelley, you say that disciplinary action was taken against the officer?

FBI Director CLARENCE KELLEY. Yes, sir.

FRANK REYNOLDS. He says nothing happened to him at all.

CLARENCE KELLEY. Is that right?

FRANK REYNOLDS. Yes.

CLARENCE KELLEY. Well, it was my understanding that disciplinary action was taken against him, and, furthermore, that the terminal in that department, was—the Chief was informed that if there be any such activity persist that they would be removed from the line.

I was not party to the reprimand nor to any disciplinary action, so unquestionably you are right, and just that I was given the wrong information.

PAUL ALTMAYER. Did you continue the practice after that?

DAVID GELLATLY. If someone asked, yes, we'd do it. But due to the publicity, the apartment—you have to keep in mind that the apartment managers caught some heat over this—also—so consequently our requests for this type of information virtually came to a halt.

PAUL ALTMAYER. But if the request were made, you would continue to do it?

DAVID GELLATLY. That's correct.

FRANK REYNOLDS. The Attorney General of Kansas ruled, in this decision, that under Kansas law, the Lenexa Police Department could give out this information legally, even though it was a clear violation of the rules of Project Alert. This is a vivid indication of legal and procedural problems that occur when police computer systems spread across state boundaries.

The weakest link in the security of any computer system is the human element. On two separate occasions, ABC News was able to gain access to a Project Alert Computer terminal and punch into the computer. While a violation of Police Department rules, it is not a violation of the law. Producer Paul Altmayer explains . . .

PAUL ALTMAYER. We asked the Jackson

County Prosecutor only for permission to film around his office. We made contact with a middle level official in the prosecutor's office and convinced him to let us use their computer terminal. We did this twice, at 8:00 a.m. when the office was nearly empty. We learned the code to the computer with relative ease. We gained access to information in it with even greater ease.

FRANK REYNOLDS. The information on the computer printout is clearly labeled "For Official Use Only Within The Criminal Justice System." As a test, Altmayer punched in the name of Kansas City Mayor Charles Wheeler.

His criminal history record showed he had been twice guilty of violating the Kansas City dog ordinance. We informed both Mayor Wheeler and Police Chief McNamara that we had gained access to the computer.

CHIEF JOSEPH MCNAMARA. Well, we . . . we will take this and trace it back to the terminal in which it was used and determine whether or not it was a violation of . . . of the standards which we set. But this kind of a violation we would take direct action against and we can trace this back to see who was operating the terminal and why, in fact, that was done. Now, sometimes we can do things like this as a test, but you yourself punched this in?

PAUL ALTMAYER. Yes.

CHIEF JOSEPH MCNAMARA. I see. Well, we can trace this back and find out who allowed you to do this and if they allow anything like this to occur again, we would cut off their access to the computer.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Only a warning was issued to the prosecutor's office. No further action was taken.

Later, we learned the prosecutor, himself, had the terminal removed because of "light usage" and "difficulty in maintaining security control." No subscriber has ever been removed from the Project Alert system for a security violation. For that matter, no subscriber has ever been removed from the FBI's National Crime Information Center for a violation.

EPILOGUE

Prof. ALAN WESTIN. The right to privacy is the right of each individual to decide what information about himself or herself should be shared with others.

Representative BARRY GOLDWATER. It's not a partisan issue. It's something that all Americans should be concerned about.

FRANK REYNOLDS. Understandably most of us feel rather helpless in the face of all these records, wondering what's in them and most importantly who has access to them.

Tonight we examined only some of the government files on us—you and me—and we have discovered there are some things that can and must be done.

Congress is now considering legislation to establish tighter controls over arrest records, the information on those records and who has access to them. This legislation is long overdue. Technology has made it far too easy to collect information. Technology, however, has not improved the accuracy of such information.

We asked law enforcement officials who is a pre delinquent. We received no satisfactory answer . . . perhaps because there is none.

Clearly, there is an urgent need for Congress to investigate the record-keeping practices of these so-called "pre delinquent" programs.

If you're a parent demand to know what's in your child's school record and who has access to it.

The states must guarantee parents legal access to their own children's school records and at the same time protect the confidentiality of those records.

During the course of our investigation we've seen some official changes take place. The Defense Department abolished those SPN numbers. But there are still half a million veterans tainted with unfavorable num-

bers. The Defense Department has a responsibility to inform them.

Just two days ago a federal court ruled that the FBI has the responsibility to expunge the record of a person who has been detained by the police and then exonerated.

The decision was a wise one and a first step in bringing legal order to a bureaucratic nightmare.

Government must maintain records. But no government, no police department, no school system, no armed service has any right or legitimate reason to brand any citizen without the citizen's full knowledge.

In the end the purpose of government record-keeping should be to protect, not restrict, the citizen's rights.

This is Frank Reynolds. Good night.

CREDITS—THE PAPER PRISON: YOUR
GOVERNMENT RECORDS

Produced by: Paul Altmeyer.

Directed and Photographed by: Dick Roy.

Written by: Paul Altmeyer.

Correspondent: Frank Reynolds.

Associate Producer: Richard Gerdau.

Film Editors: William P. Thompson and James Franagan.

Production Associates: Paula Borger and Bernadette Carey.

Sound: David Blumgart.

Program Controller: Don MacLleod.

Director of Operations: David Buksbaum.

MR. SAXBE'S ATTITUDES

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of attacks on Attorney General William Saxbe. Some of these are from individuals who are well informed. Some are from the liberal elements of the press which may be prejudiced.

Those of us on Capitol Hill who know Mr. Saxbe and have worked with him know that he has a good background of moderation in government. He is new to his present work but he possesses the courage of his convictions. It is my impression that Mr. Saxbe is a down-to-earth individual who wants the Nation's laws enforced and who believes in apprehending and punishing criminals.

It is regrettable that a law-and-order man, who seeks law enforcement and who does not believe in pampering lawbreakers, automatically becomes subject to criticism from quarters where more concern is held for those accused of crime than for the victims. It would appear that instead of declaring Mr. Saxbe fair game, almost before the ink is dry on his commission, the critics would have the good grace to wait to see how the man performs in his new responsibilities.

IMPEACHMENT DEMONSTRATION

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matters.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the impeachment demonstration of the past weekend seems something of a bust. We do not know who organized and paid for it, but it was, to some extent, a small-scale rehash of antiwar demonstrations and the abortive May Day protest. There was a sprinkling of the same professional organizers. There were many young people

on a lark. The whole thing was laced with pot and beer. It was hardly a genuine outpouring of public sentiment. But it gave the press something to get excited about.

FAIRCHILD'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY, CRESTVIEW, OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLA.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, Crestview and Okaloosa County celebrated the 10th anniversary of the Fairchild Industries plant in Crestview on April 15. The groundbreaking 10 years ago marked a proud occasion of a nationally known and important industry becoming part of the Okaloosa County Industrial Complex. The 10th anniversary was a happy recognition that Fairchild Industries had been an important member of Okaloosa County's vital growth pattern. Present with us at Crestview for the 10th anniversary celebration were Mr. Edward G. Uhl, president of Fairchild Industries and many others who were also present on the first day of Fairchild's Aircraft Service Operational Division in Crestview. Officiating at the 10th anniversary were Crestview's mayor, George Whitehurst, and Cecil Anchors, clerk of the circuit court.

The occasion was sponsored by the Crestview Chamber of Commerce whose president is Pace Allen, joined by other Okaloosa County Chambers of Commerce, with the active support of the city and county officials and business communities of the county.

Fairchild Industries is, of course, one of America's 500 largest corporations with plants in many States. However, I do not feel that any Fairchild facility has become more a part of the community than at Crestview. Fairchild currently employs close to 500 people who are friends and neighbors to us all. The work performed at Crestview by the employees is vital to our Nation's defense and important to every taxpayer in the savings and defense dollars by extending the useful life of military aircraft.

Through Fairchild hangar doors at Crestview have passed more than 1,300 aircraft of many different types. All have received the highest quality inspection and repair, returning to useful service in almost better than new condition. Cargo aircraft, fighters, and trainers have all received the outstanding attention and efforts of the Fairchild people here.

Because of our good climate, our living conditions and opportunities, the Aircraft Division has attracted top flight personnel, many of them former members of the armed services whose military careers were devoted to aircraft maintenance. Today the division has the talent and resources to offer complete maintenance, repair, modification, and design service to the military and civilian fleet operators.

More than a good neighbor, Fairchild has contributed strongly to the economic growth and prosperity of the area. For example, Fairchild's payroll alone dur-

ing its years in Crestview has been more than \$25 million. Last year Fairchild's Crestview employees received more than \$3½ million.

But beyond the paychecks are many other areas in which the local business community is benefiting. Let me point out just a few of these ways in which this fine company is contributing to the better future for Crestview and Okaloosa County. Fairchild just this year paid out more than \$150,000 for hospital and medical care for employees through their health insurance plan. Fairchild has also paid to Okaloosa County more than \$600,000 in bond payments on its lease at Crestview. Fairchild's phone bill last year was more than \$58,000 and it used more than \$80,000 in electrical power. The company is spending \$30,000 for guard services each year. To maintain the employment rate as necessary to fulfill its Government contracts, Fairchild spends more than \$7,000 in classified advertising in local newspapers each year. I could state many other statistics but the important thing is to note that all local businesses and all of our community programs have benefited directly or indirectly because of Fairchild Industries selecting the Okaloosa area in which to do its business.

We certainly look forward to many more anniversaries of success for Fairchild Industries and to the same warm spirit of cooperation of plant and community.

The first employee was hired at Crestview facility February 22, 1964. His name is Lee Showers, aircraft mechanic/leadman, and he is still employed at the facility. Seventeen of the original employees remain from May 25, 1964.

It will be interesting to note that more than 1,329 aircraft have received modifications or modernizations during the 10-year period. These include a wide range of aircraft from the C-123 cargo aircraft to the F-105 fighter bomber as well as helicopters, interceptors, and trainers.

CONTINUATION OF CONTROLS

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the upward trend of prices on everything the American people must have just to survive is the sharpest in history; at a time when prices are at a high level we would not have dreamed just 18 months ago, we are now just 1 day short of letting die the only hope we have for keeping prices in line.

I would be the last person to suggest that the Cost of Living Council has met even modest success in controlling prices. I would be the last to suggest that the Economic Stabilization Act, under which the Council operates, is strong enough medicine for dealing with our inflationary ills. But they are all we have and we are within just a few hours of losing them.

Three-dollar-a-pound beef is already with us. The parent who buys his little child a pair of school shoes will not get any change now from a \$10 bill. Gasoline prices are up 50 percent over a year

ago; propane, the only fuel available in many rural communities for heating and cooking, is 300 percent higher than last year. Hot dogs and hamburgers have become delicacies for large numbers of American families when they can be afforded. The \$1 loaf of bread may yet become a reality. The rate at which preferred customers can borrow money has now passed 10½ percent. The average middle class American, if he can get a loan, must pay more.

The Economic Stabilization Act and its administrative agency, the Cost of Living Council, have a poor track record for holding these prices down. But if they are permitted to pass out of existence tomorrow, American consumers will be left alone and unprotected against the merciless onslaught of skyrocketing prices.

Strict price and wage controls are a strong and expensive medicine. But runaway inflation is a cancerous disease this country cannot afford. An immediate and total freeze on prices and wages seems to be totally indicated, to remain in effect at least until this Nation can regain its economic equilibrium.

But since the jurisdictional committees in neither House of Congress has recognized the urgent need for aggressively facing up to the price crisis, the next best thing seems to be an extension of the Economic Stabilization Act in some form and a reprieve of the Cost-of-Living Council under some name.

This action should be overwhelmingly supported in both Houses of Congress before midnight, April 30.

I understand that the other body is now ready to pass the substance of the so-called Muskie-Stevenson bill and send it to the House. This bill is by no means equal to meeting the emergency that now confronts us, especially with certain language it now contains. That bill, S. 3352, on page 3, lines 11 through 17, states that nothing in this act authorizes the continuation, imposition or reimposition of mandatory economic controls except those presently exercised under the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act. This language should be removed. While it does not specifically prohibit invoking economic controls, it has the effect of denying that such controls are necessary. Millions of Americans who are today paying outrageous prices for everything they buy will not deny that they need the protection of price and wage controls and rollbacks in prices.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to provide for a 1-year program of mandatory controls over prices, wages, rents, and interest rates. In so doing, I realize that such a proposal will not be enthusiastically received in all quarters. But enactment of such a bill will be popularly accepted by housewives and other shoppers who find that each trip to the marketplace under existing conditions of spiraling prices costs more than did the previous trip. Wage earners, who may not receive the increases they now seek, will come to understand that putting the brakes on skyrocketing prices will relieve them from the constant clamor for more and more money just to remain even. Any wage increases that have been granted in the past year of galloping inflation have turned out to

be meaningless; for the most part they have been absorbed by higher prices.

So, what I recommend and what I urge the Congress to do is, first, accept the Muskie-Stevenson proposal for keeping an eye on prices and acquiring all possible economic information for intelligently dealing with inflation. The second and most important step is for the Congress to move immediately to pass legislation to require the President to invoke a program of mandatory price and wage controls.

It has been reported that at the present rate of inflation, the purchasing power of every dollar laid away for emergencies will decline to zero in 10 years. Those persons who have bought Series E Bonds will have nothing to show, in terms of purchasing power, for their investment after paying taxes on interest derived from the bonds. Real estate investments—that is, the homes wage earners scrape and slave to purchase—will, after ten years, at the present rate of inflation double in price. But after paying the capital gains tax on the sale of this property ten years from now, the money derived from such sale will have less purchasing power than when the investment was made. Interest on the mortgage will further reduce this asset.

Something must be done to halt this terrible onslaught of inflation. Strict price and wage controls are not very much appreciated by anybody. Nobody except the people who find themselves slipping farther behind each payday when the paycheck is worth less and less as we struggle along without controls.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. STUCKEY (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. BAFALIS (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for week of April 29, on account of illness in family.

Mr. DEVINE (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today through May 1, 1974, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. FINDLEY (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for 1 week, on account of official business in the Middle East.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RANDALL, for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN), to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WYMAN, for 30 minutes, on April 29.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, for 30 minutes, on May 7.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TRAXLER) and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ST GERMAIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ADAMS, for 30 minutes, today.
Mr. PODELL, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. YATES, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KOCH, to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$836.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GILMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEMP in five instances.

Mr. HANRAHAN.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in three instances.

Mr. ARCHER.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. MINSHALL of Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida in two instances.

Mr. WALSH.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. SYMMS in three instances.

Mr. HEINZ in three instances.

Mr. LANDGREBE in 10 instances.

Mr. GUYER.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. BURKE of Florida.

Mr. KETCHUM.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. FREY.

Mr. HUDNUT.

Mr. BRAY in three instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI in three instances.

Mr. ROUSSELOT in two instances.

Mr. COUGHLIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. TRAXLER) and to include additional matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. WALDIE in three instances.

Mr. GUNTER in three instances.

Mr. MATHIS of Georgia.

Mr. LEHMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. HARRINGTON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. STEED.

Mr. O'HARA.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mrs. MINK.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts.

Mr. SYMINGTON.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. GIAIMO in 10 instances.

Mr. BRASCO in 10 instances.

Mr. REUSS in five instances.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa in three instances.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the follow-

ing title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 9492. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Chattooga River, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9492. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by designating the Chattooga River, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 30, 1974, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2241. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting reports of the number of officers on duty with Headquarters, Department of the Army, and detailed to the Army General Staff on March 31, 1974, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 3031(c); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2242. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for July 1973 through February 1974, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(d); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2243. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the third annual report of the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1763(f); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2244. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed amendment to a concession contract authorizing the continued provision of facilities and services for the public in Grand Teton National Park for a term ending December 31, 1975, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 17b-1; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2245. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an application by the Central Nebraska Public Power and Irrigation District, Holdrege, Nebr., for a loan and grant under the Small Reclamation Projects Act, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 422d(c); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2246. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 61st Annual Report of the activities of the Department of Commerce, covering fiscal year 1973, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1519; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2247. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Population Affairs, transmitting a revision in the previously submitted third annual re-

port on family planning services and population research; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2248. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the seventh report of activities under the High Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965, covering the year ended September 30, 1973, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1640; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2249. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States, transmitting the annual report for calendar year 1973 on applications for court orders made to Federal and State courts to permit the interception of wire or oral communications, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2250. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1973; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2251. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the first annual report on ocean dumping and other man-induced changes to the ocean ecosystems, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 1441 and 1442(c); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RECEIVED FROM THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

2252. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on alternative courses of action available to the Air Force for the strategic manned bomber; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2253. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the use of revenue sharing funds by 250 local governments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of April 25, 1974]

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 14368. A bill to provide for means of dealing with energy shortages by requiring reports with respect to energy resources, by providing for temporary suspension of certain air pollution requirements, by providing for coal conversion, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1013). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted April 29, 1974]

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H.R. 13834. A bill to provide standby emergency authority to assure that the essential energy needs of the United States are met, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 93-1014). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Ms. BOGGS, Ms. BURKE of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. ECKHART, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. POBELL, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. VANDER VEEN, and Mr. Charles WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 14435. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the privacy of individual's records maintained by Federal

agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 14436. A bill to create an Economic Stabilization Board to establish objectives and standards governing imposition of price controls after April 30, 1974, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 14437. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to reduce and then repeal the credit against the minimum wage which is based on tips received by tipped employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BOGGS:

H.R. 14438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. LUKE, Mr. SHOUPE, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.R. 14439. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for Federal participation in the costs of the social security program, with a substantial increase in the contribution and benefit base and with appropriate reductions in social security taxes to reflect the Federal Government's participation in such costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 14440. A bill to amend section 401 of the Social Security Amendments of 1972 to permit any State to utilize its public assistance payment levels for December 1973 (instead of the corresponding levels for January 1972) in limiting its liability for supplementation of Federal benefits under section 1616 of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARNEY of Ohio:

H.R. 14441. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the mailing under the congressional franking privilege to Members of Congress of letter mail transmitted by their constituents in response to questionnaires of Members sent to constituents to obtain their opinions on public issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 14442. A bill to amend certain provisions of Federal law relating to explosives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, and Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 14443. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to lobbying by certain types of exempt organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONABLE (for himself, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, and Mr. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 14444. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a program of long-term care services within the medicare program, to provide for the creation of community long-term care centers and State long-term care agencies as part of a new administrative structure for the organization and delivery of long-term care services, to provide a significant role for persons eligible for long-term care benefits in the administration of the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FREY (for himself, Mr. BOLAND, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. KEMP, Mr. LUKE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RONCALIO of Wyoming, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 14445. A bill to provide for a uniform application of safety standards for mobile homes and recreational vehicles in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FREY:

H.R. 14446. A bill to amend section 5345 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that certain prevailing rate employees shall not be subject to a reduction in pay; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUNTER (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. FULTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. DAVIS of South Carolina, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.R. 14447. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the suspension of excise taxes on diesel fuel and special motor fuels, and to roll back the prices for such products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUYER (for himself and Mr. LATTI):

H.R. 14448. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to relieve employers of 50 or less employees from the requirement of paying or depositing certain employment taxes more often than once each quarter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By HAWKINS (for himself, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin):

H.R. 14449. A bill to provide for the mobilization of community development and assistance services and to establish a Community Action Administration in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to administer such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KYROS (by request):

H.R. 14450. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act respecting the new drug provisions of such act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

H.R. 14451. A bill to amend the emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973 to authorize and require the President of the United States to allocate asphalt and asphalt derivatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.R. 14452. A bill to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to prohibit the Secretary of Transportation from imposing certain seatbelt standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 14453. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require skilled nursing facilities under the medicare program and the medicaid program to provide medical social services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. QUIN, and Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina):

H.R. 14454. A bill to extend the authorization of appropriations for the Vocational Education Act of 1963 until fiscal year 1980; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUILLIN:

H.R. 14455. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to certain rates of postage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SYMMS (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. GOODLING and Mr. ROUSSELOT):

H.R. 14456. A bill to suspend for a temporary period of time the provisions of section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, in order to permit, under certain circumstances, vessels of foreign registry to transport fertilizer necessary to the production of agricultural commodities from Alaska to the west coast of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 14457. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 with respect to the definition of "air commerce" and "air transportation"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 14458. A bill to provide that finding of permanent and total disability under title II or XVI of the Social Security Act, chapter 13 or 15 of title 38, United States Code, or the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 will be considered as a finding of disability under any of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.J. Res. 990. Joint resolution to designate May 1974 as National Needlepoint Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.J. Res. 991. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the month of May 1974 as National Arthritis Month; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.J. Res. 992. Joint resolution to prohibit the Bureau of Labor Statistics from instituting any revision in the method of calculating the Consumer Price Index until such revision has been approved by resolution by either the Senate or the House of Representatives of the United States of America; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Con. Res. 484. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim the week of May 12 through 18, 1974, as National

Migrant Education Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 1072. Resolution; authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Committee print entitled "Procedures for Handling Impeachment Inquiry Material"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 1073. Resolution; authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of February 5, 1974"; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. Res. 1074. Resolution; authorization for reprinting additional copies for use of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Committee print entitled "Work of the Impeachment Inquiry Staff as of March 1, 1974"; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials, were presented and referred as follows:

439. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, relative to membership of the trust territory in the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

440. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Amtrak; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

441. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, requesting the Congress to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the assignment of students to schools on the basis of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 14459. A bill for the relief of Susan Magdalena Sotillo Daniele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 14460. A bill for the relief of Lim Jesusa Llacer and Emilio Llacer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.R. 14461. A bill for the relief of Judith E. Sterling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Monday, April 29, 1974

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father-God, we thank Thee for this world which Thou hast given us for our home. For buds and blossoms, for lush fields and singing brooks, for cascading streams and stirring winds, for gentle rains, for warm sun, for the starlit heavens and all nature proclaiming Thy glory, we give Thee thanks. May our lives match all that is beautiful and good and true in the world about us.

We thank Thee, too, for the goodness in so many people and for the durability of our institutions. We thank Thee that when we wander from Thy pathway and transgress Thy law Thou dost call us back in love and forgiveness. With thankfulness for all that is good in the past and with forgiveness of all that is wrong, we beseech Thee to call us to a life we never yet have known—a new life of selfless service and a fresh devotion to justice, righteousness, and truth.

Through Him who is Redeemer and Lord. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication

to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. EASTLAND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ABOUREZK thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading