

deer in gruesome and nonsporting situations, was an insult to the intelligence of even nonhunters.

Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, Johnson, and Theodore Roosevelt were ardent hunters. Kennedy was a member of the National Rifle Association. Eisenhower loved to quail hunt. Many urbane and sophisticated men and women enjoy hunting. Much of the cost of conservation and game preserves and maintaining wildlife is paid for by hunters who purchase duck and deer stamps, who pay a huge chunk of taxes on ammunition and other hunting gear.

I have learned from the news media that the CBS personnel who put the so-called documentary together were, in fact, nonhunters.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who has ever watched a dog go on point early in the morning while walking through the broomsedge and thrilled to the sound of a covey bursting into the air can tell you there is a dimension that CBS neglected.

Anyone who has sat in a duckblind on a cold morning with some good friends and a Thermos of coffee can tell you that CBS is guilty of a grave misrepresentation.

If the men who settled this country had been like those who produced the CBS program, this country would not exist now.

There is still another factor: a given area of land can support just so much wild game. CBS used the term "harvest" in a sardonic manner, but in many respects that is accurate.

Dr. Havilah Babcock, the late author and English professor at the University of South Carolina, expressed it best in his book, "My Health Is Better in November," a book about quail hunting. Robert Ruark of North Carolina also captured that ineffable quality of a young man hunting for the first time, as did Archibald Rutledge of my State.

If you have ever eaten quail or venison you will be assured that there is a pragmatic reason to hunt other than rec-

reation and sport. Wild game can be delicious if prepared correctly.

Most hunters I have known do not hunt because of some sort of malicious thrill in killing "Bambi" or some Walt Disney cartoon character.

I suggest that those at CBS read one of the many good books on hunting by Jack O'Connor, a former editor at *Outdoor Life* magazine, or one of the other authors I have mentioned. Hunting can be good exercise. Modern man has become flabby and unfit, partly because he has hearkened to the bleating of the phony sophisticates who tut-tut over the "killing of helpless little animals."

Man can be a person of the intellect and sophisticated and acceptable on any value scale and still enjoy hunting. Hunting can be a wholesome and enjoyable pursuit. CBS chose to single out those minority situations that I concede are less than pleasant and cloak them as if representative of the whole sport.

I certainly hope that the Federal Communications Commission will examine this charade and see to it that any further such propaganda at least have some semblance of balance and objectivity.

SOVIET UNION ALREADY IN VIOLATION OF HELSINKI CSCE AGREEMENT

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 24, 1975

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in July of this year the participants at the Conference on European Security and Economy agreed to notify one another when major military maneuvers were to be staged. Dutifully, NATO has given notice to the Kremlin of five exercises in Western Europe. West Germany, which is holding its largest military exercise since 1968, not only informed the Warsaw Pact countries of the exercise, but invited observers from East

Europe and the U.S.S.R. What has been the response from the Soviet Union? You guessed it—silence. The London Daily Telegraph of September 18, 1975, recently discussed this instance of Soviet duplicity. The item follows:

[From the London Daily Telegraph,
Sept. 18, 1975]

RUSSIANS SILENT OVER MANOEUVRES

(By John Miller)

NATO has begun notifying the Soviet Union about its exercises but is still awaiting a reciprocal gesture from the Warsaw Pact forces.

Since the European Security Conference declaration in July, the Kremlin has been given advance details of five exercises in Western Europe.

Under the terms of the declaration on military movements aimed at increasing East-West "confidence" signatory states are obliged to send out advisory notices when more than 25,000 of their troops are involved.

NATO was understood to have gone further than it needed to have done and has also told the Russians about manoeuvres involving less than 25,000 men.

Whitehall sources said yesterday that the Warsaw Pact countries were believed to be preparing for their annual autumn manoeuvres.

But the Russians have so far given no formal or informal indication when they will take place or how many men will be involved.

GESTURE TO WEST

In February, during Mr. Wilson's visit to Moscow, the Kremlin gave notice of a large-scale military exercise in Western Russia.

It was seen at the time as a gesture to the West in order to speed up the work of the then deadlocked European Security Conference negotiations in Geneva.

Military experts did not rule out the possibility that the Russians were busy deliberating on how far they would go in abiding by the spirit and the letter of the Helsinki declaration.

They have also yet to decide whether to take up an invitation by the West German Government to send observers to a six-day exercise code-named "Certain Trek" beginning in Bavaria on Oct. 14.

They may feel that if they attend the exercise they are duty bound to offer a *quid pro quo* and invite NATO observers to future Warsaw Pact exercises.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 25, 1975

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Charles L. Yates, Fairview United Methodist Church, Wheeling, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Precious Heavenly Father, we come to Thee this morning in the U.S. House of Representatives, where men and women of outstanding character, honesty, and integrity are dedicated to pass laws which will meet our needs and protect our people. We pray that we may abide by them and support our lawmakers.

We plead for divine leadership, for we know Thy infinite wisdom, power, and goodness is needed to guide us all.

May we remember our forefathers who had the courage and insight to establish the basis for our humble beginnings, and those who gave their lives for our country.

Bless this assembly that what they do may benefit mankind through peace and

understanding and what is right in Thy sights. 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 SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7715. An act to extend until the close of June 30, 1978, the period during which

certain dyeing and tanning materials may be imported free of duty.

RHODESIAN CHROME

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for quite some period of time about the hypocrisy surrounding the issue which we will debate today in H.R. 1287.

The American Coalition, which I believe is an organization of stainless steel producers in the United States, has summarized all of the arguments against the repeal of the Byrd amendment in a pamphlet that has come into my office today and I would direct this to the attention of the Members.

It sums up the hypocritical aspects of the bill when it states in its conclusion: Should the House vote to impose sanctions on Rhodesian chrome, it will be engaging in what The Washington Star-News has quite rightly called an "exercise in selective morality." Can a morality that is selective be much of a morality at all? Does anyone really believe that the Soviet Union is morally superior to Rhodesia?

Mr. Speaker, I will include the entire article in the Extensions of Remarks section today.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1976

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Without objection, a call of the House will be ordered.

There was no objection.

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

[Roll No. 546]

Alexander	Eshleman	Moore
Ambro	Fary	Neal
Annunzio	Fenwick	Pike
Ashley	Foley	Rees
Brademas	Fountain	Riegle
Brooks	Gibbons	Rodino
Broomfield	Harsha	Rose
Brown, Calif.	Hays, Ohio	Scheuer
Burton, Phillip	Hébert	Sisk
Chisholm	Heckler, Mass.	Stephens
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Symington
Diggs	LaFalce	Thompson
Dingell	Landrum	Udall
Drinan	Lent	Ullman
Eckhardt	Macdonald	Wiggins
Edgar	Mathis	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Ala.	Meeds	
Esch	Mitchell, Md.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 381 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

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

PERMISSION FOR AD HOC COMMITTEE ON OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF TO HOLD HEARINGS AT OCEAN CITY, MD., SEPTEMBER 26, 1975, AND GRANTING LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the Ad Hoc Committee on the Outer Continental Shelf conduct hearings in Ocean City, Md., on Friday, September 26, 1975, while the House is in session. I also ask unanimous consent that the following Congressmen be granted official leave of absence: Congressmen JOHN MURPHY, JOHN BREAUX, CHRISTOPHER DODD, WILLIAM HUGHES, PIERRE DU PONT, ROBERT BAUMAN, GEORGE MILLER.

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

There was no objection.

THE QUALITY OF LIFE IN ERIE COUNTY

(Mr. VIGORITO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VIGORITO. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the 24th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which includes Metropolitan Erie, I was proud to see that Erie was the top-ranked Pennsylvania metropolitan area in the quality of life test project conducted by the Midwest Research Institute.

It was interesting to note that of the 12 metropolitan areas with more than 50,000 population in Pennsylvania, Erie was rated No. 1 according to its economics, environment, health, education, social, overall and politics.

I am sure that the residents of Erie and the surrounding townships which comprise Greater Erie are very proud and happy, as I am, that their hometown has been given the recognition it truly deserves.

It is especially a well-received and significant feat to be considered tops as far as quality of life is concerned as our society watches the large urban areas of our country deteriorate. Although it is considered a large urban area which includes the third largest city in Pennsylvania, the Erie area still retains a certain smalltown atmosphere which allows for everyone to truly enjoy living in a somewhat large town without all the tensions and pressures of the big city.

It is my hope that the results of the test project will further publicize that Erie is a nice place to live with good people contributing to all segments of the community.

RHODESIAN CHROME

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

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider H.R. 1287 later today—legislation to repeal the Byrd amendment and reimpose the embargo on the shipment of chrome from Rhodesia. Since I am leaving early this afternoon for Alabama to inspect the damage inflicted on cities and towns in my congressional district by hurricane Eloise, I will not be present to vote on this most important legislation.

I have consistently opposed the Rhodesian embargo and voted for the Byrd amendment when it was originally

passed by the Congress. Earlier this year, when this matter was considered in the House Armed Services Committee, on which I serve, I voted to reject the reimposition of the suspended embargo on the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

Evidence in favor of continuing to trade with Rhodesia is overwhelming. The United States must pursue policies which are in the best interest of our Nation—not the U.N. Continued trade with Rhodesia, one of the few friends we have left in Africa, is certainly in the best interests of the United States. To reimpose an embargo on this African nation would be insane and asinine.

If I were present, I would have voted against H.R. 1287—reimposition of the embargo on the shipment of chrome from Rhodesia.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE TO MEET THIS AFTERNOON

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Aviation of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation be permitted to sit this afternoon for the purpose of conducting business.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I was presiding over a revenue-sharing committee hearing and I was delayed in getting here for the quorum just announced. I would like the RECORD to show that I am present on the floor of the House.

AMENDING THE UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 722 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 722

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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. 1287) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, one hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, and one hour to be controlled by Representative Donald Fraser of Minnesota, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed on page 2, line 1, through page 4, line 2, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI. At the con-

clusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 722 provides for an open rule with 3 hours of general debate on H.R. 1287, the United Nations participation Act of 1945, which would bring to a halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

The rule further provides that 1 hour of debate be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, that 1 hour be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, and that 1 hour be controlled by Representative DONALD FRASER of Minnesota.

House Resolution 722 also provides that it shall be in order to consider the amendment recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed on page 2, line 1, through page 4, line 2, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 7, rule XVI(16) of the rules of the House. This is the germaneness provision.

H.R. 1287 would amend the United Nations participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel. The proposed amendment would return the United States to full compliance with United Nations economic sanctions in accordance with the international treaty obligations of the United States. It provides a procedure also for prohibiting the indirect importation of Rhodesian chromium via foreign-made specialty steels by requiring that imports of chromium-bearing specialty steel mill products be accompanied by a certificate of origin. This certificate of origin would specify that the chromium contained therein did not originate in Rhodesia. The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to establish a system of certification review for all imports of steel mill products.

H.R. 1287 has serious implications for U.S. policy toward Africa. It rejects the argument that we need the chrome Rhodesia supplies to the United States because we have sufficient supplies in our stockpiles as administration witnesses have testified. And it upholds our primary commitment to the United Nations Security Council economic sanctions imposed upon Rhodesia in 1967, a commitment which only the United States and South Africa officially have violated. Clearly, the enactment of this historic amendment would give firm indication of our fundamental belief in the cause of international law and justice.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 722 in order that we may discuss, debate and pass H.R. 1287.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services met on this same bill we have before us and opposed it. The vote in the Committee on International Relations was 17 to 8; the vote in the Committee on Armed Services was 29 to 7. If we add those votes together, we would have a majority vote of 37 to 24 in opposition to this bill.

This bill in my opinion would bring us to an immoral decision, since it is not morally right in my opinion for the United States to meddle in the internal affairs of another country. It is also not morally right for the United States, through its agent in the United Nations or otherwise, to impose upon the citizens of the United States a position which they have not granted.

The United Nations Charter requires for a sanction that there be a threat of international war. There was no international aspect involved in Rhodesia. Rhodesia is a colony of the United Kingdom. No nation in the world recognizes Rhodesia as a sovereign state, so this was purely an internal matter.

Furthermore, there was no threat of war.

Therefore, the United Nations Charter has been distorted by the action of this sanction, and the U.S. Congress should turn its back on such a distortion. This amounts to an erosion of the powers and the privileges of American citizens, because American citizens never gave, through the United Nations Charter, the privilege of the representative of the United States in the United Nations to speak for the United States in regard to a domestic matter in another country. So this is ab initio, from the very beginning, an improper action by the United Nations.

The right of Congress to pass an amendment to nullify the United Nations sanction would be good whether that is so or not, and it has been so held by the Federal courts, with certiorari denied by the Supreme Court.

So even if my argument that I first made, that it is immoral to do it because of the fact of the distortions in the United Nations Charter were not sound, the courts, not on that basis, but on the basis of the fact that we can turn down a sanction of the United Nations, have so held.

Furthermore, it is settled law that if other signatories of a treaty disregard its terms, then the remaining signatories are released from compliance. There has been an almost universal disregard of this sanction by other countries, so we are relieved of any legal obligation to comply with it ourselves aside from the court decision on the validity of the Byrd amendment and aside from the argument I have made with regard to the United Nations Charter.

The bill is contrary to our international trade policies. We have long had agreements with other nations to try to increase free trade as best we can.

So I will summarize this first point with regard to the morality of our country in this matter by saying that ob-

viously it is not a moral thing for the United States to set aside the Byrd amendment, because if we took another position, we would be flaunting the rights of the American citizens not to be embroiled in the domestic affairs of another country. Any country like the United States, which has just come through the Vietnam war, should realize that there are limits on what a country can do in the internal affairs of another country. Certainly in this particular instance we do not want to get dragged any further into this matter. Actually, under this section of the charter, if this sanction were upheld, we could also have it upheld in a military matter, because the same sections of the charter refer not only to these sanctions but to a military matter, so we could have another Vietnam war coming along if we are not careful.

Mr. Speaker, my next point is that this bill endangers the national defense of our country. Chrome is a metal of great importance. It is essential to the national defense of our country, and there is no substitute for this vital defense material.

Second, with regard to the defense aspect, there is no domestic supply of chrome in the United States. Rhodesia holds 67 percent of the world's known reserves of metallurgical grade chrome.

If we pass this bill, we increase our dependence on the Soviet Union as a source of supply. Increased dependence on the Soviet Union is not wise, it is not prudent, and it is foolhardy. It is against the national defense of our country.

We have no excess of chrome in our national stockpile. In fact, we may have a shortage. Based upon current consumption, we have perhaps a 3-year supply, but this assumes a free flow of Rhodesian chrome to the United States. A few years back we had a 5-year supply. We need to look down the road and worry about the defense requirements of our country. Studies are now under way to see whether or not the stockpile should be brought down or increased. These studies may reflect that actually we need to increase the amount in our stockpile.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States wrote me on August 28. Since I do not have much time, I will not read the whole letter.

It said:

... the Executive Branch has undertaken a thorough review of stockpile policies, including each of the planning assumptions. On the basis of these studies, and taking into account the points you have raised, I am considering possible changes to the stockpile planning assumptions ...

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) had a letter in July from the Department of Defense. Since I am strapped for time, I will just read the concluding paragraph:

... the Deputy Secretary of Defense has recommended to the National Security Coun-

cil that the assumptions and policies controlling the levels of strategic and critical materials to be held in the National Stockpile be reexamined and has further recommended that action be taken to defer the disposal of any stockpile materials since this reexamination may lead to recomputation of stockpile objectives . . .

Not long ago, just 4 or 5 days ago, I talked to General Bray, in charge of this stockpile matter for the executive branch. He tells me that he does not now have any firm reason to think that we may not actually need additional chrome for the stockpile when the facts are all in.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) has brought up these points which basically underlie the legislation. However, I was especially interested in his comment that many foreign countries disregard this so-called sanction anyway. Therefore, it is a facade, does the gentleman think we should go through this legislation?

Mr. BENNETT. I think the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) went to the U.N. as a representative there.

Before he went there, he was enthusiastically in support of the position of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT) and mine. Yet, somehow or other, now he has appeared before the Committee on Rules in strong support of this bill.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Consequently, what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) is saying, in effect, is that other countries can do what they want in buying chrome from Rhodesia even though they may endorse the sanctions?

Mr. BENNETT. Our national defense will be very much in peril if we do enact this legislation.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal to say or will have a great deal to say when we debate this bill, but there is one point about the rule which I wish to emphasize, just for the sake of the record.

I appeared before the Committee on Rules to oppose the adoption of the rule, but in the process I asked the Committee on Rules to please consider deferring action on the rule until at least January 1976.

My point was that before we make this decision this afternoon on whether or not we will or will not repeal the Byrd amendment, we at least ought to review what was done at the 1975 U.N. General Assembly session.

It was my privilege to serve at the United Nations in 1971 as a delegate. I consider that the high spot of my public career. I am a great supporter of the United Nations, but I am not a blind supporter of the United Nations.

I honestly think that if the coming General Assembly session of the United Nations misbehaves as badly as did the

1974 General Assembly session, many Members who might vote for this measure this afternoon would seriously regret not having had an opportunity to pass judgment on the situation in January, after the U.N. session.

I say this not to oppose the rule—and, insofar as I know, there is no strategy or intent to do that, and it is not really my point—but I do want to make the point that at this time I think it would be far better for the House, for our country and for the United Nations, were we to defer action on this measure until at least January 1976.

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

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

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois takes that position, would it not make sense if the House were to consider this as a procedural matter and vote down the rule. Then we can defer action on the legislation until after the General Assembly of the United Nations has taken place, without actually voting on the merits of the matter at this time.

Mr. DERWINSKI. As the gentleman from Maryland knows, I am a statesman, not a political tactician, and I am not aware of any effort to organize a vote against this rule. I have always felt that one should not charge into a fight unless one first lines up the voters and, as I say, so far as I know, there has not been an attempt to line up the opposition against the rule itself. I would hope that there is either a motion to recommit that is carried, or that a "no" vote on final passage of the bill will ultimately prevail.

Mr. BAUMAN. But may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Illinois in his statesmanlike manner has given very compelling reasons for voting down this rule especially in light of the fact that the Committee on Rules only voted out the rule by one vote. Actually there would have been a tie had one vote been changed because of the gentleman's convincing argument.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I honestly thought that my eloquence would compel the Committee on Rules to defer action but, when they proceeded to adopt the rule I lost a little bit of my self-confidence.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 722 is an open rule providing 3 hours of general debate on the bill H.R. 1287 which amends the U.N. Participation Act by halting the importation of Rhodesian chrome. The resolution waives the germaneness rule against section 2 of the bill which deals with the certification of imported steel products. Since section 2 is a provision added as a committee amendment in markup, there is some question as to whether it goes beyond the scope of the original bill. This is the reason for the waiver.

The Rules Committee conducted 2 days of hearings on this bill and heard from numerous witnesses on both sides of the issue. You will notice that the bill was sequentially referred from the International Relations Committee to the

Armed Services Committee; and while the former committee reported favorably on the bill by a 17-8 vote, the latter committee reported adversely on the bill by a vote of 29-7.

In deference to these two great committees and those who feel strongly on both sides of the issue, the Rules Committee decided on a rule which would give all sides concerned adequate debate time to state their case. Thus, the 3 hours of general debate is divided as follows: 1 hour to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the International Relations Committee; the second hour to be divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Armed Services Committee; and the third hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), one of the chief sponsors of the bill. Given the stated positions of those controlling the debate time, we have presented a rule in which debate time has been divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this rule and the bill which it makes in order. And, as a member of the Republican leadership, I should point out at the outset that the administration favors this bill, though this is certainly not a partisan issue and the bill has strong bipartisan support. I particularly want to commend the prime sponsors of this bill on their efforts—Mr. FRASER, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. BIESTER.

By way of background on this issue, Southern Rhodesia declared its unilateral independence from Great Britain in November of 1965. Great Britain opposed this move on the grounds that the Ian Smith regime did not accord sufficient political rights to the black majority in that country which comprises 95 percent of the population. Rather than intervene militarily, Great Britain took its case to the U.N. On three occasions, in 1965, 1967, and 1968 the U.N. Security Council, with our support, voted economic sanctions against Rhodesia, the third being a complete embargo against commerce with Rhodesia. In each instance, President Johnson issued Executive orders to implement the sanctions.

In 1971 the so-called Byrd amendment was attached to a defense bill. That amendment prohibited the President from barring the import of any strategic substance from a free-world nation if it is being imported from a Communist-dominated country. The effect of this amendment was to lift the import ban against Rhodesian chrome.

A bill similar to the one before us today passed the other body in the last Congress by a vote of 54 to 37 and was favorably reported by our House Foreign Affairs Committee, but never came to a vote in the House.

H.R. 1287 would not directly repeal the Byrd amendment, but rather would make its provisions inapplicable to any sanctions imposed by the United States under the authority of the U.N. Participation Act and in accord with Security Council resolutions currently in effect. This would in effect, however, restore the ban against importing Rhodesian chrome.

ore and ferrochrome into the United States.

Section 2 of the bill is an innovation added by the committee in this Congress designed to address the argument that other nations are secretly cheating on the sanctions and shipping us steel products which contain Rhodesian chrome. This section requires the Secretary of the Treasury, during the time sanctions are being applied against Rhodesia, to obtain certificates of origin on shipments of steel mill products into this country which contain chromium in any form. Countries shipping us such products would have to certify that they do not contain Rhodesian chrome. I think in fairness that it should be pointed out that the Departments of Defense, Treasury and Commerce have expressed particular reservations about the certification process on the grounds that it would be difficult to verify and administer, goes beyond the U.N. sanctions as a form of secondary boycott, and constitutes a non-tariff barrier to trade. Nevertheless, despite such reservations, representatives of the Departments of Commerce and Treasury testified that they could accept this provision and would do their best to administer it effectively. I am certain this controversial certification section will receive considerable attention during the general debate time provided by this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1287 not only from the standpoint of our obligations under international law—and I think we should lead the way as a law-abiding member of the international community—but also from the standpoint of our long-term economic interests.

The opponents of this bill will argue that our future strategic stockpiles will be endangered if we cut ourselves off from access to chrome from Rhodesia which has the largest known reserves in the world. What all this tends to ignore is the rapidly changing situation in Africa. Our chrome imports from Rhodesia during the first half of this year are half that of last year—mainly due to the increasing difficulty of shipping them out through newly independent Mozambique. And there is a growing possibility that the Mozambique border will soon be completely closed to commerce with Rhodesia. South Africa is certainly in no position to take up the slack. In fact, South Africa has joined with certain black African nations in bringing pressure on the Ian Smith regime to negotiate a political accommodation with the black Rhodesian majority.

Any objective assessment of the present Rhodesian situation points to the conclusion that something's got to give soon. If we are truly interested in insuring ourselves access to Rhodesian chrome at reasonable prices in the future, we must face up to the reality that Rhodesia will not always be controlled by its white minority government, and that the attitude of any future Rhodesian majority government toward the United States will be determined in part by where we stand today on this issue.

And I think we must quite frankly recognize that if the dispute between

the Smith regime and the African National Council is not resolved by peaceful means, there is a very high probability that a civil war will erupt. I would submit that by alining ourselves with the concept of majority rule today through our support of this bill, we can assist in getting negotiations back on the track and thus enhance the prospects of a peaceful settlement. And the sooner this matter is settled, the sooner the sanctions can be lifted.

Mr. Speaker, it will be argued today that the adoption of this bill will make us primarily dependent on the Soviet Union for chrome. In point of fact, our dependence on Soviet chrome has increased since the enactment of the Byrd amendment. There is no question that we could make up the difference in lost Rhodesian chrome by turning to other countries such as Pakistan, the Philippines, and Iran. We are not talking here about making up for large amounts of lost chrome, but rather about around only 7 percent of our total chrome imports.

Mr. Speaker, attempts will be made today to cast doubts on the depth of administration support for this bill. Let me simply state in response that the administration has not equivocated in its support for this legislation, and as recently as Tuesday of this week Secretary of State Kissinger reiterated the administration's strong stand in favor of restoring the import ban on Rhodesian chrome. Speaking before the Organization of African Unity at the United Nations, Secretary Kissinger said, and I quote:

The United States intends to adhere scrupulously to the U.N.'s sanctions against Rhodesia. President Ford and his entire Administration continue to urge repeal of the Byrd amendment and expects this will be accomplished during the current session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this rule and passage of the bill which it makes in order. I make my appeal not only on the grounds of our obligations under international and moral law, but also on the grounds that the enactment of this bill will further our long-term economic and national security interests. It is time we wake up and recognize that the darkest thing about the so-called dark continent has been our ignorance of it, and that we live in an increasingly interdependent world in which Africa will play an important role in our own economic survival as a major supplier of raw materials to us. Let us take a first step today to cement our relationships with that continent by reaffirming our 200-year heritage and commitment to independence, freedom, and equality of all races under majority rule. Let us give new life to the great founding principles of this Republic by alining ourselves with the aspirations and dreams of the African people. Let us by our action here today take an important step in promoting a peaceful solution to the Rhodesian problem, rather than exacerbate that problem and invite violence by bolstering the barriers to majority rule.

We have had a very interesting argument advanced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) that we should somehow

have held this matter in abeyance and that the Committee on Rules should have granted a request for a postponement until we have seen how well the forthcoming session of the General Assembly of the United Nations performs.

In that regard I think it might be pertinent to point out an article which came to my attention just a few days ago and which contains a statement by the Foreign Minister of Zaire, one of the principal countries of Africa, of course, who said that his government opposes any suspension or expulsion of any state from any international organization.

It seems to me, therefore, that rather than helping the situation if we were to-day to defeat this rule or to defeat the legislation, that we would be working against the very best interests of this country in trying to promote what seems to be a more favorable feeling on the part of some of the principal countries of Africa toward the United Nations and the United States and against the idea that nations like Israel and South Africa should be expelled from that international body.

He went on in that particular interview to complain that the policies of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries were strangling and weakening black Africa and condemning the Soviet bloc's intervention in Angola. So it seems to me, therefore, with that very heartening indication that some of the countries of black Africa have begun to come our way, that to deal them another blow as we would certainly be doing by a failure to repeal the Byrd amendment would be wrong.

I go back to I think it was 1973 when Bishop Abel T. Muzorewa, one of the outstanding moderate leaders in Rhodesia today, said that no more devastating blow had been dealt to the cause of majority rule in Rhodesia than when the Congress of the United States adopted the Byrd amendment.

I think it is high time that this body joined the other body in suggesting or saying to the world that we are going to stand by our international commitments. And we made that commitment not once, not twice, but three times when the Security Council acted and we supported the resolutions that were adopted imposing sanctions against the country of Rhodesia, because, of course, this whole affair goes back to their attempt illegally to declare their independence from Great Britain in 1965.

I listened with great interest to the argument that was made by my friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) and I respect him highly. There is no Member of this body who I think has a greater reputation, and deservedly so, for morality and honesty than the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT). Yet when he says that it is not morally right—those are the words that he used—to interfere in the affairs of another state, in the first place, Rhodesia is not a state. It is not recognized, so far as I know, by a single country in the world. To my knowledge, there were only four countries that did not support the sanctions that were adopted legally under Chapter 7 of the United Nations

Charter. One of them was not even a member of the United Nations. The other was the United States, when we joined with that group in the adoption of the Byrd amendment.

Then there was South Africa which, of course, is a country that maintains an apartheid system, and then there was Portugal which at that time had a number of colonies in Africa. Certainly that government no longer takes the same position, at least since April of 1974, that they did formerly on this question.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, for a technical clarification. I said in my remarks Rhodesia is a colony, and it was purely an internal affair. This is an internal affair because we are looking into a country and its colonies, which under the United Nations is considered a country. In other words, Rhodesia is considered a part of a country, namely the United Kingdom. A country and its colonies are considered an entity.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. May I remind the gentleman that the country in question is Great Britain. Rhodesia is a colony of Great Britain, and it was Great Britain that went to the United Nations that sought to make this a matter of international concern.

Mr. BENNETT. If the gentleman will yield further, that does not change the charter which limits sanctions to an international affair. It does not make it any more an international affair that Great Britain has it as a colony.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would suggest to the gentleman that nothing could be any more international.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I suggest to the gentleman that nothing could be more truly international in character than this matter of whether or not the United States is going to maintain the internationally legal obligation that it undertook when it became a signatory to the charter of the United Nations in 1945.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman.

He is going off the beam here. He is talking about whether it is international in character. I never said it had no international implication. I said the United Nations Charter restricts U.N. activities on sanctions to international war cases. There is no international war involved at all. There is no war. Any war there might be is not international.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would simply point out—and then I must move on to the final point I want to make in this brief time that I have—that the gentleman is making a completely *ex post facto* determination when he suggests that this is not an international matter. Three times that matter was

voted on in the Security Council of the U.N. Our Government said that it was, that it came within the purview of chapter 7 of the charter. We had an opportunity at that time to veto. We did not. Indeed, President Johnson then proceeded with Executive orders to implement the resolution that had been adopted in the Security Council.

There are many other points that I could make on the question of national security, but I know those are going to be very ably addressed by the sponsors of the legislation during the 3 hours that have been reserved for general debate.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not a fact that when President Ford was a Member of Congress, his position was just the opposite?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. That is quite true when this matter was before us. At that time, as Representative of the Sixth District of Michigan, he took a different position. But I think he recognizes that as the leader of this country and as the leader of the free world, far more important than any position he took in the past is the necessity of affirming now before the world that we do take seriously our obligations under international law.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman is saying is a condemnation of the President of the United States because he was a Representative of the United States when he was in this House, the same as he is the President of the United States. He was not representing just the Sixth District of Michigan.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I do not accept the gentleman's representation at all. I think the President, given his responsibilities as a leader of this country, realizes he is a world leader and appreciates his responsibilities in the eyes of the world, and, believe me, the world is watching to see what the United States does in this matter.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT), a member of the committee.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has ably stated that the repealer of the Byrd amendment has been supported by the United States in the United Nations but I think the gentleman will agree the United States has never made a commitment in the United Nations or anywhere else to support the third-party-boycott language of section 2 of this bill. That is a new provision.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I realize that the gentleman has reservations about the certification procedures under section 2 and I believe the gentleman intends to offer an amendment to take that section out. But I think that is not really the basic issue: whether we go

along with the certification procedure or not. The basic question is whether or not we are going to honor the commitment we made and stand by our pledged word to honor international law, and in that statement I think the gentleman will join me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DU PONT. Would the gentleman take an additional 2 minutes just to clarify this point?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, I agree with the gentleman and I have always voted before to support the position of the United States in the United Nations. But when the gentleman says in the United Nations we support the repealer, it ought to be made very clear that section 2 has never been brought up in the United Nations and we have never supported it there. It is a brand new piece of legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is correct, but I do not think that detracts from what I said earlier about the overall position.

Mr. DU PONT. I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman make the statement that Rhodesia was a colony of Great Britain. That is true, is it not, that the gentleman made that statement?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. At one time, that is correct.

Mr. DENT. Also I am reminded at this point that the United States of America as a colony was a colony of Great Britain. I would like to read two lines from the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America:

When in the course of human events it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bonds which have connected them with another—

I do not have time to read it all, but I will if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman is repeating testimony he gave I believe before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DENT. Let me read these words from another declaration of another colony of Great Britain:

Whereas in the course of human affairs history has shown that it may become necessary for a people to dissolve the political affiliations which have connected them with another people and to assume amongst other nations the separate and equal status to which they are entitled . . .

And take their own place under the sun, and that is from the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence of Rhodesia which are identical in purpose and principle to the Declaration of Independence of the United States against the mother country.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute merely to express total and complete astonishment that my friend and dis-

tinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, could find any similarity between the Declaration made by Rhodesia in 1965 with the Declaration made by this country in 1776.

The gentleman, in discussing Rhodesia, is talking about a country where they are insisting up to the present moment that 5 percent of the people govern totally and completely the destiny of the other 95 percent. That was not the basis on which Thomas Jefferson struck off the Declaration of Independence in 1776.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman let me answer that?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, before I go further in this discourse, I would like to say that I endorse the rule. I think it is as fair a rule as we can get. I would like to ask my colleagues to support the rule.

The gentleman from Illinois can draw any view that the gentleman wants of what I say. But is it not true that the gentleman has stretched it a little bit too far? I must say he is easily astonished. He harps on the small percent whites who rule the country.

What was the percentage of the colonists population in the United States when we declared ourselves free and independent of Great Britain, compared to the red population, known as Indians? How much of the land did we reserve for the Indians outside of the reservation, moving from one to the other to please the whims of the settlers who wanted the land they had moved to in the first place?

Approximately 73 percent of all the land mass in Rhodesia is dedicated to the blacks. They can buy land and move into any of the rest of Rhodesia, but no white man can buy one inch of ground or take over an inch of ground of the reserves for the blacks in Rhodesia.

Fifty percent of the senate in Rhodesia is black.

Thirty-six percent of the house of representatives is black.

Sixty percent of the students at Salisbury University are black, and before Ian Smith, every educated black was educated outside Rhodesia. His avowed purpose, and we can read this in their constitution if we want to read it, is to educate the blacks in Rhodesia to take over Rhodesia as a government.

I hear remarks around about one-man, one-vote. Is there any person in this room that believes we can have one-man, one-vote, with equality of any kind, when they practice polygamy? I visited a family of 37 members, one family with 37 members in it. Nineteen of them were voting age. Would you call that a one-man, one-vote equality? Does anyone tell me that this has been a bad administration? It is the only African country before the revolution in that country that as a part of its economy every black gets paid the same wage as a white.

I saw something in Rhodesia I never saw in the United States. I come from a steel section of the country. I have never seen a black running a hot crane in a steel mill. There was a black up there

perched running a hot crane at \$720 a month, exactly the same as the man that relieved him on the next shift, a white man. The puddler on one shift is black and on every job in that steel mill and in every job in industry in Rhodesia, there is either a black on the job or a black understudy learning the job.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief, but in light of the statements of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it seems to me there is need to set the record straight.

The fact of the matter is, and this is according to official records, the Rhodesian average allocation of land for Africans is 7 acres and for Europeans it is 166 acres. More than 20 times the acreage is given to Europeans. The wages of Africans in Rhodesia today vary from 100 to 400 Rhodesian dollars. The Europeans in Rhodesia vary from \$3,000 to \$5,000 in average wage. The fact of the matter is that Rhodesia is a racially segregated society. The reason that the 5-percent white minority broke from the British was to preserve white supremacy over the 95 percent of Africans. It seems to me that to argue that Rhodesia is a wonderful, multiracial society, flies in the face of every bit of the evidence.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying about Rhodesia, and I can understand his concern, but I do not hear anybody in this House expressing any concern about Northern Ireland, where discrimination is just as bad as it is in Rhodesia. If we are going to impose anything on Rhodesia, I think we should do the same thing to Great Britain. It is not fair just to pick out a country like Rhodesia and say, "Look at the discrimination that takes place there," and ignore countries such as Northern Ireland where over a thousand people have lost their lives in the last few years as a result of discrimination there in housing, jobs, and everything else.

The one man, one vote does not exist there. I had a friend who was a city councilman in the city of Armagh, and he represented 50 percent of the Catholic population in a nine-man city council. The other eight members represent the Protestant group in that city. He is outvoted by 8 to 1.

So, if we are going to cure the discrimination in the world, let us do it all over. Let us not just pick one country here and wave the flag for that one country and then say that we are doing something about discrimination. Let us get down to the problem of Northern Ireland which needs the attention of some of the Members of this House, and let us talk about discrimination over there.

We have got almost 40 million in this country who are descended from the Irish people, and yet we do not hear anybody down here asking us to impose

anything against Great Britain. They do not dare. They do not dare point a finger at Great Britain. No, they come in here with this bill here—and I am not out of sympathy with the people there that are being discriminated against because I think they are being discriminated against—but why just Rhodesia? Why do they not talk about Northern Ireland where people are being murdered every day? What about the people of the Baltic States? The Lithuanians, the Latvians, the Estonians, and the Polish people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts certainly has a right to be concerned about events in Northern Ireland, and I wish there was something that could be done about it today. Let me just add to what the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) said about the reaction to U.S. action on this question of breaking the embargo. In 1972, Harold Wilson of Great Britain, said that the American decision to allow purchases of Rhodesian chrome was an act "calculated to outrage moderate African feeling." He said:

I can think of no act more calculated to outrage moderate African feeling and to give aid and comfort to racialists south of the Zambezi and indeed north and south of the Limpopo.

This is a very important issue to those moderates in Africa to whom we need to look for cooperative relationships. Our investment in Africa runs into the billions of dollars, and our investment in Rhodesia is very minor indeed. So, I think that when we look at this debate and the issue that is the subject of the debate, it is important to understand that Rhodesia is not like the United States. Rhodesia is a racist society, broken away from the British in order to preserve the racist minority control, and it was indeed the British who went to the Security Council and asked for help.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman prepared to tell the House that in his opinion Rhodesia is the only racist society in Africa?

Mr. FRASER. No, but it is the only one in which we have a commitment to do something about.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRASER. That is a very important point, because I think that there are hardships and abuses around the world, and I wish we could do more about them, but here is one place where the international community is in agreement, and it ought not be the United States which turns its back on that effort and appear to guarantee support to the white 5-percent minority.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued, catching the most recent portion of this debate, about some of the rationale behind a reimposition of the ban on Rhodesian chrome.

I can certainly understand the sense of outrage that some Members feel in this body over the fact that 95 percent, as we were told, of the Rhodesian people are disenfranchised. Presumably, this also implies a further criticism of this nation, on the grounds that it does not recognize some of the exalted ideals embodied in the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations—principles such as human dignity, rights to freedom of speech, freedom of association, and what have you.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat perplexed, after hearing this kind of critique, to understand how we could contemplate putting ourselves at the mercy of virtually 100-percent dependence on importation of chrome—a strategic mineral—from a country that also disenfranchises 95 percent of its population and which has a long and consistently tragic, bloody, and brutal history of repudiation of any commitment to the very rights under discussion today. It is even more puzzling, in light of the fact that Rhodesia is a small nation which has been friendly to the United States and certainly has not proclaimed any commitment to destruction of the United States, whereas, "détente" notwithstanding, the Soviet Union has made repeated commitments to bury us.

So I think there is inconsistency at the very least, and hypocrisy at worst, in this debate.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and 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.

Mr. FRASER. 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. 1287) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

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. 1287) with Mr. ROUSH 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. Pursuant to the rule, general debate will continue for not to exceed 3 hours, 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations;

1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services; and 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) will be recognized for 30 minutes; the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) will be recognized for 30 minutes; and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

The supporters of the Rhodesian regime often use such lofty phrases as "multiracial society" and "parliamentary democracy" in their descriptions of that country. The fact is that Africans in Rhodesia face massive racial discrimination in every aspect of life, and those who choose to protest against that discrimination are subject to severe and often brutal oppression.

Rhodesia has a population of 6 million. Of these, 5.7 million are Africans and 270,000 are white and 30,000 are colored and Asian. That is to say the whites constitute less than 5 percent of the total population, and Africans outnumber whites by more than 20 to 1.

Despite this population ratio, the land of Rhodesia is divided evenly, one-half for whites and one-half for Africans, and so in per capita terms this means 7 acres for each African and 166 acres for each European. Almost all of the fertile land and the land which is near the vital rail lines is reserved for the whites. Those Africans fortunate enough to find employment in white areas can expect annual earnings of \$501; their white counterparts make \$5,469, 11 times as much.

According to a University College of Rhodesia study, 90 percent of African employees make less than the poverty datum line, the theoretical amount needed to keep body and soul together. Discrimination exists not so much by law as by voluntary discrimination. Whites, through their trade unions, maintain a virtual monopoly of skilled trades. In 1971 there were 59 African apprentices in the entire country; that is 59 out of a population of 5.7 million. African unions are emasculated by legislation banning strikes except after exhaustion of administrative remedies which are beyond the means of any black union. Political strikes are also banned.

Schools in Rhodesia are almost completely segregated. Education for Africans is neither free nor compulsory, as it is for whites, and secondary education is too expensive for most African families. In 1974, 35,000 Africans and 25,000 whites were in secondary schools, hardly reflective of the 20 to 1 ratio in the population of the country.

A web of pass laws and vagrancy statutes restrict Africans' freedom of movement and reinforce basic residential

segregation. Although "petty apartheid" in restaurants, hotels, parks, et cetera, is not so enshrined in law as it is in South Africa, any African faces de facto segregation of most accommodations. A recent law prohibits serving Africans in bars in "white areas" after 7 p.m. on weekdays and after 1 p.m. on Saturdays.

The Rhodesian regime is fond of claiming that its constitution embodies a "non-racial franchise." It is true that the only qualifications for voting are technically based on income, property, and education levels. But since Africans' capacity to earn an income, hold property, and obtain an education are severely restricted in Rhodesian society, it follows that their right to vote is likewise limited. In fact, only 7,400 Africans in the whole country—that is 7,400 Africans out of 5.7 million—are permitted to vote. That is 13 one-hundreds of 1 percent of the African population which is permitted to vote.

So with such lack of access to the country's "parliamentary democracy," it is not surprising that Africans have tried for many years to protest and change the system. They have found that speaking out for freedom and justice is a highly dangerous activity in Rhodesia.

The first African nationalist organization was formed in 1957. It was banned in 1959, and its leaders, including Joshua Nkomo, were arrested.

Two successive parties were formed in 1961 and 1962, in the latter case under the name "Zimbabwe African People's Union". They were also promptly banned by white authorities. In 1963 the Zimbabwe African National Union, led by the Reverend Ndabaningi Sithole, was formed and then declared illegal. In 1964 all nationalist organizations were outlawed. Nkomo and Sithole, who both favored nonviolent pressure for change, spent 10 years, 1964 to 1974, in jail.

Hundreds of other Africans have been detained, arrested, imprisoned, and some have been executed because they acted to end racial oppression. These arbitrary measures continue: More than 200 political prisoners are still in jail. In July 1973, just as Bishop Abel Muzorewa was meeting with Ian Smith for the first time, over 30 top leaders of Muzorewa's African National Council were arrested and imprisoned.

When Ndabaningi Sithole was released from prison in 1974, he was almost immediately re-arrested on vague charges of assassination conspiracy. Permitted to go outside the country for recent political discussions, Sithole understandably fears for his own safety should he return.

As peaceful efforts have been crushed by the Smith regime, some Africans moved, in the late 1960's and especially since 1973, to guerrilla warfare. The regime's response has been draconian, and has been directed more at the civilian population than at the guerrillas. One of the most grotesque actions taken in the name of state security has been the creation of "protected villages." The regime last year forcibly removed over 60,000 Africans from their homes, lands, herds and flocks, without compensation, and put them into "protected villages."

Dr. Rosalie Johnson, an American

Methodist medical missionary recently expelled from Rhodesia, described these villages. She said:

They just put barbed wire around an area and shoved people inside. There is no latrine, no water—they had to carry water in buckets from outside the camp—and no health facilities.

Torture is also used extensively against civilians. A distinguished group of Christian leaders prepared a report on the brutality by the minority regime, in which they stated:

Our investigation points to . . . the deliberate use of illegal and inhumane acts of force when questioning civilians, even those against whom there is no prior evidence of complicity with the enemy.

But the authorities refused to investigate the well-documented cases of torture and condemned the church leaders for trying to embarrass the government.

Parliament is now considering an indemnity bill aimed at giving immunity from prosecution to security forces for anything they might do in good faith during antigovernment operations.

The bill now before the committee today would have the effect of permitting the President—and let me underscore the word "permitting"—to restore the United States to full compliance with the sanctions voted, with the support of the United States, by the United Nations Security Council.

It is argued that if we should embargo the import of chrome and chrome products, this will endanger the security of the United States. It is hard to understand such an assertion in face of the continued support of the administration for the restoration of the embargo.

Does anybody seriously believe that this administration would support reinstatement of the embargo if, in fact, it would cause any question about our national security?

The United States has been importing from Rhodesia for the last several years. On the chart to my right are the figures showing what those imports are.

On that same chart is shown the stockpile—and let me underscore here that this is the stockpile that qualifies in terms of quality of stockpile objectives. Notice that in the case of chrome ore that in 1974—and this is the metallurgical grade, the most valuable ore—in 1974 our imports were 66,000 tons as against almost 2 million tons in the stockpile. In fact, our imports last year from Rhodesia amount to roughly 13 percent of all imports.

In other words we got 87 percent of our metallurgical grade chrome from other sources than Rhodesia last year. There will be no great problem to fill in a 13-percent gap if we restore this embargo. Next comes chrome ore refractory grade. Our imports from Rhodesia are so small that we have enough in the stockpile to make enough for 181 years, if we should be forced to do that.

In the case of ferrochrome, low-carbon, which Rhodesia is increasingly producing, here the Members will note that our imports there were under 5,000 tons. Our U.S. stockpile is sufficient to replace that, if necessary, for over 64 years.

In the case of high carbon ferrochrome, our imports were 29,000 tons. We have over 402,000 tons. We could replace this, if needed, for almost 14 years. There is no threat to the security of the United States.

But, let me make one point. If events should cause a problem 2 years from now or 3 years from now or 4 years from now, the President, under the law, could restore the exemption on chrome shipments. In other words, by passing the bill today we do not require the President to comply with the sanctions; we enable the President to do that, and if some untoward event should occur, or some unforeseen action, we can go back to Rhodesia and start buying again if it is required in the national security interest of the United States.

So there is no problem here that cannot be taken care of from our stockpiles, from other sources, and/or by the discretion which the President has.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on what is happening in Rhodesia itself.

The most significant thing that has happened to Rhodesia happened last year when Mozambique came under African control because Mozambique accounts for almost half of the borders which Rhodesia has with her neighbors.

Mozambique has already announced its intention to comply with the sanctions of the United Nations. Mozambique has been the principal source of permitting goods to flow in and out of Rhodesia while it was under Portuguese control through the Ports of Beira and Lourenco Marques which were the two ports used by Rhodesia in order to maintain its economy. When these ports are closed, there is no adequate replacement for Rhodesia.

Rhodesia has asked the South African Government to improve the railroad facilities in South Africa to take care of the increased load, and the South African Government has refused to do so.

The result is that if the Members will look at the entire perimeter of Rhodesia they will find for the first time that, with the exception of South Africa that Rhodesia is faced with African nations on her borders. The African nations are totally unsympathetic with the fact that a tiny 5-percent white minority controls and is maintaining the control of the 95 percent Africans.

Some people say, well, this is just an internal affair in Rhodesia, or Rhodesia and Britain. If it is just an internal affair and is not a threat to international peace, why then is Prime Minister Vorster in South Africa pushing Ian Smith very hard for a settlement? Why should Vorster concern himself if there is no problem? The fact is that Vorster is putting enormous pressure on Ian Smith to come to a political settlement with the Africans in Rhodesia.

The reason is because the guerrilla activity up in the northeastern part of Rhodesia is going to intensify, and as that becomes an increasing racial war of increasing intensity, Vorster knows it will spread to South Africa and endanger his own regime.

One does not have to have a fire in

order to know that one is about to break out. When the Security Council said that there was a threat to peace, they knew very well what Vorster today fears, and that is that there is going to be a bloody racial conflict that will spread into South Africa and bring an end to the white control in South Africa.

So he wants a political settlement, and he is putting pressure on Ian Smith, but Ian Smith, because he is elected by the whites, the 5 percent, of course, is finding it very difficult to move into a political settlement.

Let me just make the point that Rhodesia is a very important long-term source of chrome. It has got a large proportion of the world's known reserves. The question that we should address is: Is it in the interests of the United States to show apparent support for this 5-percent minority regime which will not be with us very much longer? Or would it be wiser to show that we stand for principle, that we believe in international law, that we have a deep concern about human rights, and we are going to go back into compliance with the sanctions so that when the Africans take control of Rhodesia, the probability of continued access to chrome is improved. It is the long term with which we should be concerned in terms of access to chrome ore, and it is the long term that dictates that the United States should come back into compliance with the charter obligations of international law and follow the request of President Ford.

So I would urge the Members of the Committee to reflect carefully on this. This is no ordinary issue. What we are doing here today is going to reverberate throughout much of the world. It really is.

We spent 2 weeks the first part of this month at the United Nations in protracted intense negotiations with the group of 77 nations which include most of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. We came to an accommodation with them in trying to work out some new economic relations. The relationships which the United States has with these countries are improving. The threat of suspension of Israel, for example, from the General Assembly is receding.

This measure today will bear importantly on the question of how these relationships continue in the future.

I have just one last comment. Section 2 of this bill is a section that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and I talked about 3 or 4 years ago in which Mr. DENT said at one time:

Why do you not put a provision in saying that we will not allow any steel to come into the United States that has got Rhodesian chrome in it?

That is what section 2 does. Section 2 says that when bulk steel—not a consumer product, not a finished product, but bulk steel—comes into the United States containing chrome, it must be accompanied by a certificate of origin indicating where that chrome came from.

Somebody said this is applying a sanction to third countries. We have always applied sanctions to third countries. Ever since the sanctions went into effect, we

have required, insofar as we have been able to, that when third-country shipments, for example, of chrome come in, to test to see whether in fact it came from Rhodesia. All we are trying to do now is put a new enforcement device in to enforce the sanctions that have existed and have been in place since the late sixties.

I might add that I had the opportunity to speak to the Officer of the European Community in charge of international trade because it is some of those people who are the principal exporters of bulk steel to the United States. He said in his judgment they did not foresee any problem with this provision. He said that they use a certificate of origin themselves in enforcing the rules of the Common Market.

The United States has had experience in this because we have done it in the case of Cuba, and in the case of Chinese goods, we have required certificates of origin in order to protect the United States from the illegal introduction of goods, which is in violation of the law.

I know that we are going to have a vigorous debate this afternoon, but I would only urge on the Members to reflect on why President Ford has concluded, despite his record in the House of having supported the Byrd amendment, that as the leader of this Nation it is essential to our national interests to pass this bill.

Reflect on that, because it is his judgment and that of his advisors which ought to weigh heavily on our judgment when we come to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota just consumed 21 minutes of the time allotted to the majority of the Committee on International Relations.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think this bill ought to be defeated and defeated soundly. However, it is an extremely complex subject and I wish I had the 21 minutes the gentleman from Minnesota had to answer him point by point. Let me say the gentleman was eloquent but in my judgment totally illogical and that he used the wrong facts in the wrong fashion to reach a very poor conclusion, but let me sum up the bill as I see it.

The passage of this bill to repeal the Byrd amendment would place the United States at the tender mercies of the Soviet Union for chrome ore. At a time when we are supposedly driving a hard bargain with the Soviet Union because they need U.S. grain, it seems to me the height of folly to give them a counter weapon to use. Members know very well they will use it because the record shows that when we abided by the U.N. embargo of Rhodesian chrome the Soviet Union not only controlled the price but also the quality of chrome ore that reached the United States. They doubled the price and they put many of our users in serious jeopardy as to their supplies.

I would also like to point out that in my opinion this is not a black versus white issue. To me it is a matter of practical economics for the United States.

We have had a chrome stockpile since 1939. We have been totally dependent on imports of chrome ore since 1961. Is this the time to put ourselves at the mercy of the Soviet Union to be the major supplier of chrome ore to the United States?

If Members will listen carefully to the gentleman from Minnesota and others who will support his view, it will be seen that they go to great lengths to denounce the Government of Rhodesia. Frankly, I do, too. I think that government will run its course. A government cannot be maintained in perpetuity supported by only 5 percent of the population. That is why I say the politics of the present Government of Rhodesia is not in question. But even if the politics would be in question, the Government of Rhodesia is no more valid in their eyes as is the Government of South Africa.

Suppose we did not need this Rhodesian chrome because the Government of South Africa would be the supplier. But logically then we should pass an embargo against South Africa and put ourselves again at the mercy of the Soviet Union.

And what about Turkey? They supply chrome ore from time to time. But given our present relations with Turkey and the practical facts of life, which are that the Japanese have bought up the Turkish chrome ore for the next 10 or 15 years, again where are we?

If we repeal the Byrd amendment we will be putting our industrial users who are dependent on Rhodesian chrome ore at the mercy of the Soviet Union. It is that plain and simple, the Soviet Union versus the United States, on this economic issue. It is not a question of the blacks in Africa. It is not a question of U.N. sanctions.

These U.N. sanctions are a mockery. Today we can find the products of every Western European country and some of the East European countries and Japan in Rhodesia. The United States has a far better record of compliance with the sanctions than many other countries. One exception we make is under the Byrd amendment. It is a valid exception, one that is in the economic self-interest of the United States, and it would be economic stupidity of the highest order for us at this time to repeal the Byrd amendment.

Now, given the great attendance we have on the floor, I am afraid my eloquence is not getting to enough Members; so at some later point if I get the floor with a slightly larger membership, I may ask the indulgence of the Members if I repeat the highlights of this address; but for those who are here, I know I have impressed them properly. I know that I have made new converts.

To reemphasize, H.R. 1287 would repeal a provision of law enacted in 1971 known as the Byrd amendment which prohibits the banning of imports of critical and strategic materials from any non-Communist country as long as no similar prohibitions exist regarding the importation of the same material from Communist countries. In practical effect, the Byrd amendment voided the prohibition against U.S. importation of critical and strategic materials from Rhodesia

imposed as a result of the voting of economic sanctions against that country by the United Nations Security Council in November 1967.

Although the Byrd amendment applies to the importation of all critical and strategic materials—and critical and strategic materials other than chrome; for example, nickel and asbestos have been imported under the act—the principal thrust behind its enactment was and remains metallurgical chrome, an irreplaceable component of stainless and other specialty steels of vital importance to the Nation's security and economic well-being.

An understanding of metallurgical chrome, its limited availability and its critical importance to the Nation's economy and security is essential if the Congress is to make the decisions that will serve the overall best interests of our Nation now and for the future.

Chromium is a metallurgical element that occurs naturally in the form of an ore called chromite. There are several general types or grades of chromite which differ from one another primarily in chrome content and impurities. Far and away the most important is metallurgical grade chromite. Fully 82 percent of the ferrochrome alloys consumed in the United States in 1973 was made from metallurgical grade ore.

Before metallurgical chromite can be used by the steel industry and other industrial consumers, it must first be converted by a high temperature smelting and reduction process into one of several types of ferrochrome alloy. This is the job of the ferroalloys industry, which also converts manganese ore and quartzite into various types of ferromanganese and ferrosilicon alloys essential to the production of a variety of important steel and aluminum products.

Chromium is one of the most important and most indispensable industrial metals. When the United States began to designate strategic materials for stockpiling and defense purposes in 1939, chromium was one of the first four commodities listed.

Ferrochromium alloy is irreplaceable for the production of stainless steel and other types of high-performance steels and superalloys, where the chromium imparts vital resistance to heat and corrosion. About 10 percent of domestic production of these steels goes directly to military and defense applications. Modern jet airplanes and nuclear submarines and warships, for instance, cannot be built without metallurgical chrome. Eighty-five percent of stainless steel output is devoted to other essential uses, such as oil refineries, hospital equipment, food processing machinery, and chemical plants. Contrary to popular belief only about 5 percent of U.S. stainless steel production goes for household appliances and kitchen tools.

In 1973, chrome ore prices increased toward \$50 per ton, shipping point. Effective March 1, 1974, the sole U.S. importer of Russian chrome ore announced a new price hike to \$53 to \$58 per ton, f.o.b., Black Sea ports.

Parcels of both Russian and Turkish ore have been sold for 1975 delivery at

\$100 to \$125 per ton, f.o.b., Russian or Turkish port, against approximately \$80 per ton for Rhodesian ore, f.o.b. African port. U.S. purchasers of Russian chrome ore have recently been quoted publicly as saying prices to them will rise to \$150 to \$160 per metric ton for ore delivered to U.S. ports. They complain further that only short-term—6-month—supply contracts are available. This has led to industry speculation that the Russians, anticipating the possibility of an imminent repeal of the Byrd amendment and reimposition of the U.S. ban on Rhodesian imports, want to be in a position to further escalate prices.

It is clear from the foregoing that the availability of Rhodesian chrome ore has had and, hopefully, will continue to have a stabilizing and moderating effect on ore prices. Conversely, repeal of the Byrd amendment would undoubtedly result in a substantial increase in the domestic price of chrome ore and ferrochrome. When repeal of the Byrd amendment was under consideration in 1972, suppliers of chrome ore forecast an immediate price increase of 20 percent if imports from Rhodesia were again banned. The same grim prospects would appear to be in store for the United States if H.R. 1287 is enacted into law this year. In fact, in light of today's tenuous supply/demand balance, the severing of the Rhodesian supply line is virtually certain to send chrome prices skyrocketing resulting in severe downrange consequences for the U.S. economy.

The price and competitive availability of chrome—ferrochrome, specifically—are of critical importance to the U.S. stainless and specialty steel industry. Stainless steel, for example, has a chromium content of 18 percent. Other special steels and superalloys contain even higher amounts of chromium. Obviously, then, chrome costs are a significant factor in the production of these important materials.

Chrome costs would take on even greater importance if foreign steel producers, who have freely evaded U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia from the outset, are once again able to procure their raw materials for as much as 30 percent below the cost to American steelmakers. Although chromium makes up about 18 percent of the content of stainless steel, it represents fully 25 percent of the raw material cost of stainless steel production. Repeal of the Byrd amendment and the reimposition of the ban on Rhodesian chrome imports would give foreign producers a decided cost advantage over U.S. producers. Such a cost advantage would enable foreign specialty steelmakers to increase their penetration of U.S. markets.

Meanwhile Rhodesian chrome, in the form of foreign-produced stainless steel, would continue to enter the United States just as it did before enactment of the Byrd amendment, thus nullifying the effect of U.S. sanction. The only "losers" in all this would be U.S. industry, the American worker and the American consumer.

Chrome ore and ferrochrome remained in critical short supply worldwide throughout 1974, and, despite the recent

softening in stainless steel demand, supplies currently are barely adequate to meet steel industry needs.

About 70 percent of the ferrochrome used in the world goes to make stainless steel. Stainless steel production, which worldwide has been growing at an average of 7 percent a year over the past 10 years, experienced particularly rapid growth over the past 2 years.

To the traditional broad-based demand for stainless steel—in chemical manufacture, petroleum refining, nuclear power generation, automotive manufacture, and so forth—was added the catalytic converter for the 1975 automobiles which will have a "409" stainless steel case. The catalytic converter, alone, is forecast to increase the market demand for stainless steel by at least 10 percent for the next several years.

U.S. demand for ferrochrome is outstripping domestic production capacity. The low return on investment of the U.S. ferroalloy industry during the sixties and early seventies discouraged investment in new domestic production facilities. New ferrochrome facilities are now under construction offshore but will not be adequate to relieve the shortages until 1978 at the earliest.

These uncertainties are manifest in Congress perennial entertainment of Byrd amendment repeal legislation such as the measure presently under consideration by this committee. With the threat of imminent repeal constantly hanging over the Byrd amendment, Rhodesia is understandably reluctant to alter its established chrome marketing plans in favor of greater commitments to U.S. markets. The inhibiting effect of this on-again, off-again situation on U.S. availability of Rhodesian chrome was clearly evident during the first half of 1974. At the time, the Senate had voted in favor of repeal of the Byrd amendment and House action appeared imminent.

The continued availability of Rhodesian chrome is essential if the United States is to meet its chrome needs. This year, the United States is expected to receive some 80,000 to 100,000 tons of chrome ore and more than 50,000 tons of ferrochrome from Rhodesia. This requirement cannot be secured elsewhere.

Reimposition of the ban on imports of Rhodesian chrome would deprive the U.S. market of more than 15 percent of its present supplies. This clearly would significantly worsen the domestic supply situation, stimulate higher prices and discourage employment in the ferroalloys and stainless steel industries.

Those who advocate the renewal of the embargo make much of the availability of the U.S. national security stockpile of chrome and ferrochrome. But here, too, the facts are not comforting or reassuring.

Then, too, congressional approval would be required before stockpile reserves could be released and previous Congresses have refused to authorize such action pending a better determination of the Nation's critical and strategic stockpile needs.

Such a course of action leaves wide open the question of the national security needs for the stockpiled chrome in

the event of a true national security emergency. The matter of the adequacies of the Government's stockpile of critical and strategic material is currently under comprehensive study.

As mentioned earlier, there is a growing trend among mineral rich countries to upgrade their products as much as possible prior to export. As a result, producing countries—those who produce manganese as well as chrome ore—have sought to upgrade their products into ferroalloys and retain for themselves the economic benefits of such processing. Rhodesia and South Africa are doing this. The Soviet Union, too, recently asked for bids on a mammoth 320,000-ton-a-year large chrome plant, which would be the largest chrome plant in the world—3½ times larger, in fact, than the largest U.S. chrome plant.

Forward integration efforts such as those by mineral-rich countries are spurred by specific savings that can be realized in transportation costs which may, in the case of chrome, account for 25 percent or more of ore costs.

Electric power costs, which account for somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of the production costs for ferroalloys, are another important competitive factor. Rising costs of fossil fuels, the imposition of air pollution requirements on electric generating stations and other factors are producing strong upward pressures on the costs of electric energy in the United States. In many of the producing countries today, the cost of electric power is significantly less than that in the United States.

Although U.S. ferroalloy producers were beset with serious competitive problems long before the availability of Rhodesian chrome was in issue, the imposition of sanctions saddled them with a new and even more burdensome competitive handicap. Sanctions deprived them of the best source of lower cost chrome ore and made them wholly dependent on higher cost Russian or Turkish ore. The net effect was a further serious deterioration of their competitive position and economic viability.

The Byrd amendment has effectively eliminated that handicap and helped to put domestic ferroalloy producers on a more competitive footing. It has unquestionably served to reduce the cost of their essential raw material—whether obtained from Rhodesia, Russia, Turkey, or elsewhere—and to create a more competitive and stable domestic chrome supply situation.

This is a bad time to debate still another Byrd amendment repeal bill, and an even worse time to enact it.

Reimposition of the ban on imports of Rhodesian chrome would significantly worsen an already tight U.S. chrome supply situation, drive up domestic prices of chrome and the myriad "downstream" chrome-containing products and weaken the competitive position of the ferroalloy, stainless steel and other essential U.S. industries. This, in turn, would add new fuel to our Nation's inflationary fires and pose a significant new threat to domestic employment.

Retention of the Byrd amendment is clearly in the national interest, partic-

ularly when viewed in terms of its moderating effect on the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem— inflation and the economy. Equally apparent is the utter and complete failure of sanction to bring the Rhodesian Government to its knees and force a settlement of that country's racial issue.

Repeal of the Byrd amendment would not reduce the amount of Rhodesian chrome available to world markets. It would only deny a badly needed raw material to the U.S. market and, in the process, do serious damage to our Nation's economy. In fact, repeal of the Byrd amendment could strengthen, rather than weaken, the Rhodesian economy by again enabling the Soviet Union to significantly boost the price of chrome, thus enabling Rhodesia in turn to increase its chrome prices.

The world's important sources of metallurgical chrome are located in countries with which people of the United States may have moral, political, religious, or social differences. As Americans, we do not, of course, endorse the policies of South Africa or Rhodesia toward blacks. Nor do we support the treatment of the Soviet Union accords Jews—any more than we condone many of the events that have transpired in the long-standing Arab-Israeli dispute. Our Nation's purchase of essential and critical raw materials, whether chrome or oil, in no way indicates the support of the American people or the U.S. Government for these policies, practices, or attitudes—nor should it be so interpreted.

I urge all Members to join in defeating this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the main thrust, as I understand it from those who support this bill, is that there is a very bad government in Rhodesia and we ought to do something about it, particularly since the United Nations Charter has been brought into play upon it and therefore, we should gnash our teeth about the morality of that country and try to clean it up.

Well, the United Nations Charter represents several moral obligations. It is a moral obligation to the world, but it is also a moral obligation to the American citizens. When that charter was established, it had very strict guidelines, and very properly so. The United Nations was not supposed to go into domestic affairs. The Government of our country, the citizens of our country, would never have agreed to a United Nations Charter that allowed this country to go into the domestic affairs of another country.

Mayhap the situation may be horrendous in South Africa. I do not know because I have really not done an adequate study and have relied upon the Foreign Affairs Committee to do it in their travels and their study. They have made a careful study of it and it is apparently the type of government they say: but we have a moral obligation to America. We have a moral obligation to the young men who may be lost on

foreign shores. We have a moral obligation to see to it that our citizens are not embroiled in wars and dissensions in the internal affairs of other countries.

I think it would be, therefore, highly immoral for the U.S. Government to indulge in going into Rhodesia to try to rearrange their government to suit ourselves. The United Nations Charter never contemplated this, never permitted us to go into foreign domestic matters. This Rhodesian sanction is, therefore, void ab initio. The American people did not allow this in the U.N. Charter and the U.S. Congress did not do it and domestic affairs are not in the pawn of the U.N.

The next observation I have is on these figures. Well, they are interesting figures here on the blackboard and they are very dramatic. They are somewhat in error. For instance, I notice there one line says 939,737 tons of refracting grade chrome ore. I think that figure is actually 399,670 tons, if the staff will check it; but it is rather inconsequential.

Why is it inconsequential? Because in the beautiful chart their talking about hundreds of years of chrome is based on the theory that the only thing we need to run the defense of our country is the kind of tons they have there for the national defense of our country; but that is erroneous, because in the testimony it was clearly pointed out, I think, before ours, that 95 percent of the chrome used in the United States has a defense aspect of great importance to the U.S. Government.

I would appreciate if the gentleman would leave the chart up. It is not in the way. Do not worry about it. I would like to have it there.

So the percentage is greatly distorted, because the figures they are using on that big chart there are figures that actually are of the amount of chrome that goes into a bullet or a piece of mechanism that is actually going to be fired on the front lines, something like that, in other words actual defense materiel; but our national defense cannot be sustained by that small amount of chrome.

The testimony before our committee was that 95 percent of all the chrome used in the United States goes for defense. That is just knocking out chrome for automobiles, silverware, silverplate, things like that 95 percent of all the chrome used in the United States goes for defense even if it is not listed as defense usage. So, these figures are a charade. I am surprised that they were brought here. They have no significance at all because our country could not survive with that kind of situation. It could not survive at all.

Nobody under any criteria given us prior to the Nixon administration says that we have more than 3 years' supply for our national defense needs. Nobody did, nobody at all. The actual situation is that they are very scared about that. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) himself received on July 17 a letter from the Department of Defense in which they mentioned this 95 percent situation and it concluded by saying—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. The letter concluded:

The Deputy Secretary of Defense has recommended to the National Security Council that the assumptions and policies controlling the levels of strategic and critical materials to be held in the national stockpile be re-examined and has further recommended that action be taken to defer the disposal of any stockpile materials since this reexamination may lead to recomputation of stockpile objectives. I hope this will assist you in your review of the chrome ore matters.

The President wrote me just last week and said that these reexaminations were going on. So, what I am saying is that this bill is premature. That is why I asked the Rules Committee to postpone the rule until January of next year, because we do not know now. The Department of Defense says that these are not reliable figures we have before us today, so it would be sheer folly for us to pass this bill today because we do not know.

Nobody in the Department of Defense has testified that these are accurate figures. There are not any figures that are accurate. Nobody can say how much is actually needed for defense because the whole thing is being reexamined.

In concluding, let me point out another thing: It has been said here that the President, of course, would not present to us anything that is inaccurate. Believe me, every time we have had the Department of Defense before us we have inquired into this matter, and they have expressed great concern. When I attempted to prevent this thing under the Nixon administration, I found out that there were new guidelines which had been set up, including going from 3 years to 1, taking everything from the civilian economy and putting it in defense, et cetera. Those guidelines, with the exception of the 3-to-1 year, still exist. The Nixon guidelines still exist in the bureaucracy of the present administration. The President himself has told me that he is reexamining this matter, so it would be utter folly for us to pass this bill.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I appreciate his bringing out why those figures do not represent the whole story and why there is an element of fraud in the way they are presented. I appreciate his helping us, and I hope he will make the point again when there are more colleagues present so that it will be known that those figures do not represent the whole story.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the gentleman has pinpointed something that has been overlooked. The bill itself verifies the statement the gentleman is making about the concern, be-

cause the bill itself prescribes that if we apply the embargo and then we are in danger, it can be lifted by the President.

Why put that safeguard in? If this is a moral question there can be no ifs, ands, or buts. We cannot amend a proposal dealing with morality, if that is what it is. If it is morality at the basis of this, then how do we allow the bill itself to set aside that contention?

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I understand from comments by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT), that there was supposed to be some fraud or deception in those figures. The gentleman in the well did not make that statement, did he?

Mr. BENNETT. No, but if the gentleman presses me, I might, because he is saying in here something that I think is very misleading, and this reminded me of something.

I want to remind the gentleman of one thing that I did not say when I spoke before, and that is not only are these figures wrong with regard to the things that were pointed out before, but they are wrong in regard to another point—I am glad the gentleman reminded me of it—and that is that these figures are based upon the importation of chrome ore from Rhodesia.

It could be zero, and this bill still should not pass. The problem with this bill is that if we pass this bill, then we are going to be entirely beholden to Russia—and Russia will cut us, you know where.

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

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1287, legislation which would reimpose full U.S. participation in the economic sanctions against Rhodesia and thereby halt the importation into the United States of Rhodesian chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that in some instances the House report on H.R. 1287 is totally misleading. On page 4 of this report it is stated that—

The average price of Soviet chrome ore at the end of the first quarter of 1975 was \$25.59 per ton compared to the Rhodesian price of \$39.41 per ton.

It is interesting to note that during the 1971 hearings on this issue before the House International Relations Subcommittee on International Organizations, Mr. Joseph B. Kyle, Director of the Office of International Commodities in the Bureau of Economic Affairs of the State Department, estimated that the price per ton of metallurgical grade chrome ore imported from the U.S.S.R. in 1971 was between \$70 to \$72 per ton. This was during the period before the adoption of the Byrd amendment to the Military Procurement Act of fiscal year 1972, and during the period when the United States was enforcing economic sanctions

against importing Rhodesian chrome. It is amazing what competition will do.

It is unreasonable not to expect that should we pass H.R. 1287, the price of Soviet chrome will jump back to the sanction prices or even higher, and that these increases will be passed onto the consumers. In these days of inflated prices, I do not know how any Member of this body could justify an aye vote for this legislation.

With regard to the suspicions that the U.S.S.R. was importing Rhodesian chrome during the time when the United States was observing the sanctions and then selling this chrome to us at a considerable profit, the report states on page 7:

Allegations that the Soviet Union has covertly purchased Rhodesian chrome and transshipped it to the United States have not been supported by scientific evidence. In 1971 when this charge was made, the U.S. Geological Survey examined samples of chrome ore imported from the Soviet Union and concluded that their composition was such that they could not be of Rhodesian origin.

However, during the 1971 hearings, Blair Bolles, vice president of Colt Industries and vice president of its component company, Crucible, Inc., testified before the subcommittee on the results of testing of chromium ore samples at the Crucible Laboratory. These samples were from several countries including Rhodesia and the Soviet Union. Mr. Bolles stated in his testimony:

The test is based on the titanium content of the ores. In laboratory's checking of chemical analyses of dozens of chromites from many sources, it appeared that all contained some titanium and that the titanium appeared to be at two distinctly different levels depending on the source.

On this basis we obtained chromium ores stockpiled in the United States by companies in the minerals business. One lot of samples in the possession of Lavino Division of International Minerals & Chemical Corp., Philadelphia, originated from positively identified sources.

The chromite phase in these ores were analyzed by means of the electron microscope for titanium and compared with a number of samples in another lot of ores, including four samples that had been shipped into the United States designated as coming from the Soviet Union. A total of five Soviet samples were tested:

The data resulting from the tests show an unexpected similarity in titanium content between Rhodesian ore and four Soviet samples. In summary the data showed the following:

(1) The titanium level of all samples may be placed in one of two categories—low—0.10 percent or less—or high—above 0.25 percent.

(2) The range of the titanium content within a source is relatively small.

(3) Most importantly, the so-called Soviet ore overlaps the range of the sample from Rhodesia—0.06 to 0.10 percent compared to 0.08 to 0.09 percent for the Rhodesian ore—while the sample known to have come from the major Russian source contains 0.29 to 0.30 percent.

This is, of course, circumstantial evidence, and does not preclude the possibility that the low-titanium-content ore came from a Soviet source different from the high-content sample. However, it certainly suggests the possibility that the ore originates in Rhodesia.

A table appended to this statement shows content sample by sample.

The test results were submitted to the Department of State on March 19. We suggested that the Federal Government make tests like ours in order to find out whether the results would be the same. The test is not final proof, but it does raise a question which should engage the interest of the Congress and the executive branch. Is the United States obtaining Rhodesian ore without being aware that it is doing so?

If so, it is ridiculous that the United States should continue to refrain from importing Rhodesian ore directly. It is time for the Government to face this fact.

It is my understanding that in making its tests, the U.S. Geological Survey did not duplicate the testing procedure used by Crucible, nor have they disputed this testing procedure as being inaccurate.

The House report would have us believe that the sanctions against Rhodesia were effective and we were the ones that abandoned the commitment. On page 5 of the report, it is stated.

The United States thereby is the only nation other than South Africa which openly violates the Security Council sanctions.

"Openly" is the key word. During the 1971 hearings, Mr. E. F. Andrews, vice president for materials and services at Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc., who visited Rhodesia on several occasions, testified:

While deny ourselves this major and vital raw material, one needs only to visit Southern Rhodesia to realize that its chrome ore has been finding its way into the world markets. There is little ore seen above ground although they work the mines 7 days a week. As we know, they were unable to ship but a mere 15 percent of the 150,000 tons approved many months ago for import. The United Nations has itself offered the best evidence of the sanction's failure. In the third report of the United Nations Security Council Sanctions Committee, published in June, 1970, it was estimated that Rhodesian exports were running at approximately 70 percent of their presanctions level. Twenty-one complaints of violations were investigated by the United Nations involving chrome ore from Rhodesia to France, Japan, Netherlands, Italy, Spain, and West Germany. It is generally admitted that we and Britain are the only ones seriously abiding by the sanctions.

The point was made earlier that if Rhodesian ore were not finding its way into the free world the free world would be out of chrome today. There is not that much any place else. I have also asked the question whether the flow of Rhodesian chrome into Red China has not perhaps been an aid to them becoming a nuclear power.

Many reliable sources indicate that substantial quantities of this material are flowing into the hands of foreign specialty steel producers, undoubtedly substantially aiding foreign producers of specialty steels in moving into and capturing large segments of the American market for specialty steels, producing a chaotic price situation here, bringing about unemployment and affecting the profitability of small American companies to the point where there is serious question about their economic viability.

Also, markets have been sufficiently encroached upon that we are beginning to see cutbacks in vital programs. Foreign producers of specialty steel, who are beneficiaries of the Rhodesian sanctions, have penetrated the American market for specialty steels, at the end of 4 months of 1971, at an all-time high, exceeding 22 percent. For individual specialty steel products, the penetration is even greater; some 35 percent of stainless steel cold rolled sheets; 68 percent of the market for stainless steel wire rods;

54 percent of the market for stainless steel wire. One can rightfully ask how much embargoed Rhodesian ore is contained in this imported stainless steel coming into this country, adding insult to the injury of the unemployed or about to be unemployed American steelworker.

A point which bears repeating is that to enact this legislation would be placing us in the position of having to again depend on the U.S.S.R. for our principal supply of metallurgical grade chrome. Certainly no one in this body can argue that Russia believes in the principles of democracy and self-determination.

Mr. Chairman, I must admit that I am more concerned with protecting the interests of the United States than I am with cooperating with the United Nations Security Council embargo. The domestic needs of our country must come first. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this legislation.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1287.

The distinguished chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee has eloquently demonstrated why H.R. 1287 is a dangerous bill. I would like to fully associate myself with his comments here today, and make just a few additional points to emphasize the economic and defense aspects of the chrome issue.

As we all know, when supply decreases, prices generally go up. If we cut off any major source of our chrome supply, it seems elementary that it will cost us more to obtain this critical resource in the future. I say critical, because chrome is an essential ingredient in missiles, submarines, airplanes, and tanks; and when the price of chrome rises, the cost of those weapons is obliged to rise accordingly.

This is not a theoretical exercise. In 1968, when the United States was cut off from Rhodesian chrome, the Soviet price for metallurgical-grade chromite ore was \$39.87 per ton. After the embargo, the Russian price promptly soared to \$68.45 per ton. Thus, during the period when we were cut off from Rhodesian chrome, Russia jacked up the price by nearly 75 percent.

After the Byrd amendment reopened the chrome trade with Rhodesia in 1971, the Russian price fell. Then, when Moscow had reason to believe that we would approve a new embargo last December, Russian chromite prices went up again. Now that Russia again anticipates congressional action restoring the embargo, Russian metallurgical-grade ore prices are being quoted at \$160 per ton. Therefore, it is obvious that H.R. 1287 invites the Soviet Union to further inflate our defense budget.

Even more disturbing from a strategic standpoint is the fact that Russia is in a position to control supply as well as price. A witness from the Council on Economic Policy testified at an Armed Services Committee hearing recently that the Soviet Union "has on occasion manipulated the supply of chrome." For example, she cut off shipments to the United States during the Korean war and for some years afterward. Now, we are at a very

delicate stage of negotiations in the Middle East. American weapons are important to bring about the proper balance in that volatile area. If this bill were to pass, Russia would be in a position to restrict our ability to supply the necessary weapons, by cutting us off from the chrome we need.

Mr. Chairman, we have no useful deposits of chrome in this country. For defense and civilian needs, we must import what we need. You hear the argument that our stockpile of chrome would carry us through if we were isolated from all foreign sources. In fact, we have about a 3-year supply of chrome ore stockpiled at the present time. Our ability to continue supplying the chrome ore necessary for our weapons and defense-related needs, as well as numerous essential civilian requirements, depends upon our access to Rhodesian chrome.

These are the practical considerations, Mr. Chairman. On the political side, it is pertinent to observe that, while a resumption of the embargo would hurt the United States badly, it would not seriously affect Rhodesia. The government which prompted the United Nations embargo 7 years ago is the same government that is in power today. During the 4 years of that embargo, which America participated in, that same government continued to function normally. There is nothing to be gained by approving H.R. 1287, Mr. Chairman, and for overwhelming national interests, there is every reason to oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. METCALFE).

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1287.

In 1965, Rhodesia declared its independence from Great Britain and established a minority-rule government under the Ian Smith regime. At the request of Great Britain, the United Nations Security Council voted in 1966 to impose mandatory economic sanctions against the Smith regime. This action was taken under chapter 7 of the United Nations Charter, which provides for the imposition of sanctions when the Security Council has determined that there is a threat to international peace and security. The United States strongly supported the imposition of the sanctions as a means whereby the international community could bring about a peaceful political change toward majority rule in Rhodesia.

However, for the past 4 years, the United States has been violating this solemn treaty obligation. With the passage of the Byrd amendment in 1971, this country broke an international agreement and became the only country to officially violate the United Nations-imposed economic sanctions against Rhodesia.

This action by the United States has been tragic. U.S. importation of Rhodesian chrome has been a serious blow to the credibility of our relations with the overwhelming majority of African nations. According to Secretary of State Kissinger:

The Byrd provision is not essential to our national security, brings us no real economic advantage, and is detrimental to the conduct of foreign relations.

Thus, our importation of Rhodesian chrome has created considerable hostility toward the United States among most African nations. Some of these nations, such as oil-rich Nigeria, are far more important to U.S. political and economic interests than is Rhodesia.

I do not intend to detail the many legal and economic reasons why we must pass H.R. 1287. Many of my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle have already set forth these reasons. However, I do want to impress upon my colleagues that it is past time to re-evaluate U.S. foreign policy positions regarding the minority-rule governments of southern Africa. At a time when we are trying to ease tensions in other areas of the world, it is totally incomprehensible to me that we continue to follow policies in this area of the world that can only lead to increased violence and instability.

Only by fully complying with the United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia can the United States exert effective leadership in achieving full compliance with those sanctions by other nations. The sanctions are beginning to have the desired effect on the illegal Ian Smith regime, but their potential can never be fully realized until all nations accord high priority to the goal of democratic rule in Rhodesia through multilateral cooperation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask, is the gentleman from Minnesota yielding time on his own behalf or on behalf of the committee?

Mr. FRASER. On my own time, Mr. Chairman. That is true as to the last speaker.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask, is that on the gentleman's time?

Mr. FRASER. That is on my own time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, in one sense this whole debate is very academic. I do not know whether it makes much difference what we decide here. I believe that is true in terms of our supply of chrome from Rhodesia, because actually that decision is going to be made by the newly formed revolutionary government in Mozambique.

The question we are going to decide here is whether we are going to continue a viable and a vital and a constructive relationship with all of black Africa or whether we are going to share in the racist isolation of Rhodesia, a racist isolation which even South Africa rejects.

Right now Rhodesian chrome comes across Mozambique. But as of June 23, 1975, Mozambique has formed a new government. That government has not yet closed its ports to Rhodesia, but there has already been an agreement made in the Organization of African Unity, as well as in the British Commonwealth of

Nations, to give Mozambique the almost \$20 million a year that they receive in port fees to close their borders to Rhodesian chrome. If that takes place, the government in Mozambique will then force Rhodesia to send its chrome all the way down to South African ports.

The South African ports are already overcrowded. In fact, they are in the process of building new ports elsewhere, including one just north of Durban, but they are not yet ready. South Africa's high production takes care of all the shipping facilities it can get in and out of its ports.

It is also true that South Africa is dependent on Mozambique for its energy supply from the Cabora Basa Dam which supplies very low-cost hydroelectric power, which is basic to the survival of South African industry. Therefore, South Africa is not allowing itself to get sucked into the trick of supporting 5 percent of the population of Rhodesia. In fact, they want that 5 percent to come into South Africa, and they want to give Rhodesia over to a black government without violence, because they know that if violence starts in Rhodesia—in fact, it has already started—all along the Mozambique border and all along the border of Botswana there is going to be a military confrontation which will inevitably spill over into South Africa and mean additional violence and bloodshed in the whole area.

South Africa wants to have some peaceful transition in this area. Whether they have it or not and whether they can do it at this point is still an open question. However, they can only do it if they are willing to make concessions to democratic government in Rhodesia and in Namibia.

The Nationalist Party seems to be willing to do that in order to get time to deal with their domestic problems, and the question of Rhodesia is being argued right now in Lusaka by a strange coalition of the President of Zambia, Kenneth Kaunda, the representative from Mozambique, Mr. Machel, the representative president of Botswana, whose name I do not remember and Prime Minister Vorster of South Africa.

They are only doing that because they feel that the self-interest of all of southern Africa is at stake.

The Members might also notice that if we extended this map on up here, almost all the way up, the east coast of Africa is heavily influenced by very left-wing governments.

America's access to eastern Africa and the whole question of the Indian Ocean, by and large, is going to be determined by certain factors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the whole question of what is going to happen in the Indian Ocean may well be decided by the decisions made by the Government of Mozambique which, though it did not invite the United States even to be at its independence cere-

mony because they thought we neglected them in their whole freedom struggle, yet that independence movement was founded by a young man who was a graduate of Illinois Western University and a product of Methodist missionary learn. Somewhere he was taught that he education. Somewhere he was taught to was a child of God and he wanted his people to be free.

When Senator DICK CLARK went to visit Mozambique, he found the red carpet thrown out in a willing friendship with the United States of America, but still they were very hesitant, because of the snubs they received through their struggle.

I think that if we want chrome from Rhodesia, the best way to get it is not to support the Byrd amendment, but to support the freedom struggle of all Africa, of which right now South Africa seems to be a part.

Incidentally, interestingly enough, the west coast of Africa gives us 25 percent of our imported oil. It did not cut off oil when the Arabs imposed their boycott.

Nigeria is another factor in this altogether. It in some way has been working with Zaire, right up to the present time, to support the United States in keeping Israel in the United Nations. They have been a moderating influence in the pricing of oil. They have continued the supply of oil.

I do not think we want to write off all of black Africa with its tremendous wealth and mineral resources and its moral right to freedom and dignity and the right to influence all human beings for a little bit of chrome in Rhodesia which we do not need anyway. We have enough chrome in our junkyards to recycle for the next dozen years.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BUCHANAN. May I ask whether the making of this parliamentary inquiry is taken out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it will be taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, all right. I will proceed anyway.

Is it not correct that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) is handling the 30 minutes for the Committee on International Relations on the majority side?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And is it not correct that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) is handling the 30 minutes allotted to the minority side of the Committee on International Relations?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) is handling the 30 minutes on the majority side for the Committee on Armed Services?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 30 minutes on the minority side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has 1 hour that the Committee on Rules saw fit to give to that gentleman to handle as his own time. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I raise those inquiries, Mr. Chairman, so as to make clear to the Members just who will control the time because, like my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), who is on the other side of this issue, I asked the Committee on Rules to divide the time equally between the proponents and the opponents and it was my understanding that it was their intention to do so.

I believe the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has just indicated that is his desire. Is that correct?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. So if there is some Member who wants to know whether there is a desire to keep this debate fair on a very controversial issue and a very complicated issue, they have now been reminded who controls the time and how much each one has.

May I inquire, Mr. Chairman, how much time I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Alabama has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) reminded the House during the debate on the rule of a fact concerning my position on this issue, and that is that I earlier held a position different from the one which I now hold.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman was referring to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BUCHANAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, and stand corrected. I would say to my friend that he is precisely correct about that fact. I would like to tell the Members why. Like the President of the United States, who earlier supported the Byrd amendment, who earlier voted for its passage and who now urges this House to repeal the Byrd amendment and to support the resolution, I once voted for the Byrd amendment but now I urge its repeal.

At the time that I cast that vote I agreed with Members who have spoken and Members who will speak in this chamber, that to take such action was protecting the national security interests of the United States and the vital economic interests of the United States. I believed that to take such action was a fair and right thing to do in light of the fact that, as much as we might deplore the nature of the government in Rhodesia, we also deplore the nature of the government in such countries as the Soviet Union, and I thought that this consistently made it possible for us to adopt this policy to protect the national

security interest and to receive vital strategic materials.

I will explain to the House why I here today urge repeal of the Byrd amendment.

The gentleman from Illinois in testifying before the Committee on Rules stated that we would come to the floor of this House, those of us on my side, waving the banner of the United Nations. But my friend the gentleman from Florida is wrong if that gentleman believes that is the banner I wave today. As I said to the Committee on Rules in seeking a rule, the only banner I wave or ask the Members to wave in voting to repeal the Byrd amendment, is the flag of the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I said nothing about the gentleman waving a flag.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, the gentleman did not. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) said that.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What I here believe

and would urge upon the Members is that it is in the national security interests of the United States to repeal the Byrd amendment and that it will in the long term serve our vital economic interests to do so. I believe, further, that it is right.

I hope that the committee listened with close attention to the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. YOUNG), so that the Members might understand the nature of the choice we face. I think the gentleman's case was clear.

We have heard underlined the importance of Rhodesian chrome to the United States. I am not prepared to challenge that. Two-thirds of the world's reserves of chrome may be found in Rhodesia. We in the long term will need it and must have access to that chrome if we are to protect our vital security interests and our economic interests. But, how great is our reliance on Rhodesian chrome today? I would call to the attention of the committee the latest figures on chrome and ferrochrome importation into the United States:

CHROME AND FERROCHROME IMPORTS THROUGH JUNE 1975

METALLURGICAL GRADE CHROME

Country	Percent	Amount (gross short tons)	Total value	Price per ton
Albania	1.4	5,510		
Philippines	2.3	8,575		
India	3.3	12,289		
Iran	3.0	11,240		
Rhodesia	8.0	29,707	\$1,312,000	\$44.16
South Africa	10.7	39,544	701,000	\$17.72
Turkey	14.4	53,107	3,778,000	\$71.13
USSR	56.6	209,135	11,517,000	\$55.06
Total		369,000	\$20,000,000	

LOW CARBON FERROCHROME

West Germany	7.4	2,741
India	2.6	969
Japan	29.9	10,971
Korea	.02	11
Norway	3.8	1,425
Rhodesia	14.2	5,237
South Africa	32.2	12,185
Sweden	5.4	1,939
Turkey	3.0	1,102
Yugoslavia	.1	45
Total		36,676

HIGH CARBON FERROCHROME

Brazil	4.9	7,936
Finland	2.7	4,397
Germany	1.1	1,792
Japan	32.6	52,787
Norway	.3	496
Rhodesia	23.7	38,500
South Africa	29.6	47,953
Taiwan	.91	320
Turkey	.2	441
Yugoslavia	4.4	7,184
Total		161,807

Source: U.S. Bureau of Mines.

As this chart makes clear, at the present time we are importing only 8 percent of our metallurgical grade chrome and 23.7 percent of our high carbon ferrochrome from Rhodesia. With the stockpile we possess and with the other sources of supply we now have, we can in the short run—do without Rhodesian chrome. Indeed, we may have to. For

Rhodesia is a land-locked country, and it appears likely that her neighbors, hostile to the 5 percent white minority rule in Rhodesia, may well cut off her exports' access to the sea. If this occurs, we will soon learn that we can and must operate for a time without Rhodesian chrome.

In the long run, however, access to Rhodesia's rich reserves is vital to our

interests. This is why we must act to identify ourselves again with the rights and aspirations of the 95 percent who will ultimately control Rhodesia, while there is yet time.

If we act now, it is even possible that we can help achieve the end result of a government committed to the rights of both the black majority and the white minority, and one arrived at through negotiation rather than through violence and bloodshed.

The leader of the African forces in Rhodesia at present is Bishop Abel Muzorewa, a moderate leader who is a Methodist Christian clergyman, and an exponent of nonviolence and moderation. Both in speeches to black Rhodesians and in a recent visit here, this American-educated Christian leader has committed himself to the rights of all Rhodesians, including the white minority. He maintains that his followers do not seek to victimize or dispossess the white minority. They seek only to secure the rights of the 95 percent through negotiation and nonviolent means.

Yet if they are frustrated in their present efforts to achieve justice through negotiation, there are in and around Rhodesia violent, revolutionary forces which would virtually guarantee both a violent solution and the end result of a leftist, anti-American government in control of two-thirds of the world's chrome reserves, and this arrived at after months or years of civil war in which no chrome was being exported from Rhodesia.

Mr. Chairman, the primary reason Ian Smith will not enter real negotiations with Bishop Muzorewa is the political, moral, and economic support he receives from America's official position of trade with him in violation of our earlier international commitments and our own long term best interests as well.

The British have urged him to negotiate. The South Africans have pressed him increasingly to do the same. His African countrymen have stood ready to proceed—but answerable as he is to a voting majority of the white 5 percent, and bolstered by the Byrd amendment, he has stood unyielding. Only a change in our policy can change his stance. Our long run access to this vital material is threatened thereby.

A second risk we take without national security and economic interests by pursuing our present policy is the danger involved in our relationships to the rest of Africa, all the countries of which strongly disapprove our present stance. Had it not been for Nigerian oil, for example, during the recent OPEC boycott, we would have suffered much greater hardship. Nigeria has for some time been in the top three of the nations from which we are importing oil, and has been a steadfast friend when others have forsaken us.

Yet Nigeria feels great anger and frustration over our present Rhodesian trade policy, as do a number of other black African governments whose raw materials are important to our country. These nations also comprise a rich and growing export market for our goods and

services. Yet we risk our relationship to all Africa in pursuing our present policy.

Mr. Chairman, we have placed all our eggs in one rotten basket. We have pinned our hopes on a sinking ship. We have bet all our money on a losing horse, and we must rectify this situation while there is yet time.

At the outset I indicated my conviction that the repeal of the Byrd amendment is in the national security and economic interests of the United States, and I have sought to explain why. Yet, there is another reason for this action, which ought suffice for Americans—and that is that doing so puts us down firmly on the side of freedom and justice. One may dress it in a fancy dress and cover it with powder and paint, but the reality of Rhodesia today is that of a racist white minority government which is systematically and perpetually violating the rights of the 95 percent. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) earlier made reference to Rosalie Johnson. Dr. Johnson was a Methodist medical missionary for years in Rhodesia together with her husband, also a missionary. I believe the reports of these two Christian leaders from Birmingham, Ala., concerning the plight of black Rhodesians. It is confirmed by many like reports from the Christian community there. Americans ought stand in defense of the unalienable rights of man, everywhere.

This brings me, Mr. Chairman, to my last point—why trade with Russia, but not Rhodesia? This is a question which many have raised. In answer, let me point out first that the best way to assure Russian control over more of the world's chrome reserves is to contribute toward a leftist, revolutionary solution of the Rhodesian situation, as we are doing now.

Second, let me point out that the Soviet Union is a superpower of great strength, rather than a small, land-locked country. In the fight for human rights and human freedom we must never neglect the rights of that large number of unfortunate human beings living under the heel of this and other godless, totalitarian Communist governments. We must leave no stone unturned in our struggle for human freedom behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. But one does not use the same weapons in fighting a rat and a rhinoceros. A simple boycott can probably work to achieve justice in Rhodesia, and this in a short time, thus ending the boycott and renewing our access to Rhodesian chrome.

In the case of Russia, a great deal more will be required and it will take longer. In whatever ways are appropriate and effective, we ought to stand for human freedom everywhere. I have been a part of every battle against communism and for human rights behind the Iron Curtain since my first day in this House and we must never accept defeat in that struggle.

Yet we are more apt to make progress in that case through tough negotiation and increased communication than by attempting boycotts which could not succeed as likely weaponry against a superpower.

The passage of the Byrd amendment

need not increase our reliance on the Russians for chrome substantially beyond present levels given the stockpile and our other sources of supply. And given the fact that in overall trade they need us so much more than we need them, they would be ill-advised to play too many games with us over this one item.

For all the above reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe the repeal of the Byrd amendment to be both morally right and in the national interest of the United States. I, therefore, join the President of the United States, Secretary Kissinger, and many of our colleagues in urging the passage of this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, most certainly I would say to my good and distinguished friend, the gentleman from Alabama, that I would not question his sincerity or convictions about his position, no more than I would question the sincerity and convictions of the gentleman from Minnesota. But I cannot help but recall the words of Dante when he wrote that the paths to hell are paved with people of good intentions. I feel just as strongly on the other side of the issue that the passage of this bill is going to condemn the United States to an economic hell, if not a hell affecting the national security interests of our beloved country.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1287 has been floating around the Congress in one form or another from the very day that we adopted the Byrd amendment in 1971. My close attention was first attracted to this measure, because of the hypocrisy surrounding the issues. I would state to the gentleman from Texas, that we are debating today. This was brought about when I received a letter from the Zambian Ambassador to the United States urging me, as the duly elected Member from my congressional district, to vote in favor of a repeal of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Fifty Members are present, not a quorum.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

At the time the point of order of no

quorum was made, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) had 7½ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

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

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield to me so that I could explain to the House that I am not trying to delay this action today. I am trying to get some Members of Congress here to hear the debate. Voting on this issue in the blind is probably the worst thing we could possibly do. There is no piece of legislation coming before this body this year that means so much to so many people.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM).

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

I think it is very hypocritical that we can deal with the Soviet Union, we can trade with Red China, but when we discuss the internal affairs of South Africa or Rhodesia, as we are in this bill and we realize that of the 43 countries of south Africa, 17 are dictatorships, 17 are one-party governments, and all of them control the media, it is laughable.

Mr. Chairman, the issue we have before us engages the question of whether or not Congress will continue to uphold legislation enacted in 1971 permitting the importation of strategic materials from Rhodesia. These include chrome, ferrochrome, and nickel. It is about time we took a hard critical look at the case of the politically motivated restrictive effort which is being undertaken against Rhodesia pursuant to a United Nations Security Council Resolution of December, 1966.

Metalurgical chromite is of vital concern to us because of its indispensability in defense and industrial production, the lack of chromite ore sources in the United States, and the U.S. dependency upon foreign supplies. I oppose H.R. 1287 because renewal of the Rhodesia embargo will terminate our major source of chrome supply. The New York Journal of Commerce described the ludicrous of this bill most aptly:

It is odd, when one thinks of it, that even at a time when Washington is worrying about Arab oil embargoes, Congress is gearing up for another battle over proposals to restore its onetime boycott of Rhodesian chrome ore. It is odd because while this country can probably supply most of its oil needs from its own and other sources, its only major source of chrome ore outside of Rhodesia is the Soviet Union, which currently doesn't enjoy much support in the liberal United States circles either.

Passage of this bill is utterly hypocritical to our foreign trade policies, since it permits and encourages the United States to import chrome from other oppressive regimes—the Soviet Union. The United States is wholly dependent upon foreign sources. Barring Rhodesian chrome im-

ports would drastically increase our dependency upon the Soviet Union, which historically has been a major source of supply. Past dealings with the Russians for chromium has resulted in the shipping of inferior ore at exorbitant prices, at the expense of our American consumer. We cannot even be guaranteed of their reliability as a supplier.

Chrome is an ever-increasing essential substance to our defense and industrial production. It has been a source of defense construction in the current production of weapons such as planes, submarines, and ships, and weapon-supporting systems. Can we afford to permit our supply of chrome, a national security requirement, to fall directly in the hands of the Soviet Union? Moreover, the utilization of chrome has been an absolute necessity to our steel industry. A report from the National Materials Advisory Board—May 1970—states:

Chrome is the sine qua non of specialty steel.

The only certain impact this legislation would have would be to deprive the American industry of low-cost, high-quality ore and an adequate and cheap supply of ferrochrome, while assuring windfall profits to Soviet chromium dealers.

As for the second section of the bill, requiring a secondary embargo, this would most assuredly stretch beyond the United Nations sanction, would be virtually impossible to enforce extraterritorially, by scientific testing, by labor and/or industry groups filing complaints of violations to anyone. This would mean sole reliance upon the verity of the certificate of origin, hardly an efficient or accurate enforcement of the certificate procedure. This amounts to nothing but a sham.

H.R. 1287 must be defeated. There is every reason to continue importing chrome from Rhodesia under the lawful enactment of the Byrd amendment in 1972, while respecting other aspects of the U.N. sanctions. I entreat you to retain the Byrd amendment until such time a more stable solution can be reached with regard to the Rhodesian problem.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further at this time. My time is rapidly expiring and I have not even gotten started.

I was stating at the time the quorum call was made that my close attention was directed to this measure when I received a letter from the Zambian ambassador urging me as a Member of Congress to vote in favor of the repeal of the Byrd amendment. I recalled at the time reading an article in the paper which stated that the Zambian Government was trading quite extensively with the country of Rhodesia. I asked myself the question, why should I follow the advice of the Zambian Ambassador and damage my own country economically and from the standpoint of national security when the Zambian Government itself did not practice what it preached?

Apparently this hypocrisy that I spoke of has been continued from the very beginning. The distinguished gentleman

from Minnesota has advised me that the Zambian Government was exempted from the sanctions of the United Nations.

I would state to the gentleman from Minnesota that I have read the U.N. resolutions, both 1966 and 1968 resolutions. Where is the exemption of the Zambian Government contained? I would ask the gentleman from Minnesota to answer that. I have looked through this record, through the record of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the record of the Committee on Armed Services. I do not find the exemption. Would the gentleman from Minnesota, if I may have the gentleman's attention, tell me where this exemption for Zambia is located in the record?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the resolution, as I understand it, and I do not have the records in front of me, took into account at the time the fact that Zambia which used to be known as Northern Rhodesia, had special problems.

Mr. ICHORD. Would the gentleman supply that for the record? I do not question the gentleman, but I have not seen it.

Mr. FRASER. I do not recall whether or not Zambia is named by name, but account is taken of the difficulty of certain states.

Mr. ICHORD. I wish the gentleman would furnish that evidence for the Members of the House.

The hypocrisy of Zambia, Mr. Chairman, I later learned, was just the beginning. During the Easter recess I traveled to Rhodesia with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), whose district probably stands to be injured more than that of any other Member of this House, and the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS).

I looked for myself as to what was going on in Rhodesia. I stood on the bridge, on the railroad bridge at Victoria Falls going into Zambia, and witnessed a whole trainload of foodstuffs and supplies going into the nation of Zambia. I was advised that four trains a day travel into Zambia. I have pictures of the train if the Members of the House care to examine the fact.

Then, in the beautiful city of Salisbury, I found out more about the hypocrisy that is going on throughout the world. Apparently, every nation in the world, practically every nation in the world, is trading with Rhodesia, except the United States, as we are only trading with Rhodesia in chrome. I have pictures here, if the Members of the House care to examine them, taken on the streets of Salisbury of new 1975 automobiles which were not manufactured or assembled in Rhodesia.

Here is one, a picture of a 1975 Renault, and there are many others besides this. I think Renault is made in France, is it not? Here is another picture of a Datsun, and I think the Datsun is made in Japan, and there are many, many more Datsuns, I assure the Members, on the streets of Salisbury.

Here is another of another French automobile, the Peugeot, the French

automobile, a 1975 model. Here is another of a BMW, Bavarian Motor Works, and there are many other automobiles of the same make and model on the streets of Salisbury.

The only answer I have gotten from the gentleman from Minnesota and others is that Fiats and Volkswagens are made in South Africa, and South Africa does freely trade with Rhodesia. But these, I would state to the gentleman from Minnesota, are not Fiats and they are not Volkswagens, and they are very good evidence that many, many nations of the world are trading surreptitiously and covertly in violation of the United Nations sanction. I resent the hypocrisy of this particular resolution.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making a very valid point, because it is obvious that the Government of Rhodesia could not have sustained its economic effectiveness since it declared its independence without a substantial flow of trade, as well as a market for its products.

Mr. ICHORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman is properly emphasizing that other nations trade with Rhodesia, and we do not except for this Byrd amendment.

Mr. ICHORD. I take the floor this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, not in defense of Rhodesia, and not in defense of the policies of Rhodesia, but to protect the interests of my own country, the United States of America. I submit that it is not in the interests of the United States to cut itself off from Rhodesian chrome and make itself primarily dependent upon the Soviet Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. The Soviet Union has not proved itself to be a reliable supplier of chrome for the United States of America. Let me remind the Members that no chrome is produced in the United States, and that we must have chrome to make everything from jet engine blades to sterile hypodermic syringes.

There is no other element which can be substituted for chromium. Stainless steel cannot be produced without this thing that we call chrome ore.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, is apparently attempting to sell this proposal on the ground that we do have dependable supplies of chrome and ferrochrome from other sources.

On page 17 of the House Armed Services Committee hearings, he states:

Mr. Chairman, adequate and dependable supplies of chrome and ferrochrome are available to the United States at competitive prices from non-Rhodesian sources.

As the gentleman from South Carolina pointed out, the Soviet Union cut us off during the Korean war and did not resume shipments of chrome until the year of 1959.

And the gentleman, later on in the hearings, freely admitted—and I compliment the gentleman for his frankness—that the passage of this measure will mean an increase in the price of chrome to the United States of America.

And so, Mr. Chairman, the validity of all of the arguments of the proponents of this measure are exploded when closely examined and measured against commonsense, logic, and reason.

There is no validity to the argument that the United Nations sanctions are mandatory. That issue has already been decided by the Federal courts. The constitutionality of the Byrd amendment was upheld.

There is no validity to the argument that we must comply with United Nations sanctions in order to make Rhodesia change its policy. Rhodesia according to the proponents of this bill has not changed its policy. The record shows the futility of sanctions. Rhodesia has not been harmed by the sanctions. In fact, Rhodesia has prospered throughout the duration of the sanctions. Sanctions are not effective.

The hypocrisy of the argument is exposed when we see all of the other nations of the world, practically all of the other nations of the world, trading with Rhodesia covertly.

There is no validity to the argument that we have other dependable supplies. H.R. 1287 will make us primarily dependent upon the Soviet Union which has cut us off in the past and will do so again if it serves her purpose.

There is no validity to the argument that the price will not be increased. The principal proponent of the bill admits that the price of chrome will be increased when we cut off Rhodesia. The only argument of the proponents of H.R. 1287 which has the slightest scintilla of validity is the argument that Rhodesia will eventually become Zimbabwe under a black majority government which will not sell us chrome in the future if we do not pass this measure. But even this argument falls as one which is not compatible with commonsense and our own experience.

The proponents of this proposal say that Rhodesia is on its last legs. This argument, however, is purely conjectural. They have been saying for the last 10 years that Rhodesia was on its last legs and Rhodesia is still in existence and more prosperous than it has ever been before. I am sure that if the proponents had been in the United States 200 years ago in the late 1770's they would have said that the United States would have never come into being. The proponents may well be underestimating the determination, courage, and perseverance of Ian Smith and the other Rhodesian leaders. But even if they are correct in their conjecture, Mr. Chairman, it defies my experience that Zimbabwe will not sell chrome to the United States. Zimbabwe will act in its own economic self-interest as all other nations will act. Experience leads me to believe that if we have the money to buy chrome and the need to buy chrome, Zimbabwe will sell chrome to the United States just as well as Rhodesia is selling chrome and

ferrochrome to all the major industrial nations despite the U.N. sanctions. I hope the Members will vote down H.R. 1287 forthwith.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS).

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, the reinstatement of a ban against the importation of Rhodesian chromium will have the effect of American workers losing between 2,027,000 to 16,700,000 man-hours as thousands of employees are laid off in the steel industry, when chromium ore becomes unavailable to specialty steel factories.

A second negative effect will be that steel products requiring chromium for stainless steel, as, auto and factory pollution abatement equipment, nuclear powerplant reactors and boilers, jet engines, aircraft, railroad cars, pumps, tools, tableware, home appliance trim, and so forth, will cost consumers at least \$300,000,000 per year for non-Rhodesian chromium.

Mr. Chairman, as Rhodesia—67.3 percent—and the Republic of South Africa—22.4 percent—produce almost 90 percent of the world's total chromite supply, during the original 1967-71 boycott of Rhodesian chrome, the Soviet Union and its captive satellites—5.9 percent—found it very easy to increase their chromium ore price from \$36.46/ton to \$68.49/ton, by cutting back their ore supplies by 35 percent in 1967. Promoting détente and higher chrome prices, the Russians for 5 months during 1973, decided not to ship ferrochromite to the United States, which resulted in closing down several American ferrochrome facilities. Crowning this embargo folly—similar to President Thomas Jefferson's "Ograbme" embargo against warring British and French products in 1807—was the United States becoming dependent upon Russia for 58 percent of its chromium, much necessary for stainless steel used in American tanks, during the height of the Vietnam war.

Between 1967 and 1971, Russian chromite prices increased over 67 percent. When the Byrd amendment was enacted, Russian prices stabilized, then fell as Soviet chrome dealers felt the impact of stiff Rhodesian competition. The price history of Soviet chrome is particularly noteworthy in view of the economic conditions of the period. Russian prices reached their peak in 1971, the last year of the Rhodesian embargo, despite the fact that chrome demand in the United States reached a 10-year low. In 1973, Russian chrome prices continued to decline despite an all-time high in chrome demand and some of the highest inflation rates in history. This price-demand equation is exactly the opposite of the usual situation, and largely reflects the impact of renewed Rhodesian chromium imports upon the Soviet monopoly.

If the trend in Russian prices established during the embargo period had been maintained—that is, if the Byrd amendment had not been enacted—American consumers would now be paying well over \$100/ton for chromite—almost double the prevailing world price. This is an extremely conservative esti-

mate, and does not contemplate increased demand or continued high inflation rates. It reflects only a continuation of the well-established pricing policies of the Soviet chrome dealers who would have continued exploitation of their near-monopoly in the U.S. chromite market.

Such "scalping" prices are passed through to consuming industries such as stainless steel producers. For every \$0.01/lb. increase in the price of landed chromite ore—on a chrome contained basis—U.S. specialty steelmakers must pay an additional \$8 million annually. The Byrd amendment has already saved American consumers over \$30 million—much of which represented lost profits to Soviet chrome merchants. Even considering increased inflation and demand, reimposition of the Rhodesian embargo would cost over \$40 million/year in constant dollars. This additional cost does not "buy" anything. It merely inflates Soviet chrome dealers' profits. Rhodesian chromium will continue to enter the American market in the form of foreign made specialty steel, adding another burden to our balance of trade and endangering thousands of American jobs.

Since 1939, the Federal Government has been stockpiling chromium—the first mineral to be so hoarded—besides gold in 1934—since it is unique in its corrosion-resistant and alloying qualities. While the Government's chromium stockpile is twice greater than the ore's yearly American demand, should the Government sell off its reserves, low chromium prices could be expected to hold, until the Government supply was depleted after 2 years. However, at that time, the United States would become again totally dependent upon foreign supplies of chromium, as no chromium has been produced in the United States since 1961.

When the United States relied upon foreign oil to supply 18 percent of America's fuel needs, American consumers quickly learned what a foreign oil boycott could do to their gasoline and heating fuel prices, when the foreign oil tap's spicket was closed. One can readily guess what will happen to the price of chromium and stainless steel products, should the United States deplete its entire reserves and become not 18 percent, but 100 percent dependent upon some foreign supply.

Mr. Chairman, the Rhodesian chrome boycotters have made a series of unsupportable allegations.

Allegation: Sooner or later the government of Ian Smith will fall to a black majority. When this happens, the United States will be shut off from chrome in retaliation for supporting the Smith government.

Facts: First. Even the proponents of sanctions now concede that the fall of the Smith government could take as much as 10 years. It is doubtful whether the stainless steel industry can survive that long without access to the African ferrochrome. Thus, the point becomes moot. Second. Would the new black-ruled Rhodesian Government give up the income from ferrochrome shipments to the world's largest consumer? Third. One

of the black factions vying for power is from the far left. Thus, we have no assurance they would sell us for ideological reasons anyway. Fourth. The embargo legislation leaves it officially up to the United Nations to lift the embargo. Thus, if S. 1868 were passed and a non-Communist black faction should ultimately win out, the Soviet Union has the power to veto the lifting of the sanctions. Thus it would appear the bird in the hand, and so forth, is the best course.

Allegation: We must not risk offending the black nations of central Africa by buying chrome from Rhodesia.

Facts: First. Is not this commodity blackmail practiced by the Arabs? Second. Since when does our foreign policy with one nation become a condition of trade for the third nation—Taiwan-Peking? Third. All of the nations of concern are already military dictatorships. Fourth. None of the nations control any commodity to anywhere near the degree of chrome and, thus, cannot leverage us nearly as bad.

Allegation: We have larger investments in some of these black nations than we do in Rhodesia and, therefore, we should protect them.

Fact: This is a moot point for it is against the law to invest in Rhodesia or indeed to exercise management over the investments we already have there and would have there if it were not for the sanctions.

A serious deficiency in the Boycott Rhodesian chrome bill (S. 1868) is that it does not specifically relate to Rhodesia, or Rhodesian chrome, but is broadly constructed. Therefore, enactment of S. 1868 would require the President to implement an embargo on importation of any strategic material if called upon by the U.N. Security Council at some time in the future.

The only benefactor from an American boycott of Rhodesian chrome will be the Soviet Union, which during the last boycott purchased the banned metal from Rhodesia, and then more than doubled the ore's price for resale to the United States.

Worldwide consumption for chromium or ferrochromium is outpacing available supplies. Demand is and was so strong, that during the American chrome "ograbme," Communist China broke through the United Nations ban to consume a third of Rhodesia's total chromium production, and thereby helped to nourish Rhodesia's apartheid policies.

Private American chromite inventory will last less than 30 days if the ban is reinstated. Thirty days for America to become again subservient to the supply whims of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to determine thousands of American capitalist jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Congress should say "No!" to Secretary Kissinger, the United Nations, and others who are pushing this legislation; for it is clearly not in the best interest of our country and the American consumer; and is a clear-cut case of hypocrisy. I urge a no vote.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HUGHES).

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, it is

indeed unfortunate that more Members are not actively participating in the debate on this most important piece of legislation, H.R. 1287, the United Nations Participation Act amendment. The constant notice quorum calls, however, are not the answer. For the better part of an hour they have stymied the House. Instead of enhancing debate they have virtually paralyzed it by interruption. I believe that the leadership should give serious consideration to a rule change which would establish that after a 5-minute notice quorum call a regular recorded quorum would develop if the necessary 100 Members did not register their presence.

Only in this manner can the business of the House proceed in an expeditious fashion and full participation in such critical debate as this be insured.

In substance this legislation, which would effectively cut off imports to the United States of Rhodesian chrome, raises economic, military, and political issues that are extremely critical to the future of our country and to the world. With matters such as this at stake, wider participation would have better insured a well-informed resolution of this matter.

Several argument can be made in favor of this legislation: The cause of humanitarianism, the plea for world justice, the rational stand of pragmatism.

There is no doubt that our purchases of Rhodesian chrome has served to prop up the white minority Salisbury regime. Without income from the United States, the Ian Smith government would have seen the handwriting on the wall months or years ago. Detractors of this legislation claim that trade with nations such as the Soviet Union also supports a totalitarian regime. I agree we must do all in our power to make certain that trade lessens rather than enforces repression. But this argument does not take into account that our trade with the Soviet Union, the second most powerful nation in the world, does not make or break the existing government as is the case with Rhodesia.

Until this bill becomes law, America remains the only nation in the world excepting South Africa that refuses to officially embargo Rhodesia. This is contrary to the 1968 action by the United Nation's Security Council. The U.N. has often been ineffectual, but surely we must do all we can to further world justice. Passage of this bill would be one small step.

The days of the Ian Smith regime are numbered. With the independence of Angola and Mozambique, all of southern Africa is changing. South Africa is trying to come to terms with black Africa. Part of this change is her growing wariness of Rhodesia: no longer is South Africa going to maintain paramilitary forces in Rhodesia. Guerrilla warfare is increasing. The principal ports of landlocked Rhodesia in Mozambique are now cut off, accounting for the drastic decline in Rhodesian chrome imports that have already taken place this year.

Rhodesia does have 67 percent of the world's chromite reserves. For the long term, our supply of chrome would be bet-

ter assured by disassociating ourselves from the present rulers. No matter what the future brings, the new rulers will not be friendly with those who were supportive of the old.

Our present needs in chrome are not critical. We have more than enough stockpiled for any emergency. Our regular needs can be met by suppliers other than Rhodesia for the short term. For assurance of a long-term supply, adoption of this bill is critical. Passage in the next session may be too late, for there may be a new government in Salisbury.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.).

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1287. We had before us in the Committee on Armed Services witnesses to testify on behalf of this legislation. Their testimony indicated that the effect of the repeal of the Byrd Amendment, from the point of view of defense, would be uniformly adverse. In fact, as I said at the time, I had never heard a group of witnesses appear as proponents of a piece of legislation who presented such persuasive arguments against it.

The State Department is urging us to reimpose the embargo on Rhodesia chromium. They tell us our relationships with Black African countries are being compromised by continued trade with Rhodesia. Further, they contend our principles of "self-determination, democracy, and majority rule" compel us to slap down the "illegal minority regime" in Salisbury.

Let us consider just who are these freedom-loving countries we are trying to please by handing them Rhodesia's scalp. What liberties do their citizens enjoy? Well, by far the most vehement body of critics of Rhodesia is the Organization of African unity. Charter members of this club include Burundi—where over a quarter million innocent civilians have been slaughtered over the past 3 years, and Chad, where the local dictator has Christians buried alive in ant hills for his personal amusement, and the Central African Republic where "President" Bokassa has tortured hundreds of minority tribesmen to death according to the signs of the Zodiac.

It comes as no surprise, then, that it is "Big Daddy" Amin, Rhodesia's most implacable enemy who is the heir apparent to the chairmanship of the OAU. He has already—

Expelled over 60,000 Ugandans of Asian ancestry;

Executed over 75,000 of his political opponents;

Thrown four cabinet members and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to the crocodiles; and

Criticized Adolf Hitler for not killing more Jews.

If a country is known by such enemies as these, Rhodesia would indeed stand high.

The purpose of the legislation is to nullify an action taken by the House on November 10, 1971 which lifted a senseless embargo on the importation, among

other things, of chrome ore from Rhodesia.

The simple facts of life are that lifting this embargo was in our national interest.

The facts are that the three countries of the world which produce the bulk of the world's chrome—metallurgical chrome, chromite, or whatever term you want to use—are Rhodesia, South Africa, and the Soviet Union.

The economic sanctions placed against Rhodesia were voted by the United Nations in 1966 and 1967. Those sanctions were put into effect by the President of the United States. They were never submitted to the Congress for ratification. The Executive order issued by the President implementing the United Nations economic sanctions, in my view, represents a very dangerous precedent which involves the efforts of the United States to involve itself in the internal affairs of an independent and sovereign nation.

I do not endorse the internal policies of the Rhodesian Government, but certainly by the same token I do not endorse the internal policies of the Soviet Government or the Chinese Communist Government. However, to be consistent, should we not similarly apply economic sanctions against all of these nations since their form of government and their way of life is not consistent with our sense of human values? Of course not. We cannot hope to impose our way of life on any other nation of the world. Vietnam is a tragic illustration of our inability to force-feed democracy.

Let us be honest with ourselves. If we are going to eliminate trade with Rhodesia—and one of the reasons that the sponsors of this bill give that we should eliminate trade with Rhodesia—is because the white minority dominates the black majority—why, then would we not, to be consistent, similarly advocate sanctions against South Africa?

However, our Ambassador to the United Nations vetoed proposed sanctions against South Africa.

I agree with his action in that instance, but, to have been consistent, he should also have vetoed the proposed sanctions imposed on Rhodesia.

If we eliminate Rhodesia and South Africa as a source of chrome ore, our only remaining supplier is Russia. I find it inconceivable that this body could possibly accede to such incredible stupidity.

During the Korean war, the Russians turned off their supply of chrome ore. What perverse logic prompts us to think that when the Soviet Union again finds it in its national interest to deny chrome ore to the United States that it will not do so once again?

If the Congress passes this bill and reimposes an embargo on Rhodesia, we will be legislating higher prices for American consumers and windfall profits for the Soviet Union.

Every American was disturbed by the oil embargo imposed on us in 1973. Yet we are now contemplating ratifying the same kind of economic sanctions that was condemned by the world during the oil embargo.

The fact of the matter is—this is a bad bill and it should be rejected.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Committee on International Relations, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) that he has only 9 minutes remaining insofar as the time for the committee is concerned.

Mr. FRASER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will yield 1 minute in addition from the time that I control directly. That will give the gentleman from Pennsylvania a total of 10 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I know that the Members do not want to be bored this afternoon, and I hope that I do not bore them.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that pursuant to clause 2, rule XXIII, he will vacate proceedings under the call when a quorum of the Committee appears.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

QUORUM CALL VACATED

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred Members have appeared. A quorum of the Committee of the Whole is present. Pursuant to rule XXIII, clause 2, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

At the time the point of no quorum was made, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) had been recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have before me some samples. I would like some of the Members to pay attention and to look at what I have here. The Members see before them a mineral, the most valuable mineral in the world insofar as the daily lives of our men and women are concerned. I include the following:

PROPOSED REIMPOSITION OF BAN ON RHODESIAN CHROME—S. 1868

DEAR COLLEAGUE: You have received several letters urging you to re-impose a ban on the importation of Rhodesian chrome in this country because of the UN sanctions against Rhodesia due to their racial policies. We agree with the lofty intentions expressed in the letters; however we feel very strongly that the letters have not advised you of the full effect of the proposed ban. You are asked to do something which we believe you would not do if you were aware of the full effect of the ban.

There are three major sources of supply for chrome—Rhodesia, the Soviet Union and South Africa. The ban on Rhodesia would be both hypocritical and dangerous to the security of the United States. The Senate bill would also lay the basis for surrender to the United Nations of the power of determining our ability to stockpile critical materials. We therefore intend to offer an amendment to remove the hypocrisy and retain the safeguards under existing law concerning strategic and critical materials which are vital to our defense.

Since the Senate bill does more than what its title purports to do, we are enclosing an explanation of our amendment along with

pertinent sections of the existing law which the Senate bill affects.

Let us briefly point out the major objections as we see them:

(1) We are being asked to make a judgment that the Soviet Union's persecution of intellectuals, ethnic and religious minorities—especially of Jews—is somehow more acceptable to the American people than is the denial of certain civil rights to the black citizenry of Rhodesia.

(2) Rhodesia is a country which poses no threat—real or potential—to our security. No one questions the fact that the Soviet Union is a potential adversary. This has recently been confirmed by Secretary Kissinger in answer to Senator Byrd's question on this matter. The Soviet Union cut off shipment of chrome to us at the beginning of the Korean war. When Turkey recently did likewise, Rhodesia stepped in and filled the gap. Obviously it is unwise to rely upon sources in the Soviet Union in any period of crisis.

(3) The actual text of the Senate bill does not even mention Rhodesian chrome, although it is referred to in the title of the bill. The fact of the matter is that the language of the bill is much more far-reaching than it appears at first glance. The language of S. 1868 is general enough to cover all strategic materials being stockpiled which can be obtained from Communist and non-Communist countries. This bill if adopted in its present form could cause us to give preferential treatment to Communist countries while discriminating against friendly countries.

(4) Since the authority conferred by S. 1868 to ban imports from our friends is tied to decisions of the United Nations—decisions often hostile to United States policy—we would in effect embark on a course of surrendering our constitutional responsibilities to foreign powers.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. ICHORD,
JOHN H. DENT.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

September 24, 1975.

HON. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: PPG Industries urges your opposition to HR-1287, which would reimpose the embargo on Rhodesian chrome ore. The bill is scheduled for a vote on Thursday, September 25.

The years 1974 and 1975 have been exceptionally difficult for all world chrome ore buyers, of which PPG is one. PPG is not a buyer of Rhodesian chrome ore; however, a self-imposed American embargo on Rhodesian ore will compound a present shortage by forcing more users into competing for the ore we do buy from South Africa via Mozambique.

Recent travels to the region by PPG's supply personnel convince us that:

1. Free trade currently exists between Black African nations and Rhodesia, with regard to a variety of commodities. Mozambique recently decided to continue shipping Rhodesian chrome ore through the Mozambique ports of Beira and Lourenco Marques. The thrust of these actions is that economic considerations overrode racial feelings among Black African nations.

2. Russia's recent withdrawal of 35 percent of the chrome ore it was putting on the world market reflects their assessment of the strategic importance of their own 30-year chrome ore reserve. At the same time, the Russians are among the largest buyers of Rhodesian chrome ore. Thus, their reserves are not being diminished and their dependency on foreign sources of this strategic material will be far less than will America's 100 percent dependency. The House Armed Service Committee realized this when they reported HR-1287 unfavorably on July 26, 1975.

For these reasons, we strongly urge your opposition to HR-1287.

Sincerely,

JACK WOOLLEY.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that chromium production has increased during the periods of sanctions.

It is also worthy of note that Red China, boosted into the United Nations over the prostrate body of the law-abiding free nation of Taiwan, imports 60 percent of Rhodesian chrome production. Is it a possibility that China is consuming this chrome—it is not. It is the funnel for chromite and ferrochrome to the sanctimonious members of the United Nations even those nations that openly flout the United Nations' sanctions.

Another phase of the fraud is the trade in all other goods, services, and materials by the United Nations members with Rhodesia. Only Portugal, Switzerland, and the United States have had the courage to meet the problem head on.

We cannot survive without chrome, neither can they or any other nation. Unlike other nations these nations bit the bullet and openly and courageously repealed or denied the embargo.

We are asked to live a fraud. Are we afraid to admit that we are depending upon this enormous supply for our needs?

The hope expressed by the proponents that the blacks will take over anytime now—that the massacre, bloodshed, and civil war will somehow bring the fulfillment of their desires, makes a decent person's stomach revolt in disgust.

They talk of these whites in Rhodesia as a blight upon the Earth. Think of our part—we were a colony of Great Britain. We declared ourselves free and independent. So were the Rhodesians and so declared themselves to be free.

The treatment of the blacks in Rhodesia is by far better and more humane than our treatment of the Indians.

Can we wipe out the massacres of women and children? Can we call our treatments anything but cruel and inhumane? With guns we made war, with sticks and stones, with bows and arrows.

No massacres have occurred in Rhodesia. The only innocent dead were at the hands of guerrillas from neighboring countries. These neighboring countries are envious of the prosperity and decency of their neighbors, black and white, in Rhodesia.

If we again impose the embargo it will benefit one nation and one nation only, Russia.

Can Russia complain about the 5 percent whites controlling the Government in Rhodesia where the Senate has 50 percent black Members and there are 36 percent blacks in the House of Representatives.

How many non-Communists are in the Politburo in Russia? None—they are mostly in slave camps.

We make this choice between Russia and Rhodesia and blaspheme our morals by hiding behind the false cloak of humanitarianism.

No, my friends, we cannot be proud of our record if we fail to support our country.

Most of the votes against us today are not votes on the merits.

They are voting from plain, naked fear of the pressures from labor in some instances, the ADA, and the fear of loss of their elections.

Only shame can attach itself to this action, and only shame will reward the Nation if one life is taken, because of the agitators and their supporters in Congress.

This Congress may well become the one Congress that overshadows the post Civil War Congress for the worst in history.

With our world collapsing around us, we fight a paper tiger.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The call will be taken by electronic device.

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

[Roll No. 547]

Adams	Erlenborn	Mikva
Alexander	Esch	Moore
Andrews, N.C.	Eshleman	Murphy, N.Y.
Annunzio	Fary	Nedzi
Bergland	Fenwick	O'Hara
Bolling	Foley	Pike
Breaux	Ford, Mich.	Rees
Breckinridge	Forsythe	Riegle
Brodhead	Gibbons	Rodino
Brooks	Hagedorn	Rose
Broomfield	Harsha	Rosenthal
Brown, Mich.	Hays, Ohio	Santini
Burton, John	Hebert	Scheuer
Burton, Phillip	Hefner	Sisk
Byron	Horton	Stanton
Chisholm	Howard	J. William
Conyers	Kastenmeier	Steelman
Dickinson	Krueger	Udall
Drinan	Lehman	Vigorito
du Pont	McCullister	Waxman
Eckhardt	McCormack	Wiggins
Edwards, Ala.	McHugh	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, Calif.	Macdonald	Wilson, C. H.
English	Mathis	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROUSH, 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. 1287, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the Members to record their presence by electronic device, whereupon 363 Members recorded their presence, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the point of order of no quorum was made, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) had been recognized for 10 minutes. The gentleman had used one-half minute of his time.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is recognized for 9½ minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, for the first time that I can remember I feel inadequate to the task I have to perform. Somehow I do not feel that I was gifted with either the wisdom nor the ability to make this Congress understand the importance of what I have to say.

I might say that long before my time a wise philosopher said, "When you speak, few will listen, and fewer will hear you."

I have before me now a display of the most valuable mineral element in the entire world. In the daily lives of every man and woman in the world this is the

most valuable mineral. It is the most valuable for the progress of mankind. Without it we would never have been able to go to the Moon, much less flown an airplane. All of the improvements made by man in our standards of living have come directly and indirectly from what I hold in my hand.

This is the natural rock created by the Maker and put in only a certain few places on the face of the Earth. I do not know why Rhodesia was chosen to be the depository of this valuable mineral, but, of course, the Lord moves in strange ways. What He has in mind for us, I do not know; what this Congress has in mind for our people, I do not know; what the Members have in mind for my 4,100 steelworkers, I do not know.

Here are the petitions, signed and delivered. When I look at these, it is just like reading the litany of the citizenship of the United States. Let me read these names:

Keith Schaeffer, Gene Cousins, Gene Bowser, Ed Kiersul, Steve Hosak, Mike Timko, John Podsbensky, and William J. Hodak.

These names are the fiber of this country. These people do not know anything about the political pressures that are being applied here. They know nothing about how we shake and shiver when a threat is made against our careers and our chances for election. They do not know that we are swayed so many times away from the right course by the threat of political extinction.

I have had a long political life, and during that political life I have challenged every single political, religious, industrial, and labor entity in my district. When I thought I was right on a pension plan, I was threatened with political extinction, but I did not quit and leave. When I first introduced the black lung bill, they told me, "You'll never serve another day." They have been telling me that for 43 years.

Mr. Chairman, I think the people recognize when we are sincere and when we are being made afraid by some threat. The only thing that makes me afraid is the threat to the lives of these men and women and their families.

We went through it. What I am telling the Members is not what may happen. It happened. Every man and woman in this House of Representatives knows that it happened.

During the first 5 years of the embargo, we lost 35 percent of our ferrochrome industry. Now, by a twisted version of that loss, I am told by a DSG information sheet that the 35-percent loss, precipitated by the embargo is the very reason for imposing an embargo. Pursuant to an embargo of our chrome supply, the United States emphasized ferrochrome production. Obviously, without chrome, you can't have ferrochrome.

So, what did we do. We bought from other nations, destroying our ferrochrome industry in the process.

Does any man or woman here question my humanitarianism? Does any person know of any time in the 43 years that I have not stood for justice for all peoples?

I hear remarks about 5 percent of the population. What is the percent of

the population that controls Russia? Who are the men who are deep in the chrome mines in Russia? Where do they come from?

Can the moralists in the crowd tell me? They are the 1.7 million people in the slave camps of Russia. They are the Soviet Jews who have no personal freedom whatsoever.

Let Russia disgorge their manual slaves, while these Rhodesians are called political slaves.

If I had the wealth, I would ask all the Members to join me in making a trip. I would take them down and see what I saw with my own eyes. This Nation is landlocked—consider this—and that is left to the world.

The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) and I rode the Rhodesian army's most efficient military piece of equipment. It was a 20-year-old flat-bedded truck loaded with sand bags so that if the land mines went off, you would not hurt your little tootsies. There were two carbines and two rifles there to protect us.

I sat on the brink of what was called a river, and right across Mozambique were the so-called enemies.

There have been less people killed by guerrilla activity in Rhodesia in the 10 years of their independence than have been murdered in New York City or in any other big city of this country within a 6-month period.

I heard the great dissertation about how this guerrilla warfare would blow over into the Republic of South Africa. That was the threat to world peace, and that was why South Africa was left out of the embargo.

We all know better than that. Let us not delude ourselves. Let us be honest with ourselves: "At least to thine own self be true."

The Members know why South Africa is left out. If we cut Rhodesia and South Africa out, tell me something: Where are we going to get the chrome to supply the world?

Let me tell the Members this: I have heard about this moral climate, about the indignant members of the United Nations who are pointing their finger at this sinful Nation of ours that has not endorsed or abided by the sanctions, but neither have they.

Here is the litany of infidelity, here it is right here.

Spain, Japan, Germany, Netherlands, Brazil, Liberia, Israel, Belgium, Holland, Uruguay, Sweden, Greece, Panama, Iran, Jordan, Oman, Iraq, Indonesia, Egypt, Austria, Mozambique, Venezuela, Lichtenstein, Kuwait, Morocco, Kenya, Rwanda, Czechoslovakia, Italy, Burundi, Malawi, Tanzania, Zambia, New Zealand, Swaziland, Canada, Gabon, Dahomey, and France.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to take a look at this list afterward. They will see check marks after the countries that are exporting to the United States ferrochrome, and they do not have a pound of this ore to make

ferrochrome. Where does it come from? It comes from Rhodesia.

So we are told that we do not need Rhodesian chrome. We buy all of the Rhodesian chrome through whom? Through all of the sanctimonious members of the United Nations who point the finger of guilt at the innocent. And we are innocent. We have stood up for this right and we have taken a position as a legislative body that is in the best interests of America, its workers, and its people. But these other countries have not lifted the embargo, no, they just do not see it. They ignore the embargo.

I am ashamed of some of the Members who have said to me that this is only a symbolic measure, go along with this. We will not ask your companies to live up to the embargo.

But, Mr. Chairman, rather I would die than live a lie.

And we are living a lie. They are asking us today to join that fraudulent and corrupt membership that have voted to put upon themselves a burden that they will not carry. This House has no reason to follow this kind of position.

Yes, my district will lose, but we will survive. We will add the unemployed steelworkers to the other 11 or 12 percent who are on relief. But I would rather not condemn one more family in my district to a relief existence.

Let me say that every black worker in my factories and in my mills have signed this petition. They do not know anything about highbrow politics. I have heard too much about ideologies and philosophies. I would like to hear a little bit more about bread and butter.

At this time, I want to read into the RECORD the text of a letter sent to all of you by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) and myself early on in this debate, as well as last week's letter from PPG Industries, urging opposition to H.R. 1287.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. DU PONT).

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call to the attention of the Members here today to one very specific portion of this legislation that I think is bad, and I think it is bad enough that we ought to go ahead and defeat the whole bill. What I am referring to is section 2.

Let me explain the position that we are in procedurally at this point. I agree wholeheartedly with the comments of the gentleman from Minnesota that we ought to support the United Nations position that our country has taken. We ought to support the actions of the United Nations, especially when we have concurred in them and argued for them. For that reason I voted every other year for the repeal of the Byrd amendment, but this year I am going to vote the other way unless we strike section 2 off of the bill.

The reason is very simple. This is not the same bill that came to us 3 years ago. This bill has a new added feature, and that feature is a third-country embargo.

Section 2 of this bill requires that all steel products coming into the country,

basic steel products manufactured abroad, have a certificate of origin that proclaims, presumably under oath, that they have not been made with Rhodesian steel. We are not simply upholding the United Nations ban in this legislation; we are going one step further. We are saying not only are we going to come into compliance and be good guys and put on our white hats, but we are going to make sure that every other country in the world puts on its white hat, too. What kind of a policy is that for the United States to be adopting?

That amendment was adopted in committee 13 to 10. It will be offered here again as the committee amendment later this afternoon, and I hope that I can persuade the Members to vote against it and strike it off of the bill so that we can go ahead and pass the repealer.

The intent of this is clear. We are trying to require other nations to enforce their sanctions, but what is the effect of the amendment? The effect is we are going to become the policemen, and we are going to intervene in the affairs of other nations.

Do the Members know what we are saying in this amendment? We are saying to Sweden and Japan and West Germany and France, and to all of the other steel manufacturers: "We do not trust you to impose the sanctions of the United Nations yourself; we want you to sign a piece of paper." I guess if they do not sign if, or if we question it, we are going to take them into Federal court. That is a step backward for our international relations, is it not, to be taking other nations into our courts to support a United Nations sanction? How can we enforce it? There is no chemical tests known that we can give to the piece of steel to tell whether the chrome in that steel came from Rhodesia or the Soviet Union or anywhere else.

In short it is unenforceable. It is a bad step to take in international relations, and I think we make a very serious error by adopting that policy.

I will admit that I am a free-trader. I think we ought to trade with everybody regardless of their policies, and I know that is far too liberal a position for most people in the House of Representatives to take. But have we not learned anything about economic sanctions? Have we not seen what happened with the Jackson-Vanik amendment? Emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union plummeted. Have we not seen what happened when we put a military embargo on Turkey? All of our bases were dismantled. And now we want to do that again. We want to step forward again and say to our neighbors and our friends, "We are sorry; we are not going to do business with you unless you are as pure as we are and so sign on a piece of paper, and put your name on it."

The gentleman from Minnesota mentioned that frequently we have put other embargoes into effect, and that this is a suitable tactic. He mentioned Cuba, and he mentioned China. Of course, the China embargo was put on when Chinese troops came into Korea in December 1950. We were at war. That is a little bit of a different situation. The Cuban em-

bargo resulted after the aggressive Cuban action in the missile crisis in 1962. So that is a different situation, too. I think in this case it is very clear that we are breaking new ground. We are using economic sanctions to force third countries to do something that we want them to do. I think that is bad foreign policy, and I hope we defeat section 2 to the bill and go on and pass the legislation in the form in which it was before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT).

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1287. It has been argued many times that keeping the Byrd amendment on the books is important to the national security of the United States. This position is based on the single, often misinterpreted fact that chrome is considered a strategic material.

Important to the production of steel, chrome also becomes important to the defense industry as a whole. Chrome is important to the defensive industry, but this is only a fraction of the picture which we must look at when deciding whether Rhodesian chrome is important to the national security of the United States.

The United States imports all of its chrome. Domestic chrome ore is of such low quality that the expense of producing our chrome from domestic sources would be four to five times greater than the expense of importing our chrome.

The bottom line of all this is that chrome imports are very important to our security interests in 1975. However, this does not mean that Rhodesian chrome is very important to our security interests in 1975.

Supporters of the Byrd amendment like simply to transfer the importance of our chrome imports to the importance of our Rhodesian chrome imports. On the surface this appears to make sense. But it is a deceptive and dangerous transfer to make.

Rhodesian chrome ore is important to the United States as a long-term source of the mineral. In the decades to come, access to Rhodesian chrome ore will become increasingly important. Rhodesia possesses more than two-thirds of the world's chromite reserves. Possession of two-thirds of the world's chromite reserves will make Rhodesia very important to us in the years to come. I would like to emphasize, however, that Rhodesia does not presently have this importance. Nor is this importance likely to develop in the near future.

Our current refusal to recognize the United Nations-ordained sanctions against Rhodesia runs the risk of permanently damaging our relations with Rhodesia.

The Ian Smith government presently rules Rhodesia after unilaterally declaring its independence from Great Britain in 1965. The Smith government is the only faction in Rhodesia which is not antagonized by our current stance. And

the Ian Smith government is clearly little more than a remnant of the colonial government imposed by the British during the days of British rule in the region. Even the British do not accept the Ian Smith government as the legitimate Government of Rhodesia.

It was the British Government which went to the United Nations Security Council in 1965 to urge that international actions be taken to pressure the Smith government from continuing its rule in Rhodesia. Unlike the Smith government, 95 percent of the people of Rhodesia are black. The Smith government cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered to be a representative government for the country.

The result of the British appeal to the United Nations was the U.N.-endorsed trade embargo which was first imposed on a limited basis in 1966. The embargo became absolute in 1968, and at that time the United States ceased to import chrome from Rhodesia.

What the British, and later the United Nations, have been trying to achieve is the end of minority white rule in Rhodesia. The present government consists of people who, in effect, refused to go home when the Rhodesian colonial period should have ended.

Against this backdrop, I would like to review what I consider to be the significant factors when deciding whether or not to support H.R. 1287.

First, Rhodesia is not a significant supplier of chrome ore to the United States.

During 1974, Rhodesia supplied only 7.4 percent of the metallurgical grade chromite consumed in the United States. Only 13.4 percent of our imports of metallurgical grade chromite originated in Rhodesia in 1974. Figures for the first part of 1975 were just as low. During the first 6 months of 1975, Rhodesia supplied only 7.7 percent of our metallurgical chromite imports. These figures do not suggest that Rhodesian chrome is important either to our economy or to our security interests at this time.

Second, Rhodesian ore is not essential in the manufacture of high quality alloys.

There are at least seven other nations from which the United States could import chrome ore—Turkey, the Philippines, Albania, Iran, Pakistan, the Soviet Union and South Africa.

Furthermore, contrary to unsubstantiated charges, the Soviet Union is the best source of high quality chrome ore in the world. The U.S. Bureau of Mines reports that Soviet Union has the highest grade chrome ore available. The chrome to iron ore ratio of Soviet ore is 4:1. The Rhodesian ore ratio is only 3:1.

Third, the small amount of chrome which Rhodesia has supplied to the United States since passage of the Byrd amendment has not reduced our dependence on the Soviet Union as a source of chrome. Since 1971, the amount of chrome imported from the Soviet Union has increased from 41 percent to 60 percent.

Fourth, I would also like to emphasize that the Soviet position as a supplier of

our chrome should not make us as nervous as it apparently does. The Soviet Union is dependent upon the United States for 18 percent of their aluminum oxide imports and 61 percent of their grain. Aluminum oxide, I should note, is a metal used in abrasive essential to the manufacture of machinery.

This mutually dependent relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union should make us a little more comfortable about our reliance upon Soviet chrome.

Furthermore, chrome shipments from the Soviet Union have continued without interruption through the Berlin and Cuban crises, three Middle East wars and the lengthy Indochina war. It would appear highly unlikely that the Soviet Union would suddenly cut off their exports to this country.

Fifth, I would like to emphasize that the U.S. stockpile contains more than an adequate amount of chrome ore and ferrochrome. The stockpile currently contains 3,006,500 tons of chrome ore equivalent—1,952,802 tons of stockpile grade chromite; 551,758 tons of nonstockpile grade chromite; 403,000 tons of high carbon ferrochrome and 298,570 tons of low carbon ferrochrome.

All of the material in the stockpile is usable for defense needs. The Defense Department has estimated that its stockpile needs for a 1-year conventional war would be approximately 128,000 tons. At this rate of use, the U.S. stockpile would meet the defense needs of our country for 23 years at war.

Finally, when considering where our true security interests lie, it would be wise for us to consider the current situation in southern Africa.

Rhodesia is now bounded by hostile neighbors to the north, east, west, and southwest. Her life-supporting trade routes through Mozambique have been severed and the vital protection the former Portuguese colony had provided her northern and eastern flanks has now disappeared. Rhodesia's only ally, South Africa, has removed its security forces and has increased its pressure on the Smith regime to reach a settlement with the black majority in the country.

By all accounts, majority rule for Rhodesia will eventually come. The question is when it will come. When the day of majority rule comes to Rhodesia is it unlikely that our present policy toward the country will stand in a very favorable light with the government that replaces the present Smith regime. To support my concern here, I offer for my colleague's consideration remarks made recently by Bishop Abel A. Muzorewa, president of the African National Council.

Bishop Muzorewa said:

In a few months or even a few years, the government of Rhodesia will be black. We will remember those who understood and helped us in our fight for freedom. We will not forget those who ignored our suffering, and scorned our rights and, in complicity with the fascist regime of Mr. Smith, took our minerals—bestowing wealth to the white minority and sentencing the black majority to poverty and physical depravity.

Bishop Muzorewa, I must point out, is regarded as the moderate leader of the

nationalist movement in Rhodesia. There are also groups far more radical than Muzorewa who favor violent tactics to overthrow the Smith regime. There have already been reports that the radical factions are receiving Soviet and Chinese aid in their fight.

If we have succeeded in alienating the moderates in Rhodesia, then we will surely be in trouble in the years to come. Our current refusal to recognize the United Nations-sponsored embargo against Rhodesia certainly calls into question what, if any, principles motivate America's foreign policy these days. I hope the House of Representatives will again put itself on record that the United States does indeed stand for democratic rule in other countries. We should not be supporting the remnants of colonial rule. It was just such a careless attitude which allowed us to slip into the Indochina war back in the 1950's.

Our violation of the United Nations sanctions reflects badly on the importance we attach to principles in our foreign policy. And, far from insuring access to chrome supplies in Rhodesia, our present policy actually endangers this future supply.

In view of these facts, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1287.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Rhodesian chrome bill before us today contains an International Relations Committee amendment aimed at protecting U.S. steel mills from foreign competition that illegally use Rhodesian chrome. The amendment requires that shipments of bulk steel into the United States be accompanied by a certificate of origin indicating the source of the chrome in the steel. This certificate of origin program would be administered by Treasury, presumably the Customs Bureau.

An amendment such as this should have been under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Subcommittee on Trade, by virtue of the jurisdiction over trade and over customs and custom matters as provided in House Rules X(V) (1), (2), and (7) and Rule 4 of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Rules Committee has recommended an open rule waiving points of order on grounds of germaneness on the certificates of origin provisions. Certainly, such a point of order would lie, absent such a rule, because the certificates of origins provisions would be germane to a Ways and Means matter, not a U.N. matter under the International Relations Committee's jurisdiction. I should point out that we have not waived jurisdiction over these matters, or over the provisions in question, and that the fact that the Rules Committee provided the waiver recognizes that this amendment properly belonged in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 1287, which would, in its language, restore an embargo on chrome imports from Southern Rhodesia, but would, in its significance, give some credence to our country's claim that we are concerned with human rights of all citizens of the world as well as our own.

It is shocking to me that it has taken 4 years to bring this matter up again. In those 4 years, our relationship to the United Nations has been strained over and over again, and it has been a constant struggle to maintain the delicate equilibrium required in the search for peace. And yet, among all the blocs that dispute one another, all the warring philosophies seeking to gain transcendence, there has been absolute unanimity—except for America's violation—on the trade embargo to Southern Rhodesia.

And what is our rationale? The tired warhorse—and I mean it literally—that chrome is indispensable to the defense and national security of our country. We are told that because we do not have any chrome of our own, and are dependent on foreign sources, and that if we do not trade with Rhodesia we will become increasingly dependent on the Soviet Union. We are led to believe that if we were to go to war, our present national stockpiles would be insufficient, and told that if we do not continue these imports thousands of steelworkers will be unemployed.

And, finally, we are told, according to the committee's minority report that we should not "selectively impose a moralistic trade policy on the rest of the world." In short, another attempt is being made to scare us into voting for a bill that is offensive to principles we loudly proclaim are the foundation of our system.

But we do not have to look far to discover the truth. It has been shown that we do not need Rhodesian chrome to meet our defense needs. We have enough chrome stockpiled right now to meet all U.S. needs for the next 3 years—an amount equal to what we will import from Rhodesia for the next 22 years! And what is needed for defense is only a startling 6 percent of what we have on hand at this moment.

As for the threat of increased dependence on the Soviet Union, we can only note that we are importing more chrome from the Soviet Union now than we did before 1971 when the Rhodesian embargo was lifted. I am convinced that we will continue to import chrome from the Soviets, and have little anxiety that those imports will be cut off, since the Soviets are equally dependent on us for certain strategic ores that they require. And, not least of all, sources of chrome exist in many other countries—South Africa, Japan, Germany, Finland, Sweden, Pakistan, Turkey, and the Philippines.

And, while we are discussing dependencies on other nations for critical materials, we would do well to take notice of how, by dealing with Rhodesia, we have impaired our relations with many black African nations. We can ill afford similar

sanctions that could be placed on us by African producers of such ores as manganese, cobalt—even crude oil. In fact, if Southern Rhodesia's Government should change within the next few years, as many think it will, this whole discussion will become academic, as we will be forbidden access to Rhodesian chrome as a result of our current position.

On the domestic front, the specialty steel industry is in a decline. Ferro-chrome production, which has dramatically increased in the first 5 months of this year, has far outstripped production of the products it is used for. Despite this, the United Steelworkers Union has consistently supported and continues to support sanctions against Rhodesia and that union's members are the people most affected by the embargo.

Finally, it is appropriate to speak of "moralistic trade policies." And I could not agree more with those who say sanctions should not be imposed selectively. What is desperately needed are some basic criteria that will enable us to make the distinction between strategic necessity and uncaring self-interest. Throughout the world, people struggle for freedom. And in that struggle, many of them have been denied what we assume to be basic human rights. It has been American policy to very selectively turn our eyes away. If we look at our relations with many countries in the world, we can see that it has not done us much good. Yes, perhaps the time has come when we should start thinking about a "moralistic" trade policy. The bill before us this afternoon certainly is a beginning.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to advise the committee in controlling time what the time situation is.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) controlling time for the committee has used all of the majority time of the Committee on International Relations.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) has 15 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) has 4 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 15 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), having been granted time under the rule, has 52 minutes remaining.

The Chair would inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) whether he is prepared to yield time.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I got involved in this matter in 1969. My involvement was precipitated by the actions taken by local 333 in Baltimore, the dockworkers. The issue was that chrome ore was coming into the Baltimore ports. These are working men, but from that day on they would not unload chrome ore in the Baltimore ports. Each time they failed to unload, they lost a day's pay.

In many conversations with them they advised me that they would rather lose the day's pay that they needed so badly than see America acting as an international outlaw.

I am not going to speak to the facts about the economic impact in this country, the stockpiles, and the national security. We have heard all of that. I do want to speak to the issue that was raised earlier about the hypocrisy of other nations who continue to trade with Rhodesia. I echo the sentiments of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER).

I would rather see those nations act decently and not as hypocrites, but that is not my major concern. My major concern is whether this country, my nation, my country, our country, is going to act with honor and decency and integrity. That is the main issue for me.

I am really concerned about hypocrisy, but more than that, I am concerned about whether or not this Nation will continue to assert the moral leadership around the world that it did at one time. I am concerned whether or not this Nation will remain No. 1 in moral leadership. Let us not kid ourselves. We have not remained No. 1 solely because of military power. We have not been No. 1 solely because of economic power. Of course, those factors intervene; but there was that third factor which caused the rest of the world to look to us and say: "Historically, America has stood for that which is right and just." That is how we won friends. That is how we won supporters. That is how we have won allies.

My colleagues candidly admit I am not the skilled orator that some are who appear in this well. I candidly admit that I am not any kind of legislative genius who knows all the economic implications of each bill this House considers, but I yield to no man or woman in this House in terms of my understanding of that which must dominate our lives as a country, and that is the issue of moral rectitude of this Nation.

Cut away all of the rest of this, cut away all of the data and statistics, and we come down to just one issue: moral rectitude and America's adherence to it. We lose it, we lose leadership. We cling to it, and hopefully we begin a moral rearmament, a moral reaffirmation throughout this entire world.

Support us. Support H.R. 1287.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to be here to express my strong support for H.R. 1287, a bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. This is a bill which I have cosponsored and a bill, which in my opinion, is desperately needed.

Men and women throughout the world who believe in the principle of government by majority rule, express strong opposition to American foreign policy toward Africa, in particular its policy toward Rhodesia. The United States is pursuing a course in foreign affairs of alining itself with the remaining colonial governments in the world where a small elite of people rule the majority, and deprive them of their human rights.

Since 1969, the United States began to receive chrome ore from Rhodesia. This country had banned trade with Rhodesia in 1968, when the United Nations Security Council imposed mandatory sanctions on trade with the Rhodesian Government. In September 1968,

the Senate voted to violate our United Nations agreement to ban trade with Rhodesia. Thus, the United States is officially responsible for breaking the United Nations Security Council ban on trade with the minority regime in Rhodesia.

Ignoring the United Nations Security Council's resolution constitutes a serious violation of U.S. obligations under the United Nations Charter. Also, U.S. failure to comply with the resolution undermines the authority of the United Nations, whose overall contribution to world stability and peace it values and seeks to enhance.

In September of 1971, I was outraged with the Congress when we passed the now famous Byrd amendment which allowed the importation of chrome ore from the racist minority-ruled Ian Smith regime in Rhodesia. I was outraged because this country had voted at the United Nations to enforce economic sanctions against the regime.

My rage made me resolute about upholding international law. I decided that if there was any way that I could stop illegal cargo from being unloaded into the port of Baltimore, I would certainly try to do it. It turned out that I was not the only person outraged about the importation of goods that helped to maintain a minority regime in Africa. I was not the only person dismayed about the importation of chrome mined by forced labor. The workers of this country were also angry.

The crucial objection came from those workers of the International Longshoremen's Association, whose responsibility it was to unload the cargo. Their president, Thomas Gleason, had made clear in the strongest language the dockworkers commitment to uphold the United Nations sanctions. In Baltimore, the ILA locals were, and are, no less sensitive. They too, have made clear their intentions to uphold international law.

Out of this shared concern came some mutual action. On August 1, 1972, my office was successful in relaying information to local 333 in Baltimore that caused them to refuse to unload chrome ore aboard the *Mormaclove*, an American flagship owned by Moore-McCormack Lines. On June 6 of that same year, we were again successful in alerting the union to the existence of chrome ore on the flagship *African Meteor*. Some of the chrome was unloaded, but when the dockworkers were informed of the contents, they refused to unload the rest.

Much of the same thing happened on the morning of the arrival of the SS *African Dawn* into the Locust Point terminal in Baltimore. When the workers were informed of the contents of the cargo they were unloading, they again refused to unload the remainder.

I mention these incidents to reveal to my colleagues that members of local 333 have been an example of decency and morality. I only hope that the Congress will see fit to learn from them.

There is no doubt in my mind that the rescission of the Byrd amendment would be in the best economic, social, legal, and political interests of the United States. I want to emphasize, and I am sure the future will show, that the United States

must have a much greater stake and much broader national interest in fostering better relations with the black African nations, than fostering relations with those who are in violation of sanctions. There is to be found a wealth of natural resources and markets of unlimited potential for U.S. exports, both of which are vital to the quality of life. While one cannot deny the immorality of the United States position vis-a-vis sanctions against Rhodesia, what was the idealism of the 1960's, has become the enlightened pragmatism of the 1970's and beyond. The United States cannot ignore one simple basic fact which is facing us, as a new economic order is being fashioned, that is, that the U.S. relations with the developing nations of the world must reflect equality and mutual respect. If it does not, then it will be the United States who suffers because the developing nations have alternatives available to them on a scale much greater than in the past.

I am hopeful the House will vote in favor of this bill, and will rectify a mistake which has caused us severe difficulties in the conduct of foreign policy. A return to United Nations' sanctions against Rhodesia is a small price to pay for relations with the black African nations upon whose good will and understanding we will be increasingly dependent. Failure to amend the United Nations' sanctions will foster an unwarranted, negative foreign policy between the United States and Africa.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS).

Mr. RUNNELS. Mr. Chairman, the Members know that I very rarely take the well of this Chamber, and as many others who have spoken here today, I do not have a lot of education. I do not have a lot of smart know-how, but I am mystified as to what I have heard today on this bill.

Now, I am an American, and to my knowledge there is not a prejudiced bone in my body; and if there is, I ask the Lord to remove it.

Now, how can the United States go around the world when its hands are not clean? We have voted right here in this Chamber this week on a busing amendment again. Are we clean? I am asking the Members.

I come from the South. I never went to school 1 day with a black, and I was raised with a different thought about blacks than I have now, and I think the blacks that sit here know me. I judge each individual in this Chamber, in the United States, and in the world, regardless of the color of their skin, on an individual basis. I represent three true cultures, and I have been in politics for 15 years, and I have not been elected for 15 years by being prejudiced because I have Indians and I am outnumbered by the Spanish-Americans. Look at this Chamber. My colleague, MANUEL LUJAN, is the only Spanish-American in the House of Representatives on the Republican side. JOSEPH MONTOYA, U.S. Senator from New Mexico, is the only Spanish-American in the Senate and he comes from my State. I am a gringo.

I want the Members to know that I know how it feels to be a minority, and

I do not understand the word "détente" that they keep talking about. If what I see is what I think it is, I have had all the détente I want.

How can we trade with our friendly Communist Russia? How can we in all honesty trade with our Communist friends and say to the little nation of Rhodesia, "We do not want to trade with you?"

Yes, I went to Rhodesia, and was told by our great State Department, "Do not go to Rhodesia." Even when I got to Cape Town, the Ambassador's office said, "Do not go to Rhodesia; it is too dangerous." Then, he finally told us, "Well, if you must go, leave your wives here."

Our wives went to Rhodesia. They were never safer in any other country that I have ever been in. Do the Members want to hear another funny? My wife and my two younger children, at a cost of \$7,000 just for the plane tickets, have just come back from 6 weeks in Rhodesia. I am telling the Members that they are getting some false, wrong information. Let me just tell the Members, and they can use their imaginations.

There are approximately 6 million blacks in Rhodesia and only approximately 250,000 whites. I ask the Members to use their imagination. If those 6 million blacks were being so mistreated, by sheer numbers they could run over 250,000 whites, because that includes men, women and children. And let me give the Members another little funny. In their army, for every white person there are four blacks, and every one of the blacks has a gun. I guarantee the Members. I went there. I saw with my own eyes. They are not mistreated.

I will answer the gentleman from Colorado. No, we did not see any Jaguars. And Great Britain, the one that brought sanctions against America, is also the one that brought sanctions against Rhodesia. Rhodesia never had its day in court, and the Members can check the record. They have never had a chance in the United Nations to argue their side of the picture.

Great Britain may not be sending them a Jaguar, but I can promise the Members—and the record can be checked—all of the Tampax in Rhodesia comes from the United Kingdom. That I know for a fact. And I never use them. I never have.

I urge the Members to vote against the bill. It is bad. And in the goodness of your heart, vote against it.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA).

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Chairman, I rise not to talk about figures but to talk about my district. I have a substantial number of people, working in specialty steel, who would be affected directly by this embargo.

Mr. Chairman, I took a poll not too long ago. I sent out 165,000 questionnaires. People in my district said that inflation was the No. 1 problem, that unemployment was the No. 2 problem. Do the Members want to know something else? Ninety-three percent of the people in my district were against foreign aid of any kind.

What have we here in this proposition? We have, No. 1, an inflation bill; we have, No. 2, a bill that will cause unemployment in my district; and, No. 3, we have foreign aid to Russia, because it is going to increase the prices of chrome, and the chrome will come through Russia and, consequently, we will be helping out a country which is not particularly friendly to the United States.

I feel very strongly that it is nice to have these other countries like us. It is like one of my colleagues just said, it is nice to have Africa on our side and to have the people like us over here, and it is nice to have Great Britain on our side.

These Third World countries vote consistently against us in the U.N.

I want to tell the Members something else. We cannot buy their friendship. We cannot impress them by trying to interfere with the affairs of other countries, by telling them what to do.

If the Members have been to workshops, as I have almost every week, I am going to tell the Members that people do not think too much of this Congress. Do the Members know that only about 18 percent of the people think highly of what we are doing up here? Do the Members know why? Because we do not solve the real problems of this country, and those problems are inflation and unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge every person in this Chamber to consider very seriously that the 12th Congressional District in Pennsylvania is not a foreign country. We are not asking for aid of any kind. We have people in the 12th District who have fought in World War I, World War II, Korea, and South Vietnam; we have people in the 12th District who ask only for the right to work and to buy goods, especially chromite, and at the best possible price.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this great body to defeat this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge a negative vote on H.R. 1287 and to state my very strong opposition to reinstating the embargo on importation of chrome and ferrochrome from Rhodesia.

We have heard, and we will continue to hear, many conflicting figures during this debate offered by the opponents and proponents of this bill. I am going to use very few figures in these remarks, because I do not believe numbers convey the major impact of this bill. The real story of H.R. 1287 involves people, and the possible effect of this bill on people throughout the United States.

And let me say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that this bill could significantly affect many families in my congressional district. The Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. has a specialty steel plant in Leechburg, Pa., and there is another specialty steel plant in Allegheny County, just 15 miles from my district that also employs many 12th Congressional District residents. For these people, and for me, the effect of this bill is not contained in price-per-ton figures, surpluses, stock piles, or shipping costs, but in what it will mean to some 5,000 homes in my

district that have a family member involved in specialty steel production.

Here is what the chrome embargo means to these people: It means the largest and highest quality source of metallurgical grade chromite and the major source of ferrochrome will be cut off; it means the cost of these materials will rise when they are received from other nations; it will likely create a reduction in the U.S. production of stainless and other specialty steels; and it will mean an increase in the price of this steel produced in this Nation. And those facts taken together spell a formula we have all seen too often in the last 5 years—a formula of less production and higher prices leading to less demand, and eventually to fewer jobs.

The major effect of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is economic. And, the major economic impact involves jobs. In the 12th Congressional District, we have lost 42,000 people over the last 30 years. The unemployment rate of some of the counties in our district look like this as of July: the Johnstown labor market including Cambria and Somerset counties—6.9 percent with 7,100 persons out of work; Clarion County—7.9 percent with 1,100 persons out of work; Armstrong County, where the plant is located—11.7 percent with 3,200 persons out of work; and, Jefferson County has a rate of 8.3 percent with 1,600 persons out of work. Pennsylvania's total unemployment rate is 9.9 percent even though, to date, the steel industry has remained fairly strong.

And, it is against this job background that the U.S. steelworkers and company officials in my area are not willing to take a chance with such an embargo.

We are in the midst in the 12th Congressional District of a major effort to upgrade our facilities and attract new industry, new businesses, and new economic opportunities to the area. We were just able in Armstrong County to save a rail line that could have cost us thousands of jobs and been a major step backward. The possibility of reduction in jobs because of this embargo would be a major setback to our plans for economic improvement.

But, the impact goes beyond merely my congressional district. This bill will certainly not help the Nation's economic picture. The American people are suffering the ill effects of rapid and persistent price inflation, high and rising unemployment, and chronically low levels of production. Now we are considering a bill that could raise that unemployment level, increase the price of specialty steel, and cut back on the level of production within the steel industry. We need to increase the supply of scarce materials and forestall future shortages through advance planning and sensible import, export, subsidy, and market policies. I fail to see how this bill moves toward that consideration.

Testifying before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. E. F. Andrews, vice president, materials and services, Allegheny Ludlum Industries said:

The competitive effect (of this bill) could be disastrous. Imports already have captured up to 50 percent of the market for several

specialty steel products, and we could expect that trend to accelerate. Thus, American jobs and the American specialty steel industry would become the victims of a policy directed against a government which has prospered under the embargo . . . the irony will not be humorous to a black or white steel-worker in Pittsburgh who loses his job if the sanctions are reimposed.

I have been very careful in this statement, Mr. Chairman, to comment on the possible and likely economic effects. Our economy is so convoluted that it is impossible to make totally accurate predictions on what will happen if this embargo is reenacted. But, I do know for certain that this bill has a high potential to adversely affect employment, production, and prices, and at this state in our shaky economy that is a risk I am not willing to take. And, with the jobs of 5,000 families possibly affected in the 12th Congressional District, that is a risk I am not willing to take. And, with plant production possibly cut back at a time of worsening inflation, that is a risk I am not willing to take.

I have great respect for the viewpoint of many of my colleagues that this bill basically involves a question of foreign policy. I would like to speak briefly on that aspect of the embargo. One effect of this bill in terms of foreign relations would be to make us dependent on very few nations for our supply of chrome. The bill would make us primarily dependent on the Soviet Union, which supplied one-half of the total United States needs during the period of the embargo—1967 to 1971. It will increase the over one-half of our chromite we now receive from the U.S.S.R. With a limited market, price increases and vulnerability to economic sanctions are all too great, and the memory of such actions in the oil area is all too fresh.

Now, we all applaud efforts at peaceful cooperation with the Soviet Union. Two winters ago, though, we saw what can happen when our Nation becomes dependent on a few countries for a vital resource. The oil lesson should well illustrate the problems of tying our need for vital supplies to the friendly foreign policy of a nation.

The second foreign policy consideration, Mr. Chairman, simply involves effectiveness. The embargo has not been adhered to by most nations. Illegal hidden shipments have continued to many countries. Very importantly, it has not helped to alter internal policy of the Rhodesian Government.

When the embargo was in effect, Mr. Chairman, we did not change one thing inside Rhodesia. There is a need for high-grade chrome in the United States. That need will continue. The embargo will only cause us to pay higher prices for the chrome we need. Instead of buying the chrome from the cheapest source—Rhodesia—we will have to buy it either at increased Russian prices, or through an agent country that buys from Rhodesia and then raises the price and resells it to us.

This embargo did not work. It did not change Rhodesian policy. It did not have any positive international effect. The embargo's only accomplishment was to

push the price of chrome upward and jeopardize American jobs. We cannot afford to repeat that mistake.

The third consideration, Mr. Chairman, is one of consistency. The interdependence of nations for economic production raises a basic question of using economic sanctions to create foreign policy changes. We must be careful not to deplore the Middle Eastern nations for using economic sanctions against the United States, while applauding our own efforts to use economic sanctions against other nations. To be effective, our foreign policy attitude must be consistent.

We all deplore discrimination and unequal treatment by any nation, and none of us have any time for slave-labor operations, but realities prevent our foreign policy from crusading for certain policies that work undue hardships at home. As President John F. Kennedy once said:

The purpose of foreign policy is not to provide an outlet for our own sentiments of hope or indignation; it is to shape real events in a real world.

I believe the real events of this situation dictate the defeat of this bill. Too often, our foreign policy becomes confused with the needs of America. Our people cannot understand selling cheap wheat to Russia that produces shortages at home. They cannot understand a Government policy that at times appears to work with oil companies and oil producing nations while ignoring problems at the gas pump. Let us not repeat those mistakes by adopting a Rhodesian importation policy that will jeopardize jobs, cause economic hardship in many areas, and damage our struggling economy.

To me, Mr. Chairman, the bill represents neither a wise economic or foreign policy. I believe the meager moral benefits of the bill are far outweighed by the domestic problems it will create and I strongly urge the defeat of H.R. 1287.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the apparent deficiencies in the amendment of the bill under section 2.

First, this amendment is literally impossible to enforce. It would apply not only to chromium and ferrochrome but all articles containing chromium. It is impossible to determine the origin of chromium contained in specialty steel products upon entry into the United States.

Second, foreign specialty steel producers currently deny they purchase any chromium from Rhodesia, and would undoubtedly be more than happy to certify they did not purchase Rhodesian chromium.

Third, it is impossible as a practical matter to prove the origin of chromium imported by foreign specialty steel makers. The Rhodesians have a long standing policy of refusing to disclose the destination of chromium shipments or the amount of such shipments.

Since 1967, there has only been one instance of a definitive finding that a country other than the United States or South Africa had purchased Rhodesian chromium. In this case, Japanese fer-

rochrome consumers did not reconcile their import statistics with those of South Africa. False South African certificates of origin had covered the imports of Rhodesian chromium. Rhodesian chromium production is now in excess of 300,000 tons per year, ferrochrome production exceeds 100,000 tons. Only that portion of Rhodesian chromium entering the United States and South Africa can be accounted for. The rest is shipped from Laurencio Marques with false certificates of origin and duplicate forged manifests to major steel producing countries other than the United States.

The existing government of Mozambique is disinclined to permit on-the-spot scientific examination of every shipment of chromite and ferrochrome leaving their ports. Further, such examination would require explicit treaty with the government of Mozambique which is not yet even in full control of its country. It would be unprecedented for any foreign government to permit such on-the-spot investigation by foreign nationals of its own exports, yet this is the only practical method of enforcement.

Other countries will continue to import Rhodesian chromium under false certificates of origin as they have for years; then in alleged reliance upon the false certificates issue their own certificates guaranteeing the non-Rhodesian origin of chromium contained in finished specialty steel products. This procedure would not require any change in policy or practice by foreign specialty steel producers. They are doing it now and would merely continue to do so.

Fourth, the certification procedure suggested in the amendment is currently applicable to all Rhodesian products except those on the strategic critical materials list, yet millions of dollars in Rhodesian exports enter the United States annually in the form of cigarettes, leather, et cetera. In 8 years there have only been four cases brought against importers of Rhodesian products, none of these involved direct violation of the certification procedure but concerned matters where no certification at all was attempted. It is clear the overall sanctions against Rhodesian products has been a dismal failure despite existing regulations.

Fifth, if worst comes to worst, foreign steel producers including Japan may even segregate their chromium into shipping us products made from non-Rhodesian chromite while enjoying the overall cost benefits afforded by Rhodesian chromium in their domestic sales and exports to their countries.

Sixth, the amendment applies to individual shipments of chrome-bearing metals entering the United States. It does not apply across the board to all specialty steel products imported from any country. Even assuming the origin of chromium contained in a place of imported steel could be traced back through the manufacturing process to Rhodesia, a finding would apply only to that particular piece of steel.

Seventh, the only country against which the amendment could be effectively enforced is South Africa, thus cutting

us off from access to all South African ferrochrome.

I strongly urge you to reject the bill and include this chart for the RECORD:

Total inventory

SDT

Metallurgical grade ore	2,504,560
Objective	444,700
Consumption (1974)	894,708
Imports (1974)	494,902
U.S. production	0

High carbon ferro chrome	402,694	Silican ferro chrome	58,355
Ore content	1,006,750	Ore content	87,600
Objective	11,476	Objective	0
Consumption (1974, est.)	286,549	Consumption (1974, est.)	90,220
Imports (1974, est.)	116,156	Imports (1974, est.)	6,831
U.S. production (1974, est.)	234,340	U.S. production (1974, est.)	92,976
Low carbon ferro chrome	318,894		
Ore content	797,200	Total consumption (1974, est.)	1,443,956
Objective	0		
Consumption (1974, est.)	172,479	Total inventory, ore content	4,396,110
Imports (1974, est.)	45,444		
U.S. production (1974, est.)	87,256		

U.S. IMPORTS

	1972		1973		1974	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Rhodesia (ore)	65,000	10.3	43,000	11.2	66,000	13.3
Low carbon ferro chrome	2,581	—	3,329	—	29,204	—
High carbon ferro chrome	8,075	—	31,580	—	4,959	—
U.S.S.R. (ore): No ferro chrome	370,000	58.7	201,000	52.4	250,000	50.5
Turkey (ore)	55,000	8.7	82,000	21.4	86,000	17.4
Low carbon ferro chrome	4,703	—	1,179	—	1,565	—
High carbon ferro chrome	0	—	0	—	0	—
South Africa (ore)	104,000	16.5	34,000	8.8	87,000	17.6
Low carbon ferro chrome	14,406	—	8,745	—	11,709	—
High carbon ferro chrome	17,113	—	23,450	—	24,512	—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Chairman, in the gentleman's behalf, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will inquire, is the gentleman acting on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI)?

Mr. BIESTER. Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to try to set some of what we have heard here today in some real context.

We are talking, among other things, about the United States and the American economy, the United States and the American political position in the world, and the situation of the people in Africa. The resources that are locked in Africa and that are currently under the control of the African peoples are enormous resources, and they are valuable, both in the short run and in the long run, to the economy and the people of the United States.

Nigeria is frequently, one week after another, reported as the most important supplier of oil to the United States. We depend upon Ghana for 12 percent of our imported aluminum ore; we depend upon Zaire for 51 percent of our cobalt; we depend on Malagasy for 66 percent of our graphite; and we depend upon Liberia for 8 percent of the iron ore that we import and for 7 percent of our natural rubber.

Over the last quarter of a century the peoples of Africa who had been colonized for generations by whites from Europe, either in cooperative ways or non-cooperative ways, have, one by one, seen the continent come into genuine African control. There are some places where that has not happened, and the most significant of those places today is the country we have been discussing, Rhodesia.

It is a fact that there are only 250,000 whites in Rhodesia, and it is a fact that there are about 6 million blacks there. It is a fact that those blacks are effectively disenfranchised, and the whole

issue in Rhodesia is whether they shall ever be allowed to have majority control of the country, which is traditionally theirs. That is the issue.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said that we lose votes in the United Nations. Yes, we have lost votes there.

Why? We can ask Ambassador Scali, and he will tell us. He was here pleading with us over and over again, "Please repeal the Byrd amendment, because the Byrd amendment is the one event that poisons and corrodes the relations between the United States and 30 to 40 black African countries."

We talk here about the Soviet Union controlling our supply of chrome. The facts that have been brought out are correct. About two-thirds of the world's chrome supplies lies in Rhodesia; a lot of the rest of the supply lies in the Soviet Union. Right now we are trying to see that majority rule occurs in Rhodesia under the auspices of a moderate black, Bishop Muzorewa. But if that effort fails and if the intransigent Ian Smith perpetuates his minority regime, is there a doubt in our minds as to what kind of a revolution will take place in Rhodesia?

Is there a doubt in anybody's mind as to where the arms will come from in that event? They will come from the Soviet Union. And when those revolutionary forces are successful, as they are bound to be if that occurs, who will then have the greatest influence over the Government of Rhodesia, which will then control all of that chrome? It will be the same people in the Politburo in Moscow who now control the balance of the chrome supply.

So it is in the American interest to see to it that we have a decent relationship with the moderate forces in black Rhodesia and to see to it that they come into power and come into power peacefully and give the American economy a chance for permanent access to those resources, undistorted by political circumstances.

With respect to the moral issue, all we have to do is look at some of the steps that have been taken by the Rhodesian Government with respect to newsmen

whom they jail because they dare to write the truth and with respect to the reports of the herding of blacks by use of wire cages into concentration camp areas.

All we have to do is look at what happened to Father Plangger, the former editor of the Roman Catholic monthly magazine, *Motto*. Father Plangger wrote the following:

The African people of Rhodesia cannot be expected to live uncomplainingly under a constitution that is itself a mockery of the law, being deliberately framed to keep the majority of the country's citizens in subjection for ages to come. To talk of preserving Christianity while tolerating racial discrimination mocks Christ.

I understand that that man was jailed by the Rhodesian authorities.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS).

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, there have been many articulate presentations on both sides of this issue, which points out that one can take various avenues to arrive at a position on this question.

It is obvious that President Gerald R. Ford has taken one of those avenues and has arrived at a position in support of this legislation.

Let me for a moment take the Members back to the 92d Congress, when Gerald R. Ford was not the President, but the distinguished minority leader. I was given the responsibility, as a member of the then Committee on Foreign Affairs and a member of the Subcommittee on African Affairs, to articulate our concerns with respect to the Byrd amendment. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. Driggs) at that time was a Congressional Representative to the United Nations. He asked me would I assume this responsibility on the floor and I tried to do it.

During the course of the debate, I went over to the distinguished minority leader, Mr. Ford.

I said, "As I understand it, it is the position of the administration that they

oppose the Byrd amendment. It is and has been for some time the position of the State Department to oppose the Byrd amendment. It is clear to me that the Congressional Black Caucus alone will not win this issue on the floor, but certainly, if you use your credibility as a leader in this House and you take the well as you have often done to articulate the position of the administration on this issue, perhaps we can win the question."

His response was essentially as follows: "Ron, there are times when people are leaders, and there are times when people are politicians, and I have six factories in my district. This is the moment that I choose to be a politician. No, I will not assume my role as minority leader to take the floor and articulate the position of the administration. I am in opposition to the administration on this issue. The best I can do is tell you that I will not take the floor on either side of the question."

Why do I tell the Members this story? Simply to point out that when one is forced, by virtue of his or her position, to take a much broader view of the world, to take a much broader perspective than a district orientation, than a congressional election orientation, than a narrowly defined, parochial orientation, one is then forced to come to the correct position on this issue, and that is to support the legislation that is before us.

When one is forced to view the changing nature of the world, the changing role of the United States vis-a-vis that world, the changing interests of the United States vis-a-vis that world and the obvious changes in the priorities as our world changes, one is again forced to arrive at the correct position as Gerald R. Ford, now President, takes in direct opposition to the position that Gerald R. Ford, Member of Congress, took, because his position now forces him to look to the broad interests of the United States.

Let me now speak to a couple of arguments that have been advanced by the opposition.

First, there is extreme concern on the part of some of my colleagues that if we pass this legislation, there will be total and absolute reliance on the Soviet Union which in some way will affect our defensive posture.

Someone was once quoted as saying that an army travels on its stomachs, and it is interesting to me that we, with some degree of regularity and dependability, export tons of wheat to the Soviet Union.

My question is, Could there not be a quid pro quo? We could say to them: "We give you wheat, you give us chrome."

It is very simple, perhaps too simple and logical to penetrate the arguments of many of my colleagues.

The second argument: Many other nations are surreptitiously violating the United Nations sanctions. Does that mean, then, that because one nation or several nations violates the sanctions that we should also? I would suggest that that establishes an extraordinary precedent. Do we say to the American people that some of you have violated the laws, therefore all of us should violate

the laws? That sort of logic is rather absurd.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELLOMUS. I cannot yield at this moment. I would prefer to finish my statement, I have very little time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLOMUS. Mr. Chairman, some argue that we should not maintain our commitments to the United Nations on this issue, but, interestingly enough, they are the same people who argued for our commitment in Vietnam to the point where 55,000 Americans died and we spent billions of the American taxpayers dollars maintaining that commitment. What is wrong here? If one can argue with valor and courage that we must maintain our commitment to the corrupt Thieu regime why can we not maintain our commitment to the family of nations in a world that is becoming increasingly smaller and increasingly interdependent? View this issue from the top of the mountain. View it from on high. View it beyond the narrow confines of your districts and I am sure that you will arrive at the position that Gerald R. Ford arrived at and that is to support this legislation.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding to me.

First let me say, Mr. Chairman, that I was so impressed by the eloquence of the preceding speaker, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLOMUS) that, although I represent one of the only steel mills on the west coast in my district, that I shall not approach this from a parochial point of view but instead will support this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1287.

I need not reiterate the persuasive arguments of those who preceded me in this debate who have repeatedly pointed out that the importation of Rhodesian chrome is not vital to our national defense requirements, or even that Rhodesia is not now a significant supplier of chrome to the United States. These points have been amply demonstrated. Nor do I need to elaborate on the rapidly changing political situation among a united southern African community with respect to Rhodesia's geographical isolation, greatly inhibiting access to trade markets across unfriendly borders. This, as well as the inevitability of the collapse of the minority, white racist Smith regime, has been made abundantly clear. Rather, for those Members who are still undecided, I would like to address two basic and fundamental issues which should remain foremost in our deliberations to restore U.S. compliance with U.N. sanctions against Southern Rhodesia: First, human rights; and second,

U.S. adherence to law, justice, and international order.

The legitimacy of the State of Southern Rhodesia has remained questionable ever since 1965 when Great Britain declared that this racist minority ruling class' secession from the United Kingdom constituted an "illegal assumption of independence." It was the view of Great Britain, and subsequently the U.N., that no nation that systematically and deliberately excludes a majority of its population from participation in government, can be considered self-governing. The U.N. Security Council unanimously called upon all U.N. member nations not to recognize "this illegal racist minority regime in Southern Rhodesia." Indeed, no nation has yet recognized Rhodesia as a state. The deplorable human rights violations against the vast black majority in Rhodesia has been recognized throughout the world, and condemned. Not only is the majority systematically repressed politically, socially, culturally, and economically, but its disenfranchisement is cemented by the minority constitution which specifically prohibits the black majority from ever playing a significant role in the government of its own country. The U.S. Government is the only one on the face of the globe, besides apartheid South Africa, to deliberately and overtly support, sustain, and condone this regime by lifting the ban on trade with Rhodesia, per the Byrd amendment. The \$80 million in trade that we have supplied to Rhodesia, the largest single source of foreign exchange, to a large degree provides the economic base which maintains the Smith regime in power. The lofty principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which the United States is a signatory, is made a sham by our actions.

The United States, a principal architect of the establishment of the U.N., has asserted that international law will succeed in superseding military might and force as an instrument for world peace only if adherence to global agreements is scrupulously respected by nations party to such agreements. It was out of this concern for a peaceful international world order that the U.N. was established. Twice, in the Security Council, the United States voted to impose mandatory economic sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. The first time, in 1966, the list of items forbidden to be imported included chrome. The second time, resolution 253 in 1968, broadened these sanctions to include virtually all economic relations with the racist Smith regime.

These resolutions were adopted unanimously, and the United States, who had the power to veto, did not exercise this option. We were committed, as President Johnson directed in 1967 and 1968, to compliance with these sanctions, and we were asserting that the illegal, repressive regime in Rhodesia would not be supported in any way by our Government. We were bound by these decisions, entered into in good faith by all member nations. So there can be no confusion, article 25 of the U.N. charter states:

The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

Regarding article 25, the International Court of Justice has stated:

When the Security Council adopts a decision under Article 25 in accordance with the Charter, it is for Member States to comply with the decision. . . . To hold otherwise would be to deprive this principal organ of its essential functions and powers under the Charter.

Our obligations are clear; passage of the Byrd amendment, in direct contravention to our pledge to the world community is a travesty whose repeal is long overdue. I need not remind the Members that it was on this very question of enforcement of approved sanctions that the League of Nations failed. When individual nations renege on international promises and agreements, there is no question but that the international organ loses its effectiveness. When this nation is the United States, it is particularly intolerable, for our commitments to international law and justice for the easing of world tensions, and striving for a more humane world, become hollow indeed.

As my friend and colleague from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) has observed:

The finger of the world is not pointed elsewhere, it is pointed at the United States because we are the ones with an acknowledged double standard.

I urge, in the strongest possible terms, for us to rectify past wrongs and to pass H.R. 1287.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. SPELLMAN).

Mrs. SPELLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to a most important aspect of this Rhodesian issue. I vigorously support H.R. 1287. I think it is a good bill. I want to move to the heart of the matter. Rhodesia is not just another country. And in a world that is, unfortunately, filled with tyrannous governments, the Smith regime is not just another tyranny. My fellow Members of the House, what we are talking about here is out and out racism—racism we must deal with on a moral level and racism the black majority of Rhodesia must face every day.

The facts are disarmingly simple. Rhodesia, or Zimbabwe as it is called by the majority of its people, has a population of about 5 1/4 million. About 250,000 of them are white, and 5 million are black. The whites are outnumbered by about 20 to 1, and yet they run the country. The black population is effectively disenfranchised. They cannot vote for their own representatives. They are told by the whites what land they can own. In short, 95 percent of the population is dictated to by 5 percent, and the division is on the basis of race, not on ability, or ambition, but on race. It is the same old story being retold, and we cannot escape from it.

Mr. Chairman, from its very beginning the Rhodesian Government set out to perpetrate a racist state of affairs. Its "unilateral declaration of independence" was initiated when it became obvious that genuine decolonization would result in

majority rule. This outlaw government is recognized by no one, not even South Africa. The world reacted with outrage at this spread of racism at a time when true decolonization was finally taking effect. The U.N. sanctions are a result of this outrage.

Now, I have heard all the arguments—"We shouldn't meddle in the internal affairs of another state" is one. But as I just mentioned, Rhodesia's racism is so evident, it is so obviously the be-all and end-all for the Smith government, that no one recognizes it as an independent state. Legally, it is still a colony of Great Britain. There are also people who say that Rhodesia should be defended because it is the last bastion of "true parliamentary democracy" in Africa, and in this way it preserves Western tradition. Maybe they are thinking of the Ku Klux Klan, or the Nazis.

The Smith regime is truly the inheritor of those traditions. But is this what we wish to defend? Do we wish to present racism as the message of parliamentary government to African states? I certainly do not. The highest ideals of Western culture call on us to thoroughly repudiate Rhodesia and all it stands for. The United States should lead the way, not drag its heels.

Make no mistake about it, the states of Africa are clear on this issue. They will see us as either opposed to racism, or supporting it. For you see, this is not an academic issue to them. It is one they have faced all their lives.

We hear talk and read news reports that this dispute is about to be settled. But if one watches carefully, the talks always break down on the same issue—majority rule. That is, the white racist minority does not want to give up its privileged position.

Many will claim here today that importation of chrome is vital to our national interests. They will claim that our moral leadership in the international community and our respect among the African nations are secondary matters. Nothing could be less true. Our standing among the nations of the third world, the former colonial nations, will be critical as we become more and more dependent on raw materials from these communities. Moreover, the claims of the crucial nature of these chrome materials lack real credibility when we recognize that the only other country in the world not to honor this sanction is South Africa.

There can be no question about where our national interests lie: they lie with the spirit of independence, which we all look forward to honoring for our Nation's Bicentennial. The chrome, after all, won't go away: it will be there and available to us when democracy in this troubled nation is finally achieved unless we unalterably forsake that source by not repudiating this immoral position today.

I know where I stand. I know where I want my country to stand. I urge a vote for this bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I

rise in support of H.R. 1287, a bill to restore the United States to full compliance with the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one with important moral and international significance, whose passage has been delayed too long. In effect, it would prohibit further importation of chrome and ferrochrome from Rhodesia. In 1966, the United Nations, with U.S. support, overwhelmingly passed a resolution endorsing economic sanctions of just this nature.

Members of the Security Council imposed the 1966 embargo against Rhodesia as a form of protest against its improprieties. Thus our importations from Rhodesia are in direct violation of the action taken by the United Nations. More importantly, we are one of only three nations, besides South Africa and Portugal, to have violated this embargo. In 1971, on the grounds that it was wrong to purchase chrome from the U.S.S.R., we turned to Rhodesia instead.

Our trade dealings with Rhodesia merely add credibility to those who charge that the United States, although a member of the United Nations, acts unilaterally, whenever it pleases, to serve its own selfish interest.

Our present policy serves to breed hostility against us among many other African nations and to antagonize black Americans. It has led other nations to question our moral fortitude and right to world leadership. We cannot further jeopardize these fragile relationships. By the adoption of the Byrd amendment 4 years ago and by defying the embargo passed by the Security Council, the United States has been guilty of weakening the authority and prestige of United Nations.

We have an opportunity today to contribute to a movement toward genuine majority rule in Rhodesia. Indeed, if what recent events seem to indicate is true, that is, that majority rule in Rhodesia is inevitable in the not-too-distant future, passage of H.R. 1287 is essential to maintaining long-term access to the vast mineral reserves in Rhodesia.

Moreover, a repeal of the Byrd amendment will in no way harm the U.S. steelworker. In the words of United Steelworkers' head, I. W. Abel:

Do not . . . make your decision under the impression that American steelworkers will suffer if U.N. sanctions are enforced. The reverse is true.

Mr. Abel referred, of course, to the fact that chrome from Rhodesia competes with domestic production and therefore affects American jobs adversely. Two ferrochrome plants have been closed since 1971.

H.R. 1287 enjoys the support not only of the steelworkers, but also of the AFL-CIO, Secretary of State Kissinger, and the Ford administration.

Besides myself, this bill is cosponsored by more than 110 of my colleagues. I urge your strong support for the passage of this important measure today.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BEDELL).

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, this is

an extremely difficult issue. I have studied this problem very, very intently. I have discussed it at length with my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT). I have tried to listen to all of the arguments. I am convinced that I should vote for this legislation.

It is very seldom that I can agree with our President on an issue and I believe that when we get that opportunity certainly we should step forward and show that we are willing to support the President where we can agree.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that we have really looked at what I consider to be the real issue on this matter. The issue to me is whether or not we say that America is going to be a responsible citizen in our family of nations. We are a member of the United Nations. We are one of those who voted for this resolution. I do not agree with everything we do here in this Chamber. I do not agree with everything that many of the organizations to which I belong vote to do. But, if any organization is going to have votes then I submit to the Members that if that membership is going to completely ignore the vote of the membership of that organization I think our society is indeed in trouble.

We admit that only approximately 12 percent of our chrome comes from Rhodesia at this time, and since it is the fourth in the list of suppliers that supply America, and since the people who oppose the legislation agree that we now are at a point where we have a 3-year supply of chrome, I do not believe this justifies this Nation saying to the United Nations, no, we are not going to abide by the resolution which you passed and which we voted for.

I think the question really is whether America is going to step forward and assume the moral leadership that this world needs today. I applaud those who have spoken here and have stated that we should not be dragged down by the fact that maybe other nations did not follow their moral obligations. We are in a position to set the example. I submit to the Members that I think that time is now. I think the time has come for us to step forward and accept that responsibility and show that leadership.

I urge this membership to support this resolution and to stand up for what would really show that we mean business in America. We mean to be a part of this family of nations.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GUDE).

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I think the quality of debate in the House has been high today, and I am proud of this quality of debate. However, time and again it seems to me the debate has gone back to the question of Rhodesia and chrome and what this means to the United States.

Mr. Chairman, one of the charges frequently made by opponents of this legislation is that while we may be one of the few nations violating the sanctions publicly, everyone else is doing it secretly. The implication, of course, is that we are somehow being less hypocritical than the others and that we

should not comply with the sanctions until everyone else does so in substance as well as in word. The facts, however, show that there has been compliance with the sanctions, and that governments are making efforts to enforce the ban, even against their own nationals who violate it. A few facts from reports issued by the U.N. Sanctions Committee make the point:

July 1969, Italy seized 250 tons of Rhodesian tobacco.

November 1969, a group of British firms were fined 100,020 pounds for dealing in goods with intent to evade export prohibitions.

April 1970, Copenhagen City Court confiscated 10,170 kilos of mica powder and fined the importers 165,839 kroner.

And in January 1971, a British firm was fined 22,000 pounds and 500 pounds in costs for exporting carpeting yarn to Rhodesia.

These examples are not the whole story, rather they represent only a few of the cases where governments have made diligent efforts to enforce the sanctions voted by the United Nations. In voting to reimpose the sanctions here, the United States will by no means be unique.

In addition to that argument, Mr. Chairman, those who oppose this legislation generally claim to do so on economic grounds, citing the fact that this country needs chrome and that Rhodesia has large quantities of it, and implying that economic considerations alone should override moral, legal, and political considerations. Many of us reject that contention, and much of the debate today centers around just such moral, legal, and political considerations.

However, for just a few moments I would like to meet opponents of this bill on their own territory, and discuss some of the economic issues. In making their argument on behalf of the necessity of importing Rhodesian chrome, what some of my colleagues tend to forget is that Rhodesia is not the only country in Africa, and that chrome is not the only resource we import from Africa. A few examples:

Thirty-four percent of our imports of manganese ore come from black Africa. The United States is highly dependent on imports of manganese ore: 95 percent of what we use is imported.

Sixteen percent of our cobalt imports come from Zaire. Overall, Africa accounts for 64 percent of world cobalt production.

Twenty-three percent of our imports of tantalum, a highly corrosion-resistant strategic metal, comes from black Africa. The United States is totally dependent on imports for its tantalum.

Recently 13 to 14 percent of our weekly oil imports have been coming from Nigeria. I do not think anyone needs to be told the importance of oil in our economy.

While we have over \$3 billion invested in the rest of Africa, we have only \$56 million invested in Rhodesia.

These are only a few of the examples which make clear that we cannot view Rhodesia in isolation in terms of our economic needs, but that we must look

carefully at the critical relationship of the resources of all African nations to our own economy. Black African nations have made it clear time and time again that our support for Rhodesia and our violation of U.N. sanctions have prevented us from improving relations with Africa. Our U.N. Ambassadors and U.N. Undersecretary, Gen. Brad Morse, a former colleague of ours, have been frank in saying that no other issue has so damaged our credibility in the eyes of underdeveloped nations as has the violation of sanctions against Rhodesia.

At this point opponents of the legislation would likely say that this discontent has no meaning in economic terms because the black African nations will continue to sell wherever there are markets. I would point out in response that the use of economic weapons for political purposes is hardly a new idea. The Arabs did it to us two winters ago, and we have done it to Cuba and North Vietnam for years. Only in the past few years have we lifted our total embargo on trade with the People's Republic of China. It is foolish to say that the black African nations—which were clearly impressed with the recent Arab tactics—will not use the same weapons against us that we ourselves have used in the past and continue to use today. Already producers of bauxite and some agricultural commodities are talking about forming cartels and raising prices. It is only a short step from there to political embargoes.

There are also long-term economic considerations which opponents of this bill are ignoring. The history of the past 20 years shows clearly the trend toward independence and Africanization of the various African colonies, and there is no reason to believe this trend of events will bypass Rhodesia. Representatives of the Smith regime and various African independence groups have been involved in negotiations over a resolution to the current political stalemate. These negotiations are occurring in the context of increasing guerilla violence within Rhodesia. Regardless of the result of the current meetings, there is little question that Rhodesia will ultimately become a truly African state with black majority rule. There is also little question that that will happen before Rhodesia runs out of chrome.

At that time, however, we will not be dealing with the white supremacist Smith regime, but with an indigenous black government which will be looking very closely at our past Rhodesian policy.

The conclusion is all too obvious: the white government in Rhodesia is a sinking ship, and if we are determined to go down with it on hard economic issues like this one, then there will be hard economic consequences afterwards, the same kind of consequences opponents of this bill are talking about now.

However, we know we can cope with an embargo now; it has been clear time and time again that passing this bill poses no danger to our national security or to our economy. We cannot, however, guarantee the future state of our economy or our need for chrome. Thus, I would suggest to opponents of this legis-

lation that passing the bill will prevent the very thing they are most worried about—the cutting off of our sources of chrome.

I make these statements not to suggest that economic concerns should be our only, or even our major, consideration in debating this bill, for I do not believe that. However, since economic issues have been raised, it is important to show, as I believe we are doing here today, that the weight of the economic evidence, as well as the moral, legal and political evidence, clearly favors passage of the bill.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I wonder how the Members would react if an outside authority—say, the White House—tried to tell us that we could no longer buy office machinery from a particular supplier and that instead we had to buy from another, more expensive source. Or suppose you were in business and one of your clients tried to force you to stop doing business with a particular producer. Would the Justice Department object? Would the Congress?

Or suppose another nation, an ally, told us we could no longer trade with a particular country. Would we object? I think so, for we as a people and as a nation abhor blackmail.

Now the bill we have before us today, H.R. 1287, may seem to bear no relation to these hypothetical cases—and they are hypothetical, because we could never realistically imagine ourselves submitting to such dictation. Yet that is precisely what this bill represents. Acquiescence to this bill means that we are willing to cut off our noses to spite someone else's face, and I cannot think of anything more pointless.

The facts are simple. Rhodesia has two-thirds of the metallurgical grade chrome in the world. South Africa, another nation charged with being racist, has 22 percent. The Soviet Union, not known for its attention to individual human rights, has 6 percent. The only other significant deposits are in Turkey, 2 percent.

In the face of these undisputed facts, what are we to make of this bill, which tells us we must stop buying from Rhodesia and turn instead to South Africa, where a white minority of under 4 million rules 20 million blacks, or to Russia, an avowed political and economic enemy? As if that were not bad enough, there is section 2 of the bill, which says that we must dictate to other nations who supply us with steel imports where they should trade. The obvious arrogance of this demand is exceeded only by its futility. What scientific tests exist to distinguish chrome mined in Rhodesia, after it has been made into a stainless steel turbine blade, from chrome mined in Turkey or the Soviet Union? Are we going to send inspectors over to Japan or to Sweden or to any other country to vouch for the absence of Rhodesian chrome in their factory yards? Of course not. We would not insult our allies or our trading partners in such fashion, nor would we tolerate such an arrangement in our own factories. Yet that is what this bill implies.

What of the inconsistency of submitting to Russian whims of price and supply for this strategic material when Russia denies emigration rights to its own citizens on a racial basis? Will dock workers refuse to unload Russian chrome as they have refused to load U.S. wheat destined for Russia?

Mr. Chairman, I submit this bill is hypocritical. Hypocritical in that it singles out a single nation for ostracism while forcing us to deal with other nations that can be called equally immoral. I urge a no vote.

Mr. SPEENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill one thing is vital and that is for everyone to understand what the bill says.

Every year Congress goes through the same old discussions on the Rhodesian chrome bill. For the new Members let me remind you that the original bill does not name Rhodesia and it does not name chrome. The basic bill provided for the security of the United States. I remember when I first wrote the basic statute in 1971. It provides for the prohibition on importation in the United States of any strategic and critical material from any free world country for so long as the importation of like material from any Communist country is not prohibited by law.

When Senator BYRD introduced this amendment in the Senate the discussion was about Rhodesia and chrome. But if you will notice in the law there is no mention of either Rhodesia or of chrome. What this congressional law has assured us is that where a strategic material that is vital to our country is involved, we have the right to import it from a free country instead of being dependent on the Communist countries for our strategic materials. The resolution today is designed to give the Communist countries special preference in trade with the United States.

The effort to revoke this ban comes from a desire for the United Nations policy to be paramount to the best interests of the United States. The United Nations placed this embargo on Rhodesia. The United Nations realized that it has no authority to enter into the internal affairs of a local country so the United Nations took this action in the name of world peace. This is the first and only time that the United Nations has acted on world peace and placed an embargo. Here is little Rhodesia which is a country of 6 million people in the continent of Africa with 401 million people. When we needed the United Nations in Vietnam to settle that issue, they did not think that involved world peace. When we have troops in the Middle East the United Nations does not invoke an embargo to settle that. But in this small country of Rhodesia the United Nations moves in with a heavy hand. There is no excuse for the United Nations for the only time in its history to place an embargo on little Rhodesia and use the weak reasoning of world peace.

Chrome is essential to the United States. Chrome is the material that makes stainless steel stainless. So many

of our vital strategic materials that are essential in our national defense are made of stainless steel. This vote is a vote for the national security of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. McDONALD).

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, there are many reasons to rise in opposition to this bill. In the short available time, I would like to describe some of the best reasons for this opposition.

The initial sanctions were imposed in the United Nations either by simple error or by fraud.

If we want to consider Rhodesia as a colony of Great Britain, then this sanction interferes with the internal affairs of a given member; that is illegal.

If we want to consider Rhodesia as an independent state, clearly it never was a threat to world peace and, therefore, sanctions cannot legally be applied through the Security Council.

Questions of moral concern have been raised. In the nearby African States we have so-called true democracy at work, where we have one-man, one-vote, one time. As a result of this ritual, we have 17 military dictatorships with massive bloodshed in black Africa. Make no mistake about it, massive discrimination is the order of the day in the black dictatorships, discrimination based upon tribal differences and political differences.

Why did not the United Nations vote sanctions against Uganda where "Big Daddy" General Amin has murdered an estimated 90,000 of its citizens? When mass genocide was reported in Burundi by the ruling Tutsi against the Hutu, was Burundi declared a threat to the world's security? No, it was not.

We are being treated to selective morality, and we are playing a dangerous game.

The situation in Rhodesia is that they have a problem with the conflicting civilizations, Western civilization versus African tribal civilization. A similar conflict developed in the emerging United States in 1776. Luckily for us, we did not have a United Nations and no United Nations sanctions were applied against us in 1776. A direct parallel exists.

As far as future trade opportunities, we are told that unless we join the armed revolutionary groups of Rhodesia and the surrounding areas, future chrome supplies will be reduced or cut, if and when revolutionary groups take over. The same logic might be applied in regard to Eastern Europe and Russia some day when the freedom-loving people of Eastern Europe and Russia will be able to overthrow the Communist totalitarian regimes. Therefore, should we not by the same logic be cut out of Russian titanium, platinum, as well as Eastern European products.

We are told that we should support Israel in spite of a hostile set of surrounding Arab nations, but we should not support Rhodesia because of a hostile set of surrounding black African nations.

Basically this bill, if passed, gives the Soviet Union, a totalitarian killer of tens of millions of people, a virtual monopoly and stranglehold over a strategic material. This bill sustains a major area of hypocrisy. This bill is a matter of buying only Russian chrome versus buying free market chrome from all available sources, including Rhodesia.

Passage of this bill today will serve only two purposes that I am aware of. It will give the Soviet Union a stranglehold over the supply of chromite to the United States, and promote the selective morality of the United Nations, which is the most morally bankrupt organization in the world.

This measure should be defeated.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM).

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, perhaps I will not even take my 3 minutes. I have listened to quite a bit of the debate this afternoon, and I would just like to say that I think we have to decide whether or not this is not really a question of morality and conscience. As this Nation approaches its 200th anniversary, this Nation consistently enunciates the words of the Declaration of Independence and the belief that every nation and every group of people in the world should have a right to determine their own destinies.

We are not dealing with a unilateral situation here this afternoon. We are not dealing with a situation that was created in a vacuum. We are dealing with the fact that this Government did not support, in the world body of the United Nations, the sanctions that were imposed by that very important body. Many people came to the well this afternoon and talked about what would happen to their respective districts economically, and I daresay that because we are going through an economic recession and/or depression, depending upon the part of the country from which a Member comes, this, of course, is of paramount importance.

But, beyond that issue here this afternoon, the only issue is whether or not this Nation, functioning in a body of nations called the United Nations, will comply with the basic decisions that are arrived at when a majority vote is taken. If we have not done that, then we have to come to the conclusion that we can no longer go about spouting a great deal of rhetoric about democracy and alleged opportunities for people when we do not espouse the equalitarian principles we constantly speak of.

This is perhaps the reason why the third world nations have been so skeptical about what has been happening consistently to them, because our actions are not consistent with our rhetoric. I would say to my peers in the House this evening that the Chief Executive of this Nation has gotten to the point where he recognizes that we are living in a changing world in which there is an element of risk.

If our President has been able to move from parochialism to the stage now that he realizes that he is representing the views of many people, I think the least all of us, or the majority of us, should do

is to support our President. It is not a question of economics per se; the Members know that and I know that. It is a question of morality and whether or not this Nation really has the conscience to do that which is right.

I ask the Members to support this resolution this afternoon; let us get about the business of re-enunciating some really pragmatic words and implementing them. In reality this country is supposed to be about the espousal of equalitarian principles for everyone, regardless of his race, color or creed, even in the world of nations with which we have to deal.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, there is a fundamental issue in this debate on Rhodesian chrome sanctions which I have not heard articulated, and I would like to call attention to it. It is this: Is the case for imposing sanctions on Rhodesia so clear, so compelling, that we are willing to deny a fundamental freedom to our own American citizens?

Consider what this bill does to American citizens. It tells Americans that they cannot as free people spend their own money to purchase the material that they believe is badly needed; they cannot engage in commerce.

This bill says in effect, "We are taking this economic freedom away from you Americans because we disapprove of a particular foreign government withholding freedom from its people."

Mr. Chairman, no doubt we have the power to regulate foreign commerce, and there are times when compelling national interests dictate that we do so. But is the evidence so clear here today that this bill is a fair and equitable cure for a foreign human rights problem? Is this case so compelling today that we are willing to deny freedom to our own citizens; the freedom to engage in commerce, to spend their own money as they see fit?

This desire to apply an uneven, discriminatory moral standard on one foreign country is insufficient basis for denying American citizens their right to engage in commerce, their right to buy materials they need in the ordinary course of business.

Mr. Chairman, is it not ironic that the plea here today for the rights of foreign people is at the expense of the rights of the American people.

Let us concern ourselves first with preserving the American freedom and defeat this bill.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS).

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be timely at this point, despite the repetition of most of the arguments, to give some focus to the forces that are on both sides of this issue. In that regard I think it is instructive when one looks at the broad-based bipartisan coalition which is in favor of this measure.

The President's name has been invoked, and with validity. The name of the Secretary of State has been invoked with validity. Henry Ford II, one of America's most distinguished industrialists, who had reservations about this

matter at one point, has decided, after a more extensive analysis of this matter, to support it. And when one looks over the very impressive list of private groups and individuals throughout the country like the American Bar Association, the League of Women Voters, the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, AFL-CIO, United Steelworkers, various church organizations, one sees here a very broad group of Americans that has historically supported matters that are of a humanitarian character.

However, when one looks on the other side one can understand some of the comments that have been made on the floor today by Members, many of whom are good and personal friends of mine, in opposition to the bill.

If they come from an area where they have some speciality steel component, they have political pressures back home that are very formidable, and we all understand them.

If they have been identified with fighting against detente with Russia or if they come from areas where people have extremely strong feelings about any kind of interdependence or even any kind of dealings with Soviet Russia, then one can understand their vociferous opposition, and we view these things with sort of a tongue-in-cheek attitude and sort of laugh about it back in the cloakroom.

I think it is interesting to note that opposition to repealing the so-called Byrd amendment is one of the chief components, however, of the agenda of the Liberty Lobby. The Liberty Lobby has opposed the nomination of Vice President ROCKEFELLER; it is among the more vociferous opponents of what they call forced busing; it is opposed to any trade with Russia; it is very vocal about excessive Executive powers, about the Panama Canal giveaway; and it talks about prayer in the schools and all these sorts of things. These are traditional items on the agenda of the Liberty Lobby, and those who score high on the Americans for Constitutional Action rating system feel comfortable with this kind of a position.

So when we put all of this in context, we have an interesting panorama, but a panorama which reflects some of the traditional opposing forces in the House. The exceptions are the Members who are very proud of their civil rights record and have every reason to be proud of their civil rights record. Members who by no stretch of the imagination or by any definition could be called racist, but who, because of special economic situations in their districts, are compelled to speak out very strongly on this matter.

Many of these Members, as I indicated, are friends of mine, and I understand their political situation. If I were in their shoes, I might be on the opposite side of this particular matter myself.

I think it also, however, is important to stress the point about the inevitability of transfer to majority rule in Rhodesia. There is no question in the minds of most people who are acquainted with the political dynamics in that part of the world that by this time next year either Rhodesia will be under majority rule or there will be a programmed transfer to majority rule, and that is already in motion.

So those who cry out about the point of being dependent upon other sources are obviously very shortsighted with respect to their own interests when they make these kinds of statements about alternatives to dependency upon Russian sources.

I think, Mr. Chairman, this bill should be considered the Civil Rights Bill of 1975, because of the human rights components that are involved in it, and because of the implications that it has for many of the most critical politico-social decisions and responsibilities of our country, the leading nation in the world.

So I would like to point out in these few brief moments, Mr. Chairman, something about the political implications. Most of the Members of the House are politicians, not economists. We have proven that more than once by the imbalances in our budget and by other means. So I would like to talk about the political implications of this measure and speak from the mountaintop, as it was so ably put by the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS) earlier.

I am reminded, Mr. Chairman, by the emphasis on the economic aspects of this matter and about the constitutional rights that are involved and all the rest, of the debates in the 1950's on this floor on the Powell amendment and in the late 1960's on this floor, during the great civil rights debates when they talked about protecting the constitutional rights of the majority. I remember when they talked about property rights versus people's rights, and when they talked about everything except the real issue that was involved, namely the violation of human rights.

Therefore, I think it is time that we put into perspective just what we mean when we talk about Rhodesia, an area where the 95-percent majority lack even the basic freedoms and the basic equal rights.

If we were arguing a domestic civil rights bill on the floor with these kinds of percentages, there are people who would never dare come to the well and speak for this matter or otherwise raise their voice because of their personal commitments or for other reasons.

I have not been to Rhodesia, so I am not in a position to speak about these conditions except from my knowledge of other reports. I was not able to travel to Rhodesia, as were some of the Members who have testified this afternoon but I can assure the Members that there is massive discrimination by law and by practice in every aspect of life in that ill-fortuned country, and that those who protest this kind of discrimination are subject to severe and often brutal repression.

Many examples of racial discrimination have already been alluded to, to some extent, but I think it might be instructive to cite one example that ought to have some meaning to the Members of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS).

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the reason I have never been to Rhodesia is because that country discriminates against the black Members of this House.

In 1972, when there were nine Members in attendance at a conference in Lusaka, Zambia, four black Members and five white Members, there were six members of that delegation who asked to visit Salisbury, Rhodesia, which is right near by. All of the blacks were turned down. The two white Members of the House were granted permission to visit. They both withdrew their request when they found out that their black colleagues could not visit there.

This year, in 1975, in two trips to southern Africa I have been denied permission to visit Rhodesia, for no other reason than the color of my skin.

Therefore, there is no question that we are talking about a racist society. Those who want to be on that side of the issue must recognize where they are because freedom of movement is restricted. There is registration and identification that are required of Africans that others do not in moving around their own country. It is a crime for any African adult to be without a valid travel document on his person at any time. It is a crime for an African to leave his so-called district without obtaining a permit. Rhodesian Africans do not even have the basic freedom to live where they want to live, and a person of the one race may not purchase land in another area.

A third example is in the field of education where education for whites is free and compulsory but Africans must pay for their education which is not compulsory and, as a result, the secondary education is too expensive for Africans. In 1974, for example, there were 35,000 Africans and 25,000 whites in the secondary schools, certainly a ratio which is hardly reflective of the 20 to 1 ratio in that population.

De facto segregation in most public accommodations and restaurants, hotels and parks, and so forth, still exists.

So we have here a very unique kind of society that has nothing to do with the kind of discrimination that exists between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland nor is it analogous to the Jewish versus the Arab situation, but this is a racial situation that is based on no other factor and is unique in the world society. The only one country in the world that has any kind of a system like it is South Africa and South Africa like other countries does not have diplomatic relations with Rhodesia. A point to be emphasized that keeps being glossed over on the floor here today is the alleged sovereignty of Rhodesia. Rhodesia is not a sovereign state by any definition. It is still part of the British Empire, or the United Kingdom. It is not recognized as a sovereign state by any country or international forum. It was the United Kingdom itself which initiated the whole question of sanctions against Rhodesia which illegally chose to become independent on their own.

We cannot look forward to any kind of rational resolution of this matter, unless there are international pressures or, beyond that, guerrilla warfare, because

the majority has lost faith in the prospect of a peaceful internal solution.

So, for those reasons and more, Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this legislation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MARTIN).

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 1287 which, under the lofty banner of participation in United Nations sanctions, rather porous at best, against the racial policies of Rhodesia, has the singular effect of prohibiting importation of chrome from Rhodesia. In theory this may have some appeal especially if the same standards were to be applied to other nations where the majority are governed without their consent, but in practice it will be damaging to the national interest of the United States.

It is one of the cardinal rules of business management, of course, to secure alternate sources of supply. What this bill will do is it will outlaw the principal source and principal deposits of chrome in the world and leave us dependent upon a grand total of two other nations, Russia and South Africa.

The known existing deposits of metallurgical grade chromite ores are as follows: Rhodesia, 67 percent; South Africa, 22 percent; Russia, 6 percent; Turkey, 2 percent; the United States, 0; and all other nations, everybody else combined, 3 percent.

So if we boycott both Rhodesia and South Africa, we deny ourselves access to nine-tenths of the world's supply.

The United States is totally dependent upon imported chrome which is alloyed with iron to make steel.

Mr. Chairman, like everyone else, I was amused by the argument of the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. SCHROEDER) to the effect that we could do without chrome because shiny bumpers and bedpans were not essential. We all had to chuckle at the broad spectrum of perception in that argument.

If that were the extent of the use of chromium, we could indeed take it or leave it. But that is not the extent of its use. The use of chromium as an ostentatious shiny surface is a very minor use.

The major use is an essential ingredient of stainless steel. Can we do without jet engine blades or steam turbine blades? Can we do without the stainless steel in boilers? How about in railroad cars? Ships? Chemical processing equipment? How about catalytic converters in environmental control equipment? Practically every structural steel requiring corrosion resistance requires chromium alloys.

I have listened to the novel argument that we must boycott Rhodesia because there may soon be a revolutionary change in that government. Do we apply this standard to all fragile governments? I doubt it. Does this mean that if we import chrome from Rhodesia, some future government will refuse to ask us for foreign aid? I doubt it. Will we adhere to United Nations standards of morality if they expel Israel? I doubt that.

Meanwhile, if everyone in the world effectively halts the production of chrome

in Rhodesia who will be put out of work? English descendants? I doubt that.

This proposal to cut off our supply of an essential commodity from Rhodesia is not in our national interest. It was not in 1971 when the Byrd amendment passed. It is not today, and it should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. HAGEDORN).

Mr. HAGEDORN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 1287, the bill to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. It is an example of our continuing obsession with interfering in the internal affairs of other nations. Apparently, there are those who learn nothing from the past; when we attempted to tell the Soviet Union how to handle their emigration policies, we succeeded only in undermining very important trade negotiations.

We in the Congress are on the verge of prohibiting imports of Rhodesian chrome because there are those who are still intent on imposing our morality on other nations. What is most perplexing is that these advocates of interference intend to demonstrate their moral indignation with minority rule in Rhodesia despite the clear evidence that this action is not in our best interest.

I do not believe it is in our best interest to make our country almost totally dependent upon the Soviet Union for chromium. From past experience, we can certainly expect that the Soviet Union will take advantage of our self-imposed dependence upon them. During the 1967-72 embargo against Rhodesian trade, the U.S. ferrochrome industry became more reliant on Soviet supplies of metallurgical grade chromite. During the embargo, such supplies of Soviet metallurgical grade chromite almost doubled in price and during the same period the price of ferrochrome reacted similarly.

Of course, anyone with the slightest knowledge of chrome at all is aware of its importance to our national defense. Contrary to the claims of some proponents of renewing the embargo, the U.S. strategic stockpile of chromite and ferrochrome would not guarantee that our defense needs would be met. Much of the chromite now available out of the stockpile is not economically usable and the ferrochrome industry could not use the remaining metallurgical grade chromite in significant quantities because of shortrun capacity constraints.

Chrome's major use is in stainless steel for functional rather than decorative applications. Chrome is used in a number of essential industrial and consumer applications, such as nuclear powerplants, conventional powerplants, refineries, chemical processing equipment, food processing equipment, catalytic converters for automobile emission control, masonry hangers, locks and security devices, hospital equipment, flatware, pots, pans, rivets, and hose clamps. Conceivably, consumers of stainless steel products would face higher costs.

The hypocrisy involved in the attempt

to prohibit imports of Rhodesian chrome is most striking. We are being asked to support this legislation because we supposedly should not tolerate minority rule in Rhodesia. Certainly, it would be preferable if every nation of the world allowed their citizens to enjoy a system of government such as we have here. But, how can we make an exclusive issue of Rhodesia and at the same time ignore the fact that the Soviet Union is ruled by a similarly elite class—the members of the Communist Party. In both cases, the countries are ruled by a minority. But, H.R. 1287 is nothing more than a method to punish Rhodesia for their unappealing system of government and then turn around and reward the Soviet Union for their variety of equally unappealing system of minority rule. If it is our responsibility to impose our values of democracy on other nations, we could at least try to be consistent with that policy.

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

Mr. HAGEDORN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TSONGAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to speak in favor of H.R. 1287. It will end what I consider to be a very unfortunate trend in American foreign policy. In my opinion, we have been largely ignoring the states of black Africa. In relation to our long-term strategic interests, this is a most unwise course.

In the past several years, most of our energy and resources have been directed toward the Far East, the Middle East, and Europe. It is understandable that the nations of Africa have felt neglected. Just in terms of trade and economics, they deserve more attention than they have been getting. In 1974, in dollar value, the Malagasy Republic supplied us with 52 percent of our graphite imports; 50 percent of our cobalt imports came from Zaire and Zambia, 35 percent of our manganese came from Gabon and Zaire, and 24 percent of our crude oil and shale came from Nigeria, Gabon, and Angola. This economic interdependence is a fact of life. It is in our long-range strategic interests to strengthen our relations with the states of Africa.

Admittedly, "good relations" can mean many things, but I like to fall back on what has become an axiom in international relations. The best relations are those born out of respect. It is not a matter of kowtowing; it is a matter of recognizing those areas with which states have a legitimate concern. Is there anyone in this Chamber who does not think that the states of black Africa have a legitimate concern with the establishment of a white racist government in Rhodesia? I think not. In my opinion, this should also be our concern, but, at the very least, we should understand the passionate interest of the Africans.

I find it fascinating that there are those who oppose this bill who say they do so in order to maintain U.S. access to Rhodesian chrome. Now, I do not think that Rhodesian chrome is a necessity for our national defense. That argument has been disproven. But I would like to keep

this access if possible. In my opinion, the only way to do this is to be on good terms with the future leaders of what will one day soon be "Zimbabwe." The days of the Smith regime are numbered. Even South Africa has practically forced the Smith regime to negotiate with representatives of the black majority. The independence of the former Portuguese Colony of Mozambique, and the pending independence of Angola, represent the political and geographic isolation of Rhodesia. It is time to deal realistically with this problem. The future of Rhodesian chrome lies with decisions that will be taken by the black majority.

Mr. Chairman, the era of great power independence has ended, as has the isolation of the countries of Africa. We may not like it. We may find it difficult to deal with the fact that Nigeria has oil, or Ghana has aluminum, or what will be Zimbabwe has chrome. But that is the way things are. It does us no good to exhibit our exasperation with the U.N. by violating its sanctions against Rhodesia, thus earning us the enmity of Africa. This is not a sensible approach to international affairs. Instead, we can show our respect for the legitimate interests of the nations of Africa by adhering to the sanctions against Rhodesia, thus demonstrating that we keep our commitments. This will stand us in good stead over the long term, and is the best protection for our own interests.

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

Mr. HAGEDORN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call to the attention of the gentleman something he may have overlooked. During the Korean conflict the Russians embargoed chrome until 1959. At that time they started to try to get into the American market again and found that the orders were being filled by Rhodesia and Russia could not crack the market. So together with Great Britain they dreamed up this original embargo.

The British out of animosity and the Russians out of greed.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MAGUIRE).

Mr. MAGUIRE. Mr. Chairman, the Armed Services Committee report on page 10 says:

We do not believe that long-range speculations about Africa's future should condition contemporary decisions about strategic and critical materials required for the security of the United States.

That statement is both shortsighted and misleading, Mr. Chairman. I think it is apparent from the debate and all the facts we have available to us that it is in the political, security, and economic interests of the United States to preserve the position our Government voted for in the United Nations in 1966, 1968, and 1973.

Everybody from the President, the National Security Council, and the Department of Defense to the AFL-CIO and some of the most prestigious church and social action groups in this country are behind this bill.

Let me remind the Members that when

this matter came before the Security Council in 1966 the United States had refused to recognize the Smith regime, we voted for the Security Council resolution applying sanctions, and, as Ambassador Goldberg said at the time, the United States was committed to taking positive economic action to "fully and faithfully" comply with the resolution we supported.

In January 1966 the President signed orders imposing selective sanctions in accordance with the resolution. That has been the policy of several succeeding administrations. It may be the Court has found the Byrd amendment to be a legal political action by Congress, but that does not change the fact that it places us in noncompliance with treaty obligations we undertook in 1945. We will continue to be in noncompliance unless we approve this bill.

Finally, moral issues are also critical. This country stands for some things in the world and I hope we believe in some things here at home. The Smith regime in Rhodesia is an illegal entity which allows 6 percent of the people who are white, to rule over 94 percent of the people, who are black. It is recognized by no government in the world. For 10 years Smith has resisted every effort by Britain, the United Nations, and good faith intermediaries to resolve jointly and equitably the issues of self-determination. Surely this provides no moral basis for us to violate the sanctions for which we ourselves voted.

The Rhodesian matter is the only instance in which we have voted affirmatively in the Security Council and then reneged. We have a veto in the Security Council which we could have exercised in this matter but we chose not to, and for good reasons which are as valid today as they were then.

We have both a legal and a moral obligation to bring our Government back into compliance with our treaty commitments and our obligations under the U.N. Charter. If we do so we will be acting in the interests of the United States and of international peace and security. I urge support of the committee bill.

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

Mr. MAGUIRE. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to add to what the gentleman from New Jersey is saying but I only wish to compliment him on the excellent manner in which he is presenting it.

Mr. MAGUIRE. I thank the Speaker.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, in the last short while we have heard a considerable number of speakers who have entered the well and apparently were not here during the rest of the debate. It is very obvious.

One thing I heard just now was criticism of positions of Members of Congress

for parochialism and other poor motives.

On the contrary, the people I heard speak in the well apparently took the well because they thought what they were doing was in the right interests of their country.

Another thing that was obviously the result of people not being here, was the assumption that no one contests that there is a perfectly valid sanction imposed which still exists and still binds the United States. The courts have upheld the actions of the U.S. Congress in upholding the Byrd amendment as a valid act of legislation of a free people. Further, I do not think our representative in the U.N. has any right to take away some of the inherent powers of the American people to decide whether they wish to give their Representatives in the U.S. Congress or their representative in the United Nations the power to deal with the internal affairs of another country. I made a strong statement for what I thought was the law of our country in preserving the rights of Americans. There is nothing devious about that position.

The United Nations Charter did not give the United Nations the power to embroil the United States and its citizens in international domestic matters of other countries. I think the sanctions against Rhodesia were void ab initio. I think it is a good time to stand up for democracy and freedom in our country and say that we are not going to have our rights dissipated in this fashion by unauthorized sanctions.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say, first of all, that concerning the statements by the gentleman from Florida suggesting that the figures in the chart were wrong, they are not wrong, to the best of my knowledge. I have had them checked.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, they were checked at 939,710. Is that right?

Mr. FRASER. Yes; that is right.

Mr. BENNETT. My staff said it was wrong by about three times. The summary of Government inventories, objectives, excesses, and balance of disposal authorizations listed chromite, refractory, as 399,960, and it is listed on that chart as 939,710.

Mr. FRASER. That is the figure from the Commerce Department.

Mr. BENNETT. We checked it this morning.

Mr. FRASER. Well, we checked it, too.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the gentleman deny the figure?

Mr. FRASER. I have not seen the figure.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, this is a Government publication.

Mr. FRASER. I just want to make the point that the basic figures on the level and extent of the stockpile we have are such that it will provide the United States for a long time in the event we have any difficulty.

I also want to underscore that the President has the right to undo what we do today, if a national emergency arises; so we are not locking ourselves into a problem that we cannot solve.

Finally, this bill has strong support, particularly by the United Steel Workers. I have a letter from President Abel. He says that the reinstatement of the Rhodesian embargo on chrome will not have an adverse effect on the chrome specialty steel industry. This is a letter from I. W. Abel, dated September 24, 1975.

We have the support of the AFL-CIO, President Ford, the auto workers, the communications workers, the mine workers the oil, atomic, and chemical workers, and most of the church groups and many others concerned about this matter.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he had any support from those steelworkers whose jobs are at stake, the specialty steelworkers.

Mr. FRASER. The United Steel Workers of America represents all of those workers. Mr. Abel and the National have been very clear about this for the past 6 years. They held conventions which the gentleman's people and all the other people attended. The position has been consistently stated.

I am sure there are some few union members who have been misled about that information and who are worried about the bill.

Mr. DENT. I am sorry that I did not bring my information, but I will make it a part of the record.

In that letter he states that whatever rumors there are between us, he and I are in agreement that they are only personal opinions, and that I am entitled to exercise mine as a Member of Congress without regard to his, and he has the right to exercise his. I am doing it as a Member of Congress.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1287 legislation to amend the United Nations Participation Act to ban imports of chrome and ferrochrome from Rhodesia. Our vote today is one of priorities and as I see them our foremost concern must be the maintenance of a strong national defense which stands to be jeopardized if this legislation is passed.

There have been numerous efforts by Congress to repeal the Byrd amendment of 1971 which allowed the United States to resume imports of chrome from Rhodesia. This bill is the latest effort. It should be noted that this bill while favorably reported by the International Relations Committee was overwhelmingly rejected by the Armed Services Committee by a lopsided 29-to-7 margin.

The Byrd amendment was passed to prevent this Nation from being overly reliant on the Soviet Union for chrome and ferrochrome products. The logic of this argument was persuasive then, it is more compelling now. Chrome is in shorter supply both in the United States and in the world than in 1971. By banning imports from Rhodesia we would be denying ourselves access to 67 percent of the metallurgical grade chrome reserves in the world. We would then be forced to rely on 10 percent of the remaining

reserves, 60 percent of which are in the Soviet Union.

Translated this means that the Soviet Union will be primary supplier of a product of which 85 percent of our consumption is for national defense needs. The consequences of this excessive reliance could be drastic from a national security standpoint. In addition to the likelihood of higher world prices for chrome products we must also reckon with the possibility of reduced supply through embargo by the Soviet Union. This has happened before. Throughout much of the 1950's the Soviet Union withheld shipments of chrome and ferrochrome products as a protest to the Korean war. If this were to happen at a time when our dependence of these materials from the Soviet Union was at an alltime high, we could find our very security in dire jeopardy. We know the consequences of embargos. The OPEC nations have demonstrated this to us vividly. We do not need nor can we afford this to happen with chrome.

There are those who argue that our stockpiles of chrome and ferrochrome are sufficiently high to allow us to ban imports from Rhodesia. This argument was discounted by the Armed Services Committee which stated that our present stockpile is sufficient to merely meet the first year of an emergency and only as it relates to defense needs. Civilian needs including such vital industries as domestic steel and transportation could only be met through imposition of severe austerity measures. Is it wise for this Nation to shortchange ourselves in any of these vital areas? Can we afford to only look 1 year ahead? I answer "no" to both questions, but feel this will be the direct result of the passage of H.R. 1287.

I do not dismiss the arguments of those in support of this bill who point to continuation of trade with Rhodesia as being a violation of U.N. sanctions imposed against Rhodesia. I agree there is an urgent need for internal reform in Rhodesia, but I am vehemently opposed to this Nation jeopardizing its own critical national defense needs in order to bring this change about.

I will vote against this bill as I have the ones which preceded it on the subject. This bill is not in the best interest of the United States. There is no higher priority than the maintenance of a strong national defense. Our personal and ideological feelings about the internal policies of Rhodesia cannot overrule the more important consideration of keeping this Nation strong and free. The fact that the committee in the House best equipped to know the present and future defense needs of this Nation is opposed to this bill should be a critical factor in our deliberations today. I hope that their arguments will prevail and this bill is defeated.

Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues have done an excellent job in outlining the historical background of the Rhodesian chrome issue. I will not take up any more time rehashing a chronology of events. I would, however, like to take a brief moment to respond to some of the concerns which have been expressed about H.R. 1287 and to out-

line a few of my reasons for supporting this legislation.

The opponents of this bill contend that imports of Rhodesian chrome are vital to our national security. If we spurn Rhodesian chrome, so the argument goes, we will become dangerously dependent on supplies of Soviet chrome. This is, on the surface, a very appealing argument. It is, however, an argument that is not supported by either fact or logic.

There are several points to note in this regard.

First, Rhodesia is simply not an important supplier of chrome ore to the United States at this point in time. During 1974, Rhodesia supplied only 7.4 percent of the metallurgical grade chromite consumed in the United States, and only 13.4 percent of our imports of metallurgical chromite. And, in the first 6 months of this year, the Rhodesian share of our imports of metallurgical chromite has decreased to 8 percent.

Second, the enactment of the Byrd amendment in 1971 has had little affect on our chrome trade with the Soviet Union. The small amount of chrome which Rhodesia has supplied since 1971 has not reduced our dependence on Soviet chrome. In fact, the amount of chrome the Soviet Union has supplied increased from 41 percent to over 50 percent during this period.

Third, alternative sources of chrome are available at prices competitive with Rhodesia's, including South Africa, Japan, Germany, the Soviet Union, Turkey, and the Philippines.

Fourth, the U.S. strategic stockpile contains more than adequate supplies of chrome ore for domestic use in the event of an emergency. In fact, the Department of Defense has released statistics which indicate that there is enough chrome in the national stockpile to meet national security needs for more than 20 years.

The fact of the matter is that the United States does not now rely very heavily on imports of Rhodesian chrome. This is in part due to problems which the current regime is experiencing internally and with its neighbors that have hampered Rhodesian exports of chrome. All indications are that these problems will intensify, not diminish, and that there is little likelihood that any large amounts of chrome will be leaving Rhodesia in the near future, regardless of our attitude toward the United Nations embargo.

This is a very important point. Approximately 67 percent of the world's known deposits of metallurgical chromite are located in Rhodesia. While the Soviet Union, which possesses only 6 percent of world reserves of metallurgical chromite, has maintained its primacy in chrome trade with the United States for the last decade, it is evident that this situation will not continue indefinitely. Rhodesia, not the Soviet Union, will in all likelihood be the most significant chrome supplier for the world in the future.

It thus appears obvious to me that it is in our national interest to see a peaceful resolution of Rhodesia's internal problems as soon as possible so that

orderly shipments of chrome can resume. The most effective means available to contribute toward that end is for the United States to once again join the international sanction effort.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is clearly in our national interest to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome and restore U.S. compliance to the economic sanctions which the United Nations imposed against Rhodesia in 1968. This action would do as much as is possible to assure long-term access to supplies of Rhodesian chrome. It would also reaffirm the U.S. commitment to the rule of law and to the international effort to seek workable solutions to world problems.

It is time for our Nation to accept the international realities of the seventies. A new era in relations among sovereign states is emerging. It is an era based more on the economics of interdependence and mutual respect than on traditional concepts of military might and industrial power.

On September 1, the U.S. Representative to the U.N., Mr. Daniel Moynihan, delivered a landmark address before the seventh special session of the U.N. General Assembly. In this speech, the United States abandoned its policy of stonewalling third world demands and called for greater international cooperation in meeting the international challenges of the 1970's. This was a highly significant moment.

The developed and developing worlds are starting to come to terms with one another. In this sensitive time, it is of the utmost importance that the United States be believed, that its credibility remain high.

When we voted for the Rhodesian sanctions in the U.N. Security Council, we made an international commitment to support this course of action. Today, we have the opportunity to restore this pledge—to keep faith with the international community, and perhaps to keep faith with ourselves.

Reimposition of economic sanctions against Rhodesia is the right course of action. I urge my colleagues to vote for passage of H.R. 1287.

Mrs. BURKE of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1287, which would halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome into the United States and would provide once again for our full compliance with United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia. While this legislation will not erase the 1971 Byrd amendment from the books, the bill will permit the President to override the amendment if necessary to bring the United States into compliance with U.N. sanctions.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is both necessary from an international standpoint and desirable from a domestic standpoint. Internationally, we must realize that it seriously weakens the strength and credibility of the United Nations when one of the strongest nations in the world openly flaunts the clear dictates of that body. By disregarding for 4 years the U.N.'s sanctions against Southern Rhodesia—which were not imposed lightly—we have single-

handedly done more to weaken the U.N. as an instrument of world peace than any other nation. At a time when we are still striving internally to destroy racism in all its insidious forms, internationally we place ourselves in the morally questionable position of strengthening a minority, racist regime in an African nation. We should not be surprised when other nations question our credibility.

Practical international considerations also support passage of this vital legislation. The Smith regime is losing support from South Africa and its days are numbered. Indeed, South Africa is now attempting to force Smith to a political settlement with the Africans. The new Government of Mozambique has already announced its intention to close its ports to exports violating U.N. sanctions. South Africa, Rhodesia's only alternative port, has refused to build additional rail facilities to Rhodesia, although its ports cannot handle the additional traffic created by the actions of Mozambique. Therefore, the U.N. sanctions will be much more effective than in the past.

Passage of this legislation will also greatly increase the effectiveness of the sanctions. This point has been made to me by my good friend, Ambassador Siteke Mwale of Zambia, whose country shares a border with Rhodesia and has been the center of negotiations recently for a peaceful settlement of the Rhodesian question. Just last week, President Kaunda of Zambia called a meeting of five "front line" countries who are seeking a peaceful resolution of the problem. Included in this meeting were Congo Brazzaville, Tanzania, and three African nations which border Rhodesia: Mozambique, Zambia, and Botswana. Those nations have also stressed the need for the United States to help in their effort by observing the U.N. sanctions. As long as Rhodesian President Smith is assured of the moral and financial support of the United States, he will have no reason to negotiate seriously with his African neighbors. However, Ambassador Mwale has indicated to me that his country has no doubt that removal of the impediment to U.S. compliance with the U.N. sanctions will put great pressure on the Smith regime, thus hastening settlement of the Rhodesian question.

In addition to the international considerations, domestically we simply do not need Rhodesia as a source for our chrome and ferrochrome. U.S. imports of metallurgical grade chromite ore, which is used to produce ferrochrome, have declined from a high of about 335,000 content tons in 1970 to 250,000 content tons in 1974. During that period, the Soviet Union met about 50 percent of U.S. import needs. Since passage of the Byrd amendment in 1971, Rhodesia has garnered only 13 percent of the U.S. market in 1974 and 7 percent in the first 5 months of 1975. Nevertheless, defense requirements for a 3-year war are estimated to be no more than 6 percent of the chrome and ferrochrome now in U.S. stockpiles.

Furthermore, the U.S. specialty steel industry is currently in a period of recession, so there is a slack demand for ferrochrome. In the first 5 months of 1975, ferrochrome produced in this country

exceeded consumption and is being stockpiled and exported. In addition, since 1971, imports of low-cost Rhodesian ferrochrome have met only about 5 to 10 percent of the overall U.S. need. For high-carbon ferrochrome, Rhodesia's share of the import market rose from 16 percent in 1972 to 45 percent in 1973, but declined to 28 percent in 1974 and 18 percent in the first 5 months of 1975.

Currently, the U.S. stockpile contains some 1,961,194 tons of metallurgical grade chrome ore. In 1974, we imported 66,395 tons of such ore from Rhodesia. Thus, the U.S. stockpile represents 29.5 years of Rhodesian imports. It would be no exaggeration to say that our stockpiles are entirely adequate to meet our needs if we find difficulty in replacing imports of Rhodesian chrome. Thus, we face no short-run supply difficulties. In the long run, our access to future supplies of Rhodesian chrome will certainly be improved if we end our apparent support of the 5-percent white regime now in control in Rhodesia. By withdrawing our support now, we hasten the end of the Smith regime and simultaneously hasten our eventual renewed access to Rhodesian chrome.

One other aspect of this legislation should encourage the support of this body, and that is a committee amendment that will offer steel mills in the United States some protection against any foreign competitors who illegally use Rhodesian chrome. The amendment provides that imported steel mill products containing chromium cannot be released from customs unless a certificate of origin indicates the source of the chrome in the steel. The United States currently uses similar procedures in regulating Chinese and Cuban trade. In addition, the International Relations Committee has reported discussions with officers of the European Economic Community in which the EEC indicated that they had achieved success by regularly using such certificates of origin to assure compliance with their rules and regulations.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is vital and necessary—and long overdue—with respect to the international and domestic interests of the United States. The advantages overwhelmingly outweigh any disadvantages. Therefore, I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, this should be called the "buy Russia" bill. The House will remember when we stressed "buy America." That is now old fashioned. This is a new age when we are told to be kind to our enemies. Help them to be modern. Help them to be strong. The more we give them, the more they can spend for their own development for defense. Maybe the taxpayers will understand.

The "buy Russia" bill will create unemployment in America, increase inflation and cause American industry to be dependent in large extent on chrome from Russia. Russia is principal beneficiary of the bill, the United States is the loser. Jobs for American employees and price restraints on steel products depend upon defeat of this "buy Russia" bill.

This bill does not mention Rhodesia—it says we must do what the U.N. dic-

tates. But it is intended to stop American purchases of chrome from Rhodesia. Russia is a member of the U.N., but Russia is not bound by the U.N. Russia buys from Rhodesia and could sell Rhodesian chrome to us under another name. Do you like Russian policies toward labor? Toward minorities? Toward the Jewish people? This is the "buy Russia" bill. The rule and the bill should be defeated.

Chrome is essential to U.S. industry. It is essential to medical science in the United States. It is essential to defense. Guns, planes, tanks, missiles, and ships all require chrome. When we become principally dependent upon Russia, the supply can be cut off or the price increased at will. Is that commonsense?

American industry requires a constantly increasing supply of chrome. Rhodesia has the greatest resources. Passage of this bill will create permanent restrictions against Rhodesian chrome regardless of what government may be in power there in the future. If we shut off Rhodesian chrome, we increase our dependence upon Russian chrome. Russia will be glad to sell us chrome at a handsome profit. No longer will the world market govern the price to the United States. When Russia controls the major supply of chrome to the United States, they may decide it is not to their best interest to sell chrome to us. The recent Arab oil embargo demonstrated the complications that could be caused by a politically motivated trade embargo. Should we put ourselves in a position where the tyrants of the Soviet Union could use chrome against the United States as the Arabs did oil?

There are those who base the need for this bill on support for the U.N. Before we accept this assailable logic, let us look at what we are now doing for the U.N. We pay one quarter of the bills for that organization, plus loans and grants. We already are helping Russia in many ways. Russia ignores the U.N.; is usually delinquent in their payments and in toto contributes very little to the U.N. in return for three votes in the U.N.—not one, but three. Russia buys from Rhodesia in violation of U.N. sanctions; so does France; so does every other U.N. member if it suits their purpose to do so.

Now let me ask, where was the U.N. during all the years of the Indochina war when we needed their moral, if not military and diplomatic support? Where were they doing the October 1973 war? The Cyprus war?

I do not think we need jump every time the U.N. says "frog." I do not know why we should be led around by the nose. We do quite enough for the U.N. as it is. When, dear colleagues, are we going to look at America's interest?

You do not like the policies of the Rhodesian Government, because it is a minority government. I do not like those policies either, nor do I like the policies of the government in Uganda nor any government which disenfranchises and robs its citizens who are not black or white or red or green. Talk about hypocrisy—why pick out Rhodesia? Let us treat them all alike.

And you do not like Rhodesia's labor policies. Do you like Russia's labor pol-

icies? Do you like forced labor in Siberia? There are no labor unions in Russia—there is only a farce.

Have you really thought this through? Is there any reason that the House should support this "buy Russia" bill? The Rhodesians have declared their independence from the British Union. This is probably the first time in history the United States has not supported an effort for independence by a colonial power. This is not consistent with our great record for helping other people who want their independence. There are those who say this bill would help to obtain more representation of the blacks in the Rhodesian Government. Once before we embargoed Russian chrome. It did not change a thing, except we paid more for inferior chrome. We should do what we can through diplomatic channels to help give a better break to black people in Rhodesia.

There is nothing to indicate a lessening of the U.S. requirements for chrome in future years. Demand for chrome by domestic consumers exceeds domestic capability by 25 percent and the picture is predicted to worsen.

Cutting off Rhodesian chrome would also cut back on the supply of South African chrome which uses the Rhodesian product. In other words, this bill will increase the cost of the remaining supplies of chrome elsewhere; will add to the fires of inflation; will hurt U.S. industry and U.S. workers; will help Russia to compete with us.

Despite record domestic steel production, U.S. demand for steel exceeds the available supply. Shortages are particularly acute in the case of stainless and other chrome-bearing alloy steels. Chrome suppliers are already rationing chrome to domestic users. Any further reduction in available domestic chrome supplies will cause a sharp cutback in U.S. stainless and alloy steel production and employment. This will have serious repercussions in such areas as petroleum refining, chemical production, pollution control efforts, power generation, food processing, transportation, and national security applications. Reimposition of the Rhodesian chrome embargo would have extremely serious inflationary implications for the U.S. economy as a whole, aggravating critical capacity shortages in industry dependent on stainless and alloy steels.

There are those who state that the stockpile can replace Rhodesia as a source of chrome. No one can say how long we could depend on the stockpile or whether it can safely be depleted, or how it would be replaced.

This bill will cost jobs to U.S. workers. The Soviet Union will become the chief source of chrome. During the 1968-71 embargo, the Soviet Union steadily raised the price of chrome to the United States. When the embargo was lifted, the prices fell. The Soviets can stop shipping whenever their own requirements reduce their interest in exports or when they want to cripple U.S. industry. Then the United States would have a dangerous shortage of chrome. This matter is much too serious for the capricious action proposed here.

The Rhodesian Government is trying to work out its difficulties with the black race. Concern over that issue is, of course, the reason for this bill. This bill is a slap in the face when Rhodesia has resolved to try to find a solution.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, passage of this bill will enable the United States to redeem itself on a broken promise—a pledge dating back 30 years to the ratification of the U.N. Charter by the Senate and the passage of the U.N. Participation Act by Congress. By enacting the U.N. Participation Act, the U.S. Government assumed the treaty obligation to adhere to article 41 of the U.N. Charter, which reads in part:

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions and it may call upon the members of the U.N. to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relation.

Under this article, the decisions of the Security Council are binding upon all members of the United Nations.

However, the United States, like other permanent members of the Security Council, is in the position, by exercise of the veto power, to prevent the imposition of sanctions to which it is opposed. But the United States did not use its veto against the imposition of Rhodesian sanctions.

From the standpoint of international law and our own treaty obligations, once the Security Council had made its decision and the permanent members did not use their veto powers, the United States was legally committed to observe the sanctions. That commitment was breached when Congress in 1971 passed the so-called Byrd amendment.

In approving this amendment, which permitted the importation of Rhodesian chrome and numerous other minerals, Congress unwisely put the United States in the company of South Africa and Portugal, the only countries in the world the governments of which, as a matter of official policy, violated the sanctions.

The new Portuguese Government has announced that it will honor the sanctions, and the Rhodesian consulate in Lisbon has been closed. The United States of America now stands alone with South Africa in violation of the sanctions. Is this, Mr. Chairman, the position in which the United States wants to be?

How long will we stand with the practitioners of apartheid? How long will we stand against the expressed will of nearly every other nation—and against our own given word?

In approving the Byrd amendment, Congress told the world that this country cannot be depended on to keep its word.

In approving the Byrd amendment, Congress placed a marginal shortrun profit for a narrow segment of our business community over the efforts of the international community to bring about peaceful political change in Rhodesia.

In approving the Byrd amendment, Congress seriously weakened the potential for a system of effective international political action through sanctions in the future.

There is now a growing, but fragile, new dialog between the United States and the Third World. If this country reaffirms its commitment to international law, peaceful political change and majority rule, the benefits can be great indeed. African nations, long angered by our support of the Smith regime, will become more responsive to U.S. policy, both in Africa itself as well as in the United Nations.

And by joining ranks once again, this country can greatly improve the sanctions program, and quite possibly head off a tragic racial confrontation in Southern Africa.

But, Mr. Chairman, failure to do so could well poison a budding new relationship between America and the developing world and encourage the Smith regime to hold out still longer, with warfare increasingly likely.

Mr. Chairman, passage of H.R. 1287 would be a reaffirmation of the long-standing American tradition of respect for the rule of law, at home and abroad.

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia. Mr. Chairman there are many reasons to rise in opposition to this bill. It is my intention to describe the best of these reasons and at the same time to point out the illogic of those who favor this legislation. This bill is bad for the United States economically. It is a bad bill from the viewpoint of international relations, in that it is a case of selective morality that will only benefit the Soviet Union in particular and the world Communist movement in general.

Economically, the United States can only lose if this bill is passed. Rhodesia has 67.3 percent of the world resources of metallurgical grade chromite. None has been mined in the United States since 1961 and the demand for chromite is increasing. Since 1962, our national stockpile has declined and is currently at its lowest level in 20 years. Furthermore, 20 percent of this stockpile is classified as "nonstockpile grade"—not really of any use. And, as many Members of this body are also aware, the present administration wants to further reduce our stockpiles of strategic materials from 3 to 1 year.

In speaking of supplies of chromite ore, it is always instructive to "look at the record." During the period when sanctions were imposed upon Rhodesian ore the physical quality of the ore the Soviet Union exported to the United States went steadily down, while the price the Soviets asked for their ore went steadily up. After the Byrd amendment passed lifting the sanctions, the Soviet price stabilized and then fell in the face of stiff Rhodesian competition. When legislation to reimpose the ban was reintroduced in January of 1975, the Soviets responded in two ways. They informed their exclusive U.S. distributor AIRCO Alloys Ltd., that shipments would be cut back 35 percent immediately and that the price would be doubled to \$160 a ton. It should also be recalled that during the Korean War and up until 1959, the Soviets refused to ship any chromite to the United States. Anyone who feels the U.S.S.R. would hesitate to cut off our supplies in the event of

something new by way of a Middle East settlement or conflict that displeased them, just does not know the history of communism or the Soviet Union.

Now let us look at the morality issue and the international relations of the United States. Rhodesia is the only nation in the world facing U.S. sanctions at the moment. Accordingly, it must be the worst nation in the world and the worst threat to world peace and security. Who is Rhodesia threatening and whom has she attacked? No one that anyone is aware of. She is a threat, because she has not implemented one man-one vote, some say. However, if that is the rationale, how many African countries have one man-one vote or even a democratic form of government? Rhodesia is one of the few with a true parliament, even though the representation accorded blacks may be argued. Twenty-three percent of her House is black, 50 percent of her Senate is black, and 66 percent of the army that fights terrorists coming across the border is black. By way of contrast, however, how many Jews sit in the Soviet politbureau? Not one that I am aware of. How many Jewish flag-rank officers are there in the Soviet armed forces—only one that I am aware of. This is to say nothing of the lack of representation at the highest levels in the Soviet Government of the other many nationalities that make up half the U.S.S.R.

If sanctions are a good method of influencing internal policies of a nation, why did we drop them against the Communist countries? Why, because we are told that peaceful trade enhances friendship and builds interdependence and lessens the chance of war. So here we are with the Nation of Rhodesia declared a threat to the world's security and we are going to change her internal policies by not importing chromite ore. Such action will result in our importing ore in increasing amounts from the Soviet Union where an estimate 1,700,000 people are held in slave labor camps and most of the mining is still done by slave labor. How can we square such an action by claiming it to be moral? Why did not the United Nations vote sanctions against Uganda where General Amin has murdered an estimated 90,000 of its own citizens? When mass genocide was reported in Burundi by the ruling Tutsi against the Hutu was Burundi declared a threat to the world's security? No; it was not. We are being treated to selective morality and we are playing a dangerous game. As far as violators of the sanctions are concerned, it is well known that such countries as France and Japan as well as Germany, Austria, Belgium, Israel, Norway, and Denmark are all violators of the sanctions and on a much larger scale than the United States.

The bogeyman has been raised that the African states will cut us off from raw materials if we do not impose sanctions. This is highly unlikely. They need our trade more than we need most of their raw materials. It has also been stated that if the black majority ever takes over in Rhodesia, they will not trade with us and, hence, we would lose this source of raw materials. This is a never never land sort of argument. Suppose every country

in Eastern Europe rose in revolt tomorrow and threw off its Communist shackles. Perhaps they might not trade with us, because of our present détente policy, who knows? It makes just about as much sense, though, to argue along those lines. But above all, we should do what is best for the United States and not what will be pleasing to whatever dictator happens to be ruling whichever African country at the moment.

We are all in receipt of a "dear colleague" from the gentleman from Minnesota suggesting we should be for the bill, because Rhodesia does not have a "chance." What sort of logic is that? That is strange reasoning to say the least. The British Government made similar statements in 1965—10 years ago. In this letter it is suggested that Rhodesia will be unable to move its commerce via South Africa. This is speculation at best and what it does not tell you is that South Africa is developing a new port to handle this commerce—Richards Bay on its east coast. Furthermore, it is doubtful that some African countries could survive without their trade with Rhodesia and South Africa in such products as coal, grain, building materials, meat, fertilizers, cotton, and tea—and these countries know this.

Lastly, whether any of the proponents of this bill would like to admit it or not—nearly all the backing, training, money, and weapons for the guerrilla movement against Rhodesia comes from the Soviet Union and Communist China. We have the recent examples of Angola and Mozambique to see what kind of democracy that brings. Even Zambia has recently cracked down on this guerrilla group operating against Rhodesia as they have taken to shooting each others camps up—much as the various groups in Angola are doing now.

Passage of this bill today will serve only two purposes that I am aware of—give the Soviet Union a stranglehold on the supply of chromite to the United States and promote the selective morality of the United Nations which is the most morally bankrupt organization in the world, in my view.

This measure should be defeated.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1287, amending the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the further importation of Rhodesian chrome. Since enactment of the Byrd amendment in 1971, the United States has stood virtually alone in violation of a unanimous 1966 United Nations Security Council Resolution imposing mandatory sanctions against the importation by any country of products from Southern Rhodesia. Events between 1971 and the present refute every argument raised in support of the Byrd amendment and demonstrate clearly that the best interests of the United States lie in its abrogation.

BACKGROUND

The white minority government of Southern Rhodesia unilaterally and illegally declared its independence from Great Britain in November, 1965. The United Nations resolved that as long as the 95 percent black majority was ex-

cluded from political participation, Southern Rhodesia could not be considered a self-governing nation. A year later, economic sanctions were imposed. Pursuant to these sanctions, President Johnson in 1967 and 1968 issued two executive orders prohibiting the importation of products from Rhodesia into the United States. These orders had no negative impact on the American economy or national security during the 4 years of their operation. In September of 1971, Congress passed and the President signed the Military Procurement Act for fiscal year 1972, which contained the so-called Byrd amendment requiring the importation of "strategic and critical materials" from non-Communist countries. The singular effect of the amendment was to permit the importation of chrome ore and refined ferrochrome from Southern Rhodesia, in direct violation of the United Nations sanctions.

THE UNITED STATES DOES NOT NEED RHODESIAN CHROME

The supporters of the Byrd amendment argue that a ban on the purchase of chrome from Southern Rhodesia would place the United States in the dangerous position of over-reliance on the Soviet Union for this strategic metal. This argument is entirely specious. Between 1961 and 1966—the year before the U.S. barred Rhodesian chrome, imports of chrome from Russia rose from 4.7 percent to 58 percent, while imports from Rhodesia fell from 47.2 percent to 17.6 percent. After passage of the Byrd amendment restoring the availability of Rhodesian chrome, the Soviet Union has continued to account for over 50 percent of American chrome purchases, while sales from Rhodesia have fallen from a market share of 13 percent in 1974 to 7 percent this year.

The reasons for the small amount of chrome purchased from Rhodesia are obvious: the Russian product is both cheaper and of higher quality; demand for chrome has declined; and the Department of Defense has already stockpiled enormous quantities of the metal. So large is the present surplus that the Pentagon has calculated that the United States could wage an all-out war for 3 years using up only 6 percent of our chrome stockpile.

In analyzing the economic effects of the Byrd amendment, Julius Katz, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs, told a House International Relations Subcommittee that:

The amendment has not stimulated a revival of Rhodesian chromite purchases; Rhodesian chromite, to the extent that it has come into the United States, has replaced ore shipments from third countries rather than the Soviet Union; the amendment has had the effect of increasing our overall dependence for chrome materials on fewer, and less dependable sources.

Should the United States ever face a shortage of chrome due to a Soviet refusal to sell, we could easily dip into our massive defense stockpiles. Such a shortage is extremely unlikely, however, there are many other chrome exporters in the world—including Japan, Finland, Turkey, and the Philippines—to whom we

could turn. Moreover, we currently supply the Soviet Union with myriad essential strategic materials, such as aluminum oxides, and the Kremlin is not likely to endanger that supply, as well as increased United States-Soviet trade in general, by refusing to sell us chrome.

Rhodesia, to a far greater extent than any other nation, sells its chrome in the form of refined ferrochrome, direct competition with the many American businesses which depend heavily on refining raw chrome ore, obtained from abroad, into ferrochrome. I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, has stated that:

If any job loss argument can be made, then it would have to be that American ferrochrome jobs have been jeopardized by the partial lifting of the embargo for chrome products—not that reimposition of the embargo would cost jobs for American specialty steelworkers.

It is quite apparent that compliance with the United Nations sanctions against Southern Rhodesia would have a positive, rather than a negative impact upon the economy of the United States, while posing no threat whatsoever to our national security. In the simplest possible language, the United States does not need Rhodesian chrome.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF CONTINUED IMPORTATION OF RHODESIAN CHROME

The issues raised by H.R. 1287 go far deeper than the economic effects of American purchases of Rhodesian chrome. The Government of Southern Rhodesia is among the most racist and unrepresentative in the world. While imports of chrome from Rhodesia to the United States are minuscule from the standpoint of the American economy, the Rhodesians derive their largest source of foreign exchange from these transactions. America is thus subsidizing a regime whose racist policies have earned for it the status of an international outlaw.

In a more general sense, continued American noncompliance with the United Nations sanctions erodes the capacity of the U.N. to act as an instrument for peace and justice. Of what value can the United Nations be if its most powerful and wealthy member, one professing to represent equality and justice, ignores unanimously imposed sanctions against a regime that is a blight on international justice and an affront to human dignity?

Continued noncompliance will erode the moral stature of the United States among all the nations of the world. In particular, the position of the United States in Africa will be undermined seriously by continued dealings with Southern Rhodesia. African nations supply such essential goods as crude oil, manganese, bauxite, and cobalt to the United States. The Arab oil boycott illustrated American vulnerability to economic sanctions in critical areas; it is nonsensical to jeopardize these supplies, as well as our political relations with African nations, in the interest of retaining an unnecessary supply of Rhodesian chrome.

The raw materials wealth of the African Continent has barely been tapped.

Recent developments such as the independence of neighboring Mozambique; the erosion of South African military support; and the increase in guerrilla activity in Rhodesia point to the eventual fall of the Smith government. To persist in violating the U.N. sanctions is to risk a potentially rich political, cultural, and economic relationship with the free nations of Africa in exchange for access to a product which we do not need, and support for a government which the conscience of the world cannot tolerate.

CONCLUSION

H.R. 1287 is designed to meet the problem effectively. It would not directly repeal the Byrd amendment, but rather would focus on the real issue by permitting the President to override the amendment if necessary to bring the United States into compliance with United Nations sanctions. The bill also prevents indirect support of the Rhodesian Government by requiring certification that imported steel mill products do not contain chrome of Rhodesian origin.

The bill has gained widespread bipartisan support. The Ford administration, the AFL-CIO, the United Auto Workers, the United Steelworkers of America, the Communications Workers of America, the Washington Office on Africa, and the Americans for Democratic Action have all voiced support for the measure. In a letter to Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, Democrat of Indiana, explaining his support of the bill, Secretary of State Kissinger wrote:

I am personally convinced that the Byrd provision is not essential to our national security, brings no real economic advantage and is costly to the national interest of the United States in our conduct of foreign relations.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of human dignity and freedom, and in the economic and national interest of the United States, I urge my colleagues to bring our Nation into conformity with the rest of the world by enacting H.R. 1287.

Mr. NIX. Mr. Chairman, I support the effort to repeal the Byrd amendment because it is in direct conflict with an international commitment of the United States to abide by the boycott of Rhodesian products imposed by the United Nations.

The argument for retaining the Byrd amendment in our national law is our need for chrome. While this response is not related to our commitments to the United Nations it has been the most effective argument in support of the Byrd amendment because our next alternative as a source of supply is the Soviet Union.

The answer is that we have time to make arrangements with other suppliers of chrome. We do not have to depend on the Soviet Union in the short run or in the long run because we have at least 3 years of chrome on hand in emergency stockpiles.

What is much more important is that we will lose any chance of establishing ourselves as customers with an assured supply of chrome in that the Ian Smith, white supremacy government is on the way out. They must compromise

and deal with the great majority of their own citizens who are black. Their outlet to the rest of the world has been cut off through Mozambique by that government's order. South Africa will not extend rail service to the Rhodesian border and that white supremacy government has all but abandoned the Ian Smith regime.

What we are being asked to do here today is catch up with the foreign policy of South Africa which no longer will support Rhodesia. We have waited much too long. If we wait much longer we will be the Rhodesian regime's only supporter in the world. If we are ever to have any credibility left in Africa we must cut our ties to Rhodesia by repealing the Byrd amendment. We can no longer support 5 percent of the Rhodesian population against the remaining 95 percent. The days of white supremacy in Rhodesia are over, and the Byrd amendment must go.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in full support of H.R. 1287, a bill that would repeal the Byrd amendment. In an era when the United States is attempting to restore its image as a leader among nations, after having suffered a great deal as a result of its participation in the Vietnam debacle, it is essential that we pass this legislation, thus reaffirming our commitment to international justice.

On November 11, 1965, the white minority government of Southern Rhodesia unilaterally declared its independence of Great Britain. This minority government which represents 5 percent of the population is imposing its abhorrent apartheid policies on 95 percent of the people.

To counter this illegal move by the Rhodesian Government headed by Ian Smith, the United Nations Security Council acting under the authority found in chapter 7 of the charter, which allows that sanctions can be imposed in cases of threats to international peace, voted unanimously to impose sanctions with respect to the importation of Rhodesian chrome. The United States supported this move, and in 1967 and 1968 President Johnson reaffirmed our support for this action in two Executive orders.

But in September of 1971, the Military Procurement Act for fiscal year 1972 was amended, requiring the importation of strategic and critical materials from non-Communist nations. This amendment, known as the Byrd amendment, permitted the importation of chrome, thus thwarting the effectiveness of the sanctions imposed by the United Nations. Needless to say, our credibility has been severely damaged by violating this agreement thus engaging in trade with this illegal government.

Our relations with the African Continent are at best strained. The nations on that continent, chiefly the black nations, feel that the United States is not giving their needs and problems adequate attention. They see the Secretary of State engaging in shuttle diplomacy but never once touching down in their nations.

In a recent meeting with the Secretary, several members of the Congressional Black Caucus expressed these concerns to him. We felt that our Government was ignoring Africa and should begin to make a concerted effort to reverse

this trend. The Secretary was receptive to our views and offered to work with us in developing a new approach.

At a recent reception honoring the delegates to the conference of the Organization for African Unity, Secretary Kissinger outlined the administration's new policy. He pointed out that our aid appropriation for Africa for this fiscal year was 60 percent over the sum provided last year. The Secretary also stated that we would propose to alter the structure of the International Monetary Fund in order to relieve the shortfalls in export earnings for those economies who rely chiefly upon primary commodities.

Obviously the administration has come to the realization that we must begin to work positively with the African continent. However, before we can offer assistance, we must assure these nations that we are acting in good faith. The way to begin this process is by repealing the Byrd amendment, a move the Secretary emphatically supported on behalf of the entire administration.

My colleagues, the choice is clear. We must reestablish ourselves as a leader among nations. We do this by assuming the morally correct position of repealing the Byrd amendment and not by supporting the undemocratic and racist minority regime of Ian Smith. Let us stand up for the principles of human rights by passing H.R. 1287.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, today the House will vote on an important—possibly crucial—foreign policy and national security proposal, the Rhodesian sanction bill. This measure has generated a great deal of controversy—and misunderstanding. Because of the very great foreign policy implications of this bill, it is vital that some of the facts being raised by opponents be challenged.

Opponents of H.R. 1287 contend that the reimposition of UN sanctions would make the United States dependent on Soviet chrome. But maintaining Rhodesian imports—now a paltry 6.7 percent of total imports—will not lessen reliance on Soviet minerals. In fact, since the Byrd amendment allowed trade in certain minerals with Rhodesia, shipments from the Soviet Union have increased and now account for 57 percent of U.S. imports.

Ironically, keeping trade with Rhodesia could well find our country more dependent on Soviet chrome. True, Rhodesia holds some 67 percent of the world's known chrome reserves, but the Ian Smith regime's days are numbered. Even South Africa feels that 2 years is the outside limit for minority rule in Salisbury and is cutting back its support. And black nationalist leaders have hinted, not too subtly, that for our support of white supremacy the United States may itself be cut off from Rhodesia's vast chrome deposits. That would be a high price for the small percentage of chrome we now get from Rhodesia. And that amount is likely to dwindle more even without the sanctions as Mozambique—Rhodesia's route to the sea—closes its borders, and even South Africa turns down transhipments. If we fail to repeal the Byrd amendment, we will have an effective embargo anyway, but with

all the political complications of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as if the record of increasing dependence on Soviet chrome, the damage done to our international relations—especially in Africa—and the very real danger of being denied future access to 67 percent of the world's chromite reserves is not enough, the National Security Council and the Defense Department have specifically determined that Rhodesian chrome is not vital to U.S. national security. The Ford administration backs H.R. 1287 as an important foreign policy measure. On these grounds, I urge you to support it as well.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for H.R. 1287, which would halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome into this country. If passage of this bill were to seriously jeopardize our stockpiles of chromium ore, we might wish to set aside the moral consideration in order to meet our industrial and military needs. Fortunately current circumstances do not place us in the position of having to make this difficult choice. The best available evidence indicates to me that our current stockpiles of this ore are adequate to meet our present and future needs for several years to come. Should some unforeseen set of circumstances change this picture, we would have ample time to reconsider the embargo.

There are additional factors that have led me to support this bill. Given the recent trend of political developments in South Central Africa. The Ian Smith minority government in Rhodesia seems likely to not last as long as our chrome stockpiles. The change of government in Mozambique has dramatically increased Rhodesia's border problems and further limited its access to the sea. Even South Africa, who would normally be expected to support the current government in Rhodesia, continues to withhold diplomatic recognition and has tried to pressure Rhodesia to negotiate a political settlement with the nonwhite majority which constitutes 95 percent of the country's population.

In addition to the moral issues, reimposition of the embargo best now seems to serve our immediate and long-term interests. A major share of the world's dwindling mineral reserves are located on the African continent and a significant proportion of our petroleum also comes from the area. It makes good sense to try and maintain friendly relations with these resource rich countries, as long as we are not denying ourselves needed materials, and as long as the moral issue is right.

Until recently, the third world block in the UN has generally not acted responsibly on several issues most notably the integrity of the State of Israel. But there is new evidence that this track record is beginning to improve. Secretary Kissinger's recent speech to the UN delivered by Ambassador Moynihan seems to have had a salutary impact on our relations with these countries. We have an opportunity here today to help maintain this momentum. We ought to do so.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1287. I share the con-

victions of many of my colleagues that we should comply with international sanctions to which we were an approving party and that our future political and economic relations with black African nations are at stake in this matter. However, an underlying question the Congress must ask itself is what kind of economic and strategic impact a cutoff of Rhodesian chrome would have on the United States. The evidence, in my opinion, does not justify anxiety.

The administration supports repeal of the Byrd amendment partly because the National Security Council and the Department of Defense have determined the Rhodesian chrome is not vital to U.S. national security. The U.S. strategic stockpile is more than adequate to meet security needs, and indeed excess stocks could provide us the equivalent of decades of Rhodesian imports. Furthermore, the Byrd amendment did not succeed in lessening our dependence on the Soviet Union for chromite as it was designed to do: both during and after sanctions slightly more than 50 percent of our imports have come from Russia. So the recent inflow of Rhodesian chrome has in fact replaced ore not from communist nations but from other "free world" countries, thereby increasing our dependence on fewer and less dependable sources.

The legislation has been carefully tailored so as to assure that the domestic steel industry will not be harmed. In order to prevent the possibility of unfair competition from foreign steelmakers who might obtain Rhodesian chrome for their operations, the legislation establishes an enforcement procedure regarding specialty steel mill products imported from our major foreign competitors. Therefore renewal of sanctions will have no adverse domestic employment effects.

Besides, Rhodesian chrome prices have not been consistently less than, for example, Soviet prices. In 1973 and 1974 they were even greater. If Rhodesian chrome has no consistent price advantage, and since Rhodesian chrome only represents about 10 to 15 percent of U.S. consumption—13 percent for chromite; 6 percent for ferrochrome—I am forced to conclude that industry opposition to this bill is based only on short-run reluctance to change suppliers.

To conclude, I support this bill enthusiastically and can foresee no adverse effect on our economy or security if it is passed.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the many Members who have spoken in favor of H.R. 1287, which would amend the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 in order to halt further importation of Rhodesian chrome. This is a bill, long debated in Congress, which has broad bipartisan support and whose time has obviously come.

Our experience with the Byrd amendment, which suspended the embargo on Rhodesian chrome and other strategic materials, has demonstrated that it has not fulfilled any of the purposes of its sponsors, except perhaps to undermine our relations with African States. I believe the evidence indicates clearly that this exception to the Rhodesian embargo

has been as unnecessary, even harmful, in economic and national security terms, as it has been damaging to United States relations with black Africa.

One of the major contentions of supporters was that the Byrd amendment was necessary to prevent the United States from becoming dependent on chrome imports from the Soviet Union. It is clear, however, that removing the embargo on Rhodesian chrome has not had that effect. In the 5-year period since the embargo was lifted, the Soviets have continued to supply 50 percent or more of U.S. chromite ore imports.

In 1972 and 1973 we imported five times as much from the Soviet Union as from Rhodesia. In 1974 the proportion was lower, but the absolute amount of Soviet imports actually increased over the 1973 level, from 200,000 to 250,000 tons. In 1975 the trend has been further away from reliance on Rhodesia, with Soviet ore imports rising to almost 63 percent of the total, and imports from Rhodesia falling below 8 percent.

Since ending the embargo the United States has relied to a much greater extent on Rhodesia for imports of ferrochrome, a processed alloy made from raw chrome. Here too, however, the trend is the same—first an increase in the Rhodesian proportion of the market and then a decline. Rhodesia's share of U.S. high-carbon ferrochrome imports reached a high of 45 percent in 1973 but has declined to 28 percent in 1974 and 18 percent in the first 5 months of 1975. Moreover, Rhodesia's share of all ferrochrome imports dropped below 7 percent, which was less than the proportion of Rhodesian chrome ore imports.

In sum, the lesson is clear. It is that suspending the embargo has not reduced our dependence on Soviet chrome—imports of chrome, and particularly ferrochrome, from Rhodesia have in large part substituted for third country, not Soviet, sources.

The argument that Rhodesian imports have helped keep down chrome prices, and prevent the Soviets from gouging us, is also unsubstantiated by the facts. It is obvious, for example, that the 930,000 tons of chrome that our Government released from the U.S. stockpile and sold in 1973 had much more of an effect on the price than the 43,000 tons imported from Rhodesia. And now we see, according to the International Relations Committee, that the average price of Rhodesian chrome ore has risen almost to \$40 a ton in the first quarter of 1975, while Soviet ore cost less than \$26 per ton in the same period. Here too the facts show that ending the embargo did not produce the result promised by the Byrd amendment's supporters. The inescapable conclusion, as Assistant Secretary of State Julius Katz stated in International Relations Committee hearings, is that Rhodesian chrome imports have had no real economic benefit to the United States, and the economic cost of reimposing the embargo would be quite small.

An important factor in the decline of our Rhodesian chrome imports has been, not only its cost, but also Rhodesia's difficulty in transporting its chrome. Por-

tugal's grant of independence to neighboring Mozambique has added another country to the long list of those opposing the racist Ian Smith regime and supporting majority rule in Rhodesia.

This country will have a particular effect on Rhodesia's future, however, because heretofore most of Rhodesia's exports have been shipped through Mozambique. In this situation, continuing the attempt to trade with Rhodesia is likely to be an increasingly futile exercise. In short, the Smith regime is progressively less able to deliver, and even our short term economic interest lies in ending whatever reliance we place on it.

It is even clearer that we will be serving our long-term economic purposes, not to speak of fulfilling our political and moral values, by shunning the odious Smith colonial regime. It is apparent that the future of this regime is not bright, that Rhodesia will be ruled by its black indigenous majority in the not too distant future. If we wish to have access to Rhodesia's 67 percent of the world's chrome reserves in the longer term, we will need an amicable relationship with that majority and a favorable orientation on its part to our needs. An end to our current trade arrangement, which has provided Ian Smith and his minions with much of their hard currency, would obviously be conducive to the establishment of such a relationship.

This is one instance where the course dictated by our political interests and moral values will also fulfill our long-term economic and security interests. This bill will enable us to end a flagrant violation of our U.N. Charter obligations and return to a responsible foreign policy in our dealings with Rhodesia. It will also enable us to avoid the political hazards of relying further on Rhodesian chrome. The value of Rhodesian chrome is low, relative to the significance our violation of U.N. sanctions has had for the attitudes of such key Africa states as Nigeria, Ghana, and Zaire. By passing this bill we can remove one of the greatest obstacles standing in the way of an effective U.S. foreign policy in Africa.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to support a bill which so clearly serves all of America's interests.

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Chairman, I will vote against H.R. 1287 because I believe the facts require such a position.

We are not determining whether or not the majority population in Rhodesia will assume their proper role in the life of their nation. There have been positive developments in negotiations between the Smith government and the leaders of African independence movements. There is reason to hope that the people of Rhodesia will find a sane and peaceful solution to their internal struggle.

The main issue is one of economics. We need to provide sufficient supplies for vital industry in this country. We know that we are beginning to experience the first stages of a serious minerals deficiency. We must not be dependent upon Soviet sources only. The alternative sources of chromium—South Africa and Turkey—both represent real difficulties for us at this time. The influence of the embargo, its lifting and the threat of

reimposition, on the import price of Soviet Union chromium has been well documented in this body.

Our country is totally dependent upon imports for chrome ore. There is no compelling humanitarian or foreign policy issue to mandate an affirmative vote. The bill should be defeated.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1287.

Over the past 20 years, the Russians have been accused of many things—but rarely of being bad businessmen. In 1972, Soviet grain merchants skinned American taxpayers for more than \$161 million. Now their business partners—the chrome merchants—are at it again. After the Russian chrome monopoly was broken in 1971 by passage of the Byrd amendment, Soviet prices plummeted despite the highest demand levels in history. Russian chromite dealers tried everything to salvage their dominant position here including a 5-month embargo on shipments to American consumers. Nothing proved very successful until legislation was reintroduced which would prohibit imports from Russia's toughest competitor—Rhodesia.

Imagine the champagne toasts in the Kremlin when H.R. 1287 was announced. It should be subtitled the "Buy Russia" bill. Chrome is already their biggest dollar earner in exports to the United States. This bill will give the Soviets at least another \$200 million in windfall profits. The "Russian Chrome Merchants Relief Act of 1975" will permit the Soviets to double their prices while cutting back on quality and quantity.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1287, which is designed to force the United States to cease all importation of chrome from Rhodesia on the ground that we have to comply with sanctions against trade with that country as ordered by the United Nations Security Council. The plain fact of the matter is that this bill, if passed, will have an adverse impact on both the price and the availability of chromium, which means an adverse impact on our industrial and economic well-being.

It is my belief that anything which adversely affects our industrial or economic well-being must of necessity adversely affect our security as a nation.

Unfortunately, the United States is in a bad position with respect to chromium. Since no chromite ore has been mined in this country since 1961, we are completely dependent on imports and our dwindling national stockpile, which has declined by more than 60 percent since 1962 and is now at the lowest level in 25 years.

As with all steel-producing nations, we have a tremendous need for chromium, so we have to ask ourselves where we are going to buy it if not from Rhodesia. We should recall that during our prior observance of the sanctions, our principal supplier was the Soviet Union and that, to put it mildly, they took advantage of us.

Perhaps some have forgotten the deterioration in the quality of ore exported to this country by the Soviets. Also, perhaps they have forgotten how the price was raised from \$35.78 per short ton in 1965 to \$69.45 in 1972. True, the price fell

back to \$51.73 per ton in 1973 when sanctions were lifted, but in obvious anticipation of congressional action to restore the embargo, the prices for 1975 delivery of Russian metallurgical grade ore are being quoted at an unbelievable \$160 per ton. I think it is fair to say that if this bill is passed and we become dependent on the Soviets for chromium ore again, we are in real danger of being thoroughly fleeced.

And I think we can safely assume dependence on the Soviet Union. The world has three major suppliers of chromium: Rhodesia, the Republic of South Africa, and the Soviet Union. It is hardly realistic to think that we will be able to buy from the South Africans if we cannot buy from the Rhodesians, because the opponents of Rhodesia's racial polices are even more opposed to those of South Africa. Obviously, the next logical step would be to cut off imports from South Africa, which would leave us at the tender mercy of the U.S.S.R. again—at a minimum of \$160 per ton.

We cannot afford the loss of chrome, either, because the automobile industry uses stainless steel, of which chrome is a major ingredient, at the rate of 7,500 tons per month just to meet current air quality standards. But if sanctions are reimposed as this bill contemplates, our imports of ferrochrome would be reduced by nearly 50 percent. South African imports would be just about cut in half because South Africa uses Rhodesian ore in about half of its ferrochrome production.

We might be able to make part of this up from lesser suppliers, but it would have to be at a much higher and inflationary cost. Japanese high carbon ferrochrome, as an example, was selling as of July at \$60 a ton above the Rhodesian price.

During the 92d Congress, I introduced legislation to prevent the imposition under the United Nations Participation Act of prohibitions on the importation into the United States of any strategic material from any free world country for as long as the importation of like material from any Communist country is not prohibited by law. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., succeeded in amending the military procurement bill with this provision, and we were once again allowed to import from Rhodesia.

Now we are faced again with the prospect of losing our supply of Rhodesian chrome ore because of what I regard as irresponsible action by this body. If we pass H.R. 1287, we will have to go, hat in hand, to the Soviet Union for our chrome ore. What this means is that we will be subsidizing the Soviet economy again, which I regard as a dangerous business.

There is a great deal of moralizing about Rhodesia's race policies, but the people who moralize the loudest about Rhodesia—and about South Africa, too, for that matter—are often strangely silent about the Soviet Union. It is not Rhodesia that persecutes Jews and other religious minorities. It is not Rhodesia that puts dissenters in mental institutions and gives them daily injections that literally destroy their minds. It is not Rhodesia that trains and equips terror-

ists and guerrillas in the so-called "third world" countries. And it was not Rhodesia that supplied the Vietnamese Communists with the arms to kill American boys.

We should remember that every time we provide another subsidy or crutch for the disastrous Soviet economy we make it that much easier for the U.S.S.R. to divert production to military hardware that finds its way into the hands of anti-American terrorists and others around the world. Do we want to be guilty of this again? I, for one, do not.

Besides, from a purely practical standpoint the boycott is a farce. It is an indisputable fact that during the period the boycott was in force, exports continued from Rhodesia to U.N. member countries that were supposed to be observing the boycott. There were 170 recommendations made that breaches of the sanctions be dealt with, but only four cases were prosecuted. It is also a fact that by early 1972, exports from Rhodesia had recovered to 97 percent of what they had been before the imposition of sanctions.

Another practical objection is raised by a new feature of this bill which requires that no steel mill product containing any form of chromium may be imported without a certificate of origin from the exporting country that satisfies the Secretary of the Treasury that the product contains no Rhodesian chromium. Thus, H.R. 1287 expands implementation of the U.N. sanctions to steel mill products from third countries—in effect, a secondary boycott. The Treasury Department's opinion is that this requirement would be difficult to enforce and that it would constitute an impediment to our normal trade relations with other countries. Does our economy, with its current unemployment and inflation problems, need this additional burden? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, no matter how noble the intentions of H.R. 1287's proponents may be, we must ask ourselves one root question: Who benefits? It is obvious to me that the only ones to benefit from the reimposition of sanctions against Rhodesian chrome ore will be the Communist bloc and the host of minuscule "third world" countries that, spurred on by the Soviets, are causing U.N. actions to be increasingly anti-United States.

If we pass this bill, we will go a long way toward hurting Rhodesia and, eventually, South Africa while at the same time giving a major boost to the economy of the Soviet Union. This strikes me as being indicative of a somewhat misplaced sense of priority. Many people find the racial policies of Rhodesia and South Africa abhorrent, although there is much evidence that the picture we usually get is grossly distorted. However, what of the racial and other policies of persecution within the Soviet Union, which are, if anything, probably far worse than most of us realize?

Mr. Chairman, let us maintain our perspective. No matter how you approach this legislation—whether it be from the moral or pragmatic standpoint—it is unwise because it is, in my considered opinion, going to lead inevitably to further economic problems for the United States

while it gives the extremists of the "third world" and Communist blocs a psychological victory of the first magnitude.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this bill and make note of the fact that the House Armed Services Committee, on which I serve, reported H.R. 1287 adversely by a rather large margin. I feel it would be the height of folly for the Congress to once again vote to place a total embargo on the importation of chrome and chrome products from Rhodesia.

It is my understanding that Rhodesia has the most plentiful supply of high quality chrome of any nation in the world. Yet we are about to vote to cut this supply off. Some say that we can import chrome from Russia, but let us look at past history for a moment. The last time we placed an embargo on Rhodesian chrome, the Russians immediately doubled their price to American firms. We have no reason to believe they would not do this again. Can you imagine the impact this would have on an already inflated American economy if the price of chrome were suddenly doubled.

The main reason some appear to be supporting this bill is their alleged aversion to the internal policies of Rhodesia. I personally feel this is a matter we should allow the Rhodesian people to work out, as they are apparently trying to do at this very moment.

Mr. Chairman, it should be noted that there are other nations in Africa with internal policies that many would consider to be similar to those alleged in Rhodesia. Yet, we are continuing to trade with and give foreign aid to these nations without a moment's hesitation. This is a double standard of justice I do not think the U.S. Congress should practice.

There is no doubt in my mind that it is in the best interest of the United States to continue to have an unlimited supply of chrome from Rhodesia at a relatively stable price. For this reason I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 1287.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Section 10 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 596; 50 U.S.C. 98-98h) shall not apply to prohibitions or regulations established under the authority of this section."

Mr. FRASER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of 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 Minnesota?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask my friends and colleague from Minnesota whether there is any inten-

tion on his side to close off debate. Some of us have been waiting to speak on this bill, even though it has been a long afternoon.

Mr. FRASER. I have no intention of cutting off debate prematurely, but if it goes on late in the evening, I would not want to be committed.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERRED BY MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DERWINSKI: Page 2, line 2, immediately after "section" and before the first period insert the following: " ; except that this section shall not apply with respect to the importation into the United States of chromium of Southern Rhodesian origin so long as chromium is imported into the United States from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, unless the President determines that the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—

"(1) grants its citizens the right or opportunity to emigrate;

"(2) does not impose more than a nominal tax on emigration or on the visas or other documents required for emigration, for any purpose or cause whatsoever; and

"(3) does not impose more than a nominal tax, levy, fine, or other charge on any citizen as a consequence of the desire of such citizen to emigrate to the country of his choice."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment as offered by the gentleman from Illinois, in my judgment, is not germane under rule XVI, clause 7. It is introducing a subject which is different from the one dealt with in the bill and would change the scope of the bill considerably.

The bill itself simply allows the President to promulgate prohibition and regulations under United Nations Participation Act to give effect to its decisions. This introduces wholly extraneous matter that has nothing to do with the United Nations Participation Act or acts of the United Nations Security Council or the subject of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

May I point out to the Chairman that section 2 of the bill was added in the subcommittee, and that in and of itself, section 2 addresses itself to subject matter considerably beyond the scope of the original bill.

It in effect introduces substantial technical requirements that go far beyond the issue of the United Nations Participation Act.

Mr. Chairman, there are numerous precedents in the House, whereby once an amendment has been accepted that substantially enlarges the scope of the

bill, further amendments so doing are in order.

Section 2, obviously, has been ruled germane, has been judged germane. It substantially expands the scope of the measure before us, goes far beyond the mere amendments to the United Nations Participation Act and, therefore, Mr. Chairman, logically, I believe, my amendment would be in order.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in support of the position of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI)?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may be heard.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I would further point out in support of the argument of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) that this is in effect an amendment to section 10 of the Stockpile Act.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) only goes to that basis, so undoubtedly his amendment would be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may be heard.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the argument of the gentleman from Illinois.

Section 2 deals with the United Nations Participation Act and so does section 1. Neither are in any sense related to the subject matter which the gentleman has sought to introduce in his amendment. The gentleman is introducing a whole new subject which has no relevance or germaneness to the basic thrust of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman is prepared to rule on the point of order.

With regard to the argument made by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) when he last stood, the Chair would also point out that while it was necessary to obtain from the Committee on Rules a rule waiving points of order on that particular committee amendment which would indicate that it might not be germane in the first instance, and in any event, the committee amendment has not been adopted and is not part of the bill.

The Chair would also point out that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) has this effect: The effectiveness of the bill itself, the working of the bill itself, is contingent upon certain things happening. And in the case of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), those contingencies in the amendment are wholly unrelated to the substance of the bill.

As authority, the Chair would point to Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, chapter 28, section 24, on page 395, the section being entitled "Amendment Postponing Effectiveness of Legislation Pending Contingency."

In section 24.10, in the instance of an amendment "To a bill authorizing appropriations for the Arms Control and

Disarmament Agency, an amendment delaying the effectiveness of the authorization until the Soviet Union 'ceases to supply military articles to our enemy in Vietnam,' was ruled out as not germane."

Also, in section 24.11, an amendment "To a bill authorizing funds for foreign assistance, an amendment making such aid to any nation in Latin America contingent upon the enactment of tax reform measures by that nation was ruled out as not germane."

In view of this, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Are there any other amendments at this point?

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

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this entire debate, and I will have to admit that there have been some rather interesting concepts propounded. In the first place, I would like to address myself to the so-called moral obligation that we have to follow an action of the United Nations.

In commercial law there is a theory that we often talk about, and that is about bad paper becoming good paper if it is transferred to a good-faith purchaser in due course. I think that is what we are talking about here, trying to make bad paper good paper and fabricating as a fact that because an action has been taken by the U.N. have to follow along dutifully, with blinders on our eyes, agreeing to whatever they might have done in any way.

Let us just change that around for a moment. If by some mistake the United Nations had ever decided to support us in Vietnam, we would have probably heard exactly the same people saying, "Oh, no, we certainly cannot implement that; we can not give credibility to that."

Mr. Chairman, I think this moral argument runs a little bit shallow. They use it when it is in their best interests, and they oppose it when it would not be in their best interests.

On the subject of how that 1966 U.N. policy was arrived at, when I heard the very interesting and eloquent statement by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS), I could not help but think of a personal experience I had.

I was the first Member of this body to go to Rhodesia. I went to Rhodesia in 1965, one month after its independence. I will never forget this. I got a call from a gentleman from Michigan whom most of us have probably forgotten about. His name was G. Mennen Williams, and he was in the State Department; particularly, he was in charge of African Affairs. I thought it was my obligation as a Member of Congress to go over to the State Department and hear him out.

I went down to his office and we talked for an hour.

If our policy was in any way based on his understanding of what was going on in Africa—and I am not sure he had any understanding—but if it was, it was not any wonder that we ended up backing the wrong position in the sanction vote.

He asked me, "Who are you going with?"

I named a few people, and I named Max Yergan. He said, "Oh, not Max Yergan. He is a white supremacist."

I said, "Well, I never heard that. How can a Negro be a white supremacist?"

"Oh," he said, "is Mr. Yergan a Negro?"

I said, "Yes."

He said, "He opposed our policy in Katanga."

I said, "The position has changed. You forgot that some of the issues have changed. You now oppose our former policy in Katanga."

He said, "Yes, I think that is right. I guess we have changed."

The 1966 action was wrong and now this is translated into a solemn, moral obligation of this country by those who want to repeal the Byrd amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in responding to the arguments of some of the Members of this body, I will say that I listened to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS) and my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. DELLUMS), and they both talked about the view from the mountaintop. I cannot help but wonder who put them on the mountaintop. How did they get there? Were they voted there? Are they self-ordained?

My friend, the gentleman from California, kept referring to the "correct position." The inference was left on a number of occasions that politicians would vote one way and leaders would vote another way. I think that is specious. I think just the opposite: politicians normally are going to be voting for this repeal because it is going to be translated into a civil rights issue.

Let us not use this excuse that leaders vote one way and politicians vote another way. That has been injected throughout this entire debate. It has been placed in the debate, I think, improperly.

There are men of different opinions, politicians and leaders, on both sides, but let us not leave the implication that politicians will vote against this bill and for the Byrd amendment and leaders will vote for it and against the Byrd amendment.

My friend, the gentleman from Michigan, went on to say that Rhodesia was not independent—and I wrote down what he said—it just decided to become independent on its own.

Mr. Chairman, that is the way most people become independent. They just decide to do it on their own. I never understood the argument that there needs to be some certification committee that says, "You are free and independent."

Rhodesia is free; Rhodesia is independent. They have survived 10 years, and that would pass the test in almost anybody's criteria, and yet we hear it said, "Oh, they are not free and independent."

Why? They say, "Because Great Britain does not agree."

The only difference, as my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) pointed out, is that we have been independent just 190 years more than Rhodesia. But to say they are not independent, to my way of thinking, it inaccurate.

Then I would have to say that my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BIESTER) spoke very forcefully, and I listened to this strategy of how we have got to do this and what this country is going to do and that country is going to do and how this is going to work, and that reminded me a little bit about the lawyer in a losing case who bragged that he held the verdict to the amount asked for in the petition.

I think that is the sort of victory we are going to get in this particular case. If the Byrd amendment is taken off the books, we will be worse off, not better.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose H.R. 1287, which would repeal the Byrd amendment and reimpose the United Nations-sponsored embargo on chrome and ferrochrome from Rhodesia. Passage of this legislation would cost thousands of American steelworkers' jobs.

Metallurgical grade chromite is essential for our specialty steel industry. It is the only grade economically suitable for steelmaking applications. Specialty steels such as stainless steel require chrome ore for their production. In fact, chrome accounts for about 20 percent of the raw materials cost of stainless steel.

Chrome deposits in the United States are extremely negligible. As the Committee on Armed Services writes in its report:

The United States has no indigenous chromite ores of economic significance . . . Since 1961 there has been no domestic mining of chromite.

Consequently our Nation must depend on foreign sources for this vital material.

Approximately two-thirds of the world's known reserves of metallurgical chrome are found in Rhodesia. H.R. 1287 would cut off this supply of chrome, leaving the Soviet Union as virtually the only supplier of metallurgical chrome to the United States.

Reliance on chrome from the Soviet Union would mean a large increase in price. The Soviets would use their captive market to increase prices and cut back on quality and quantity.

This is not empty theorizing. Let us take a look at the record. During the 1967 to 1971 embargo against Rhodesia, the price of Soviet chrome ore doubled. After the Russian chrome monopoly was broken in 1971 by passage of the Byrd amendment, Soviet prices fell sharply despite the highest demand levels in history.

This January, in anticipation of a renewed embargo, Soviet chrome merchants announced delivery cutbacks of 35 percent and price increases of 100 percent. No wonder this bill has been called the Russian Chrome Merchants Relief Act of 1975.

In summary, H.R. 1287 would grant the Soviets a monopoly in the U.S. market and allow them to gouge American chrome users. This would have a devastating impact on our specialty steel industry. Other countries that openly or covertly buy cheaper Rhodesian chrome would be able to produce steel products at a lower cost than in the United States.

It has been asserted that our purchase of Rhodesian chrome is unique in that

other countries have scrupulously abided by the U.N. sanctions resolution. This is a myth. Our competitors in the world steel market only give lip service to compliance.

Japan is a case in point. It was recently shown that Japan secretly imported over 25 percent of its chrome requirements from Rhodesia over a 5-year span. Other industrialized countries also carry on trade with Rhodesia. As the report by the Committee on Armed Services observes:

Cars and trucks and goods of every description from the western nations and Japan can be found in the stores and markets of Rhodesia. The dreary history of the failures of economic boycott seems to be repeating itself.

If our foreign competitors have access to low cost, high quality chrome, while Americans are forced to pay premium prices to Soviet suppliers, the U.S. steel industry simply will not be able to compete against imported stainless steel. Our domestic specialty steel industry would be seriously injured and thousands of jobs for American workers would be lost.

It would be ridiculous for Congress to adopt sanctions against Rhodesia when it would mean the loss of thousands of American steelworkers' jobs. We are sanctioning ourselves, not the Rhodesians. For the sake of American jobs, I urge the defeat of H.R. 1287.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On the second page, after line 2, insert the following:

Sec. 2. Section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) During the period in which measures are applied against Southern Rhodesia under subsection (a) pursuant to Security Council Resolutions numbered 232 (adopted December 16, 1966) and numbered 253 (adopted May 29, 1968), a shipment of any steel mill product (as such product may be defined by the Secretary) containing chromium in any form may not be released from customs custody for entry into the United States if—

"(A) a certificate of origin with respect to such shipment has not been filed with the Secretary; or

"(B) in the case of a shipment with respect to which a certificate of origin has been filed with the Secretary, the Secretary determines that the information contained in such certificate does not adequately establish that the steel mill product in such shipment does not contain chromium in any form which is of Southern Rhodesian origin; unless such release is authorized by the Secretary under paragraph (3) (B) or (C).

"(2) The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for carrying out this subsection.

"(3) (A) In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary may issue subpoenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence. Any such subpoena may, upon application by the Secretary, be enforced in a civil action in an appropriate United States district court.

"(B) The Secretary may exempt from the certification requirements of this subsection any shipment of a steel mill product containing chromium in any form which is in transit to the United States on the date of enactment of this subsection.

"(C) Under such circumstances as he

deems appropriate, the Secretary may release from customs custody for entry into the United States, under such bond as he may require, any shipment of a steel mill product containing chromium in any form.

"(4) As used in this subsection—

"(A) the term 'certificate of origin' means such certificate as the Secretary may require, with respect to a shipment of any steel mill product containing chromium in any form, issued by the government (or by a designee of such government if the Secretary is satisfied that such designee is the highest available certifying authority) of the country in which such steel mill product was produced certifying that the steel mill product in such shipment contains no chromium in any form which is of Southern Rhodesian origin; and

"(B) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. FRASER (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point, since it is printed in the bill that is on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a minute to comment on the committee amendment because I addressed it earlier in the general debate, but some of the Members may not have been present.

We are going to have to vote in just a few minutes on the committee amendment, which is, in fact, section 2 of the bill. Section 1 of the bill is the straight repealer of the Byrd amendment as we voted on it in prior years, but the committee adopted, by a vote of 13 to 10, section 2, which is the section that requires steel products manufactured in other countries and coming into the United States to be accompanied by a certificate of origin.

I stressed in my earlier remarks on this subject that I thought this was a very dangerous precedent in that we were saying to other countries of the world that we did not trust them, that we did not trust them to enforce the embargo on their own. We were going to make them sign a piece of paper saying they had supported the United Nations sanction.

I think that is bad foreign policy for the United States. I do not believe that we ought to be engaged in snooping on other countries of the world in order to see if they are living up to their international agreements. After all, it has been years since the United States has lived up to its international agreement in regard to the Byrd amendment.

Second, I pointed out that section 2, the committee amendment, is absolutely unenforceable. There is no test that one can apply to a piece of steel to tell where the chrome ore was mined that was used in making that piece of steel. Therefore, we have no way to follow up on it. It is not as if we were dealing with some other kind of product where there was a test by which we could easily tell where the product originated.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we are going to take an absolutely unenforceable standard and apply it to the other na-

tions of the world. I think that is a mistake.

I would hope that we have learned from our recent excursions into the morass of moralistic foreign policy that we found ourselves in with respect to the Vanik amendment and the Turkey arms amendment, that we cannot legislate morality in the international sphere.

The fact is that we are going to get ourselves into trouble with this amendment because, once again, we are trying to be the policeman of the world.

I do not believe, even though I supported repeal of the Byrd amendment in the past, that I can support it again unless section 2 is stricken. When we get to the appropriate point in the proceedings, I will ask for a recorded vote to see whether section 2 is stricken; and Mr. Chairman, I hope that my colleagues will join me in seeing that that happens.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise somewhat reluctantly in opposition to this legislation.

I recognize, as has already been said, that in some ways this is being interpreted as a black issue.

I think that my record in this Congress over the years on civil rights issues is a strong one, however, and needs no special defense here.

Recently I returned from a trip to Somalia and I recommended, in spite of the fact that I did not receive universal support in the Committee on Armed Services, that we supply humanitarian aid to Somalia, in spite of the Soviet missile base that we found located in the city of Berbera. But I believe that the question that is before us today in this legislation is another one, and deserves to be clearly understood.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York is absolutely correct in pointing out that this is not a black and white issue.

I would say to the gentleman from New York that in South Africa recently over Easter the gentleman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENN) and I had conversations with the mayor of Soweto and his deputy mayor. I might add that Soweto is a township outside of Johannesburg.

Both the mayor and the deputy mayor, although being black, asked us not to vote for sanctions against Rhodesia or South Africa on the ground that it would hurt the black man himself.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for that very good point.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have had too many instances in recent weeks where we have cast our votes not on what was right for our country or on what was good for America, but on ethnic considerations. I think here we must consider what is the best course for America.

Chrome is a vital metal. It is a vital metal to national defense. I am sure that argument has been made earlier today;

and it is also a vital metal for industrial America and for our industrial production. That is the reason we have a strategic stockpile of chrome. That is the reason why the Committee on Armed Services over the years persistently resisted the efforts of the Nixon administration to try to get rid of that stockpile so they could raise a little cash. We recognized we had a vital national interest involved in chrome and under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. BENNETT) we held the line. And as a result we still have a few thousand tons left in the stockpile today. But even so we have less than a 3-year supply left.

Chrome is extremely vital to our civilian economy too. I think we ought not to forget that.

I heard a lot of talk here a moment ago about how Mr. I. W. Abel of the United Steelworkers had sent a telegram to somebody or other saying that the AFL-CIO are for this bill and that the steelworkers are also for this bill.

Well, that is what they told us last fall, too. I remember seeing a telegram from the steelworkers to that effect. They said they were for this bill and they wanted the embargo imposed.

I happen to have the Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., in my district and the business agent of the local steelworkers union there is a fellow by the name of Jim Sloan. He has always been a very close friend of mine. He was in Pittsburgh at the time I got that telegram. This was one of the conferences that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) tells us the steelworkers have had from time to time where they have reaffirmed their position in support of this embargo.

I asked Jim Sloan where the local at Allegheny Ludlum stood on this issue. He said, "Let me call you back in a minute. I will ask them."

He went around the conference area and came back and said, "We want the best chrome that is available and we want the best source available. We do not care where it is from." He said, "That is the position of the steelworkers at this conference, not just our local."

So I think we ought to look at some of these telegrams that come from headquarters with a little grain of salt. Instead, let us turn to the people that actually make the steel.

And let me add that my record in support of the AFL-CIO I think will stand up with that of anybody else in this Chamber.

Also we have in my district a General Electric plant that manufactures turbines. This is not a defense plant. It is one of the major energy manufacturing sources of America and those turbines could never be produced without chrome. In fact, the people at General Electric in Schenectady get their chrome from the Allegheny Ludlum plant over in Watervliet.

So if we are going to cut down the supply and the quality of chrome for stainless steel, we are going to create more unemployment, and we are going to take away more jobs by passing this bill.

I have heard a lot of statistics cited

here today. But I happen to have some statistics, too, and these do not come from the steel companies or the Chrome Institute either, I might say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. STRATTON was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. STRATTON. These statistics do not come from the Steel Institute or big business, or anything like that. They come from the critical materials commodity action analysis of the U.S. Department of the Interior. We have been engaged for the last few weeks in the debate over oil and the price of oil, and we finally got a bill out of this body to hold down the price of oil because we were afraid that if the controls over oil prices were taken off, we would be confronted with additional costs of \$30 or \$40 or \$50 billion.

Well, here is an analysis from the Department of Interior that says that "the real cost on the economy of an indefinite embargo was estimated to be almost \$11 billion, with the first 2 years alone costing over \$1.2 billion."

Is this the time for us to slap on an extra \$11 billion burden on the very slowly recovering economy that we hope is underway? I do not think we want to do that at all, and I think we ought to start thinking about jobs and the welfare of America, and not try to base our vote on other considerations.

I have also noticed these very attractive charts over here, but again my figures do not jibe with those charts at all. We are told in these charts, for example, that in high-grade ferrochrome, high carbon content, we imported 29,000 tons from Rhodesia in 1974. I wonder if the gentleman from Minnesota knows what we imported in 1975? I have it here, and again this statistic does not come from the steel manufacturers. It comes from the mineral industry surveys of the U.S. Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior:

We imported from Rhodesia 38,500 tons in 1975. But that is not all that we got from Rhodesia, because we got 47,953 tons from South Africa, and a good deal of that comes originally from Rhodesia. We also got 52,787 tons from Japan. They do not have any chrome in Japan. This is Rhodesian chrome that went to Japan and then came back here to us. That is the point that the gentleman from Delaware was making a moment ago. Once it comes in here as ferrochrome ore, we have no way of knowing for sure where it originated.

Brazil—we imported 7,936 tons from Brazil. They do not have any chrome down there either. This is Rhodesian chrome again.

So if we are going to cut off Rhodesia with this bill we are not going to lose just 38,000 tons; we are going to lose 148,968 tons. That is the real problem we are confronted with on this bill, and I think we would be extremely foolish at the present time to interfere not only with our national defense but to create the possibility of increased unemployment by cutting off a vital mineral that is absolutely essential to continued pro-

duction of high-grade steel by American industrial workers.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am glad the gentleman made the record straight on an inaccuracy, because Members on the other side of the issue have talked about chrome from Rhodesia. There is a difference between chrome from Rhodesia and Rhodesian chrome which might come from somewhere else. I am glad the gentleman set the record straight.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for his kind words.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DENT TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DENT to the committee amendment: Page 2, line 20, after "steel mill product" add "or any product containing chromium in any form." And on page 3, line 13, strike out all of subsection (c), or paragraph 3, lines 13, 14, 15, 16, 17.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I am sure no one wants to perpetrate a fraud on the people of this country and especially on the Members of Congress. The gentleman from Minnesota said he and I did discuss an amendment which would bar from the United States steel from any country which contained Rhodesian chrome. But when he talks about steel mill product and then says it does not mean any finished product, all he is doing is saying to us that now of course it does not mean anything because such a small amount of steel mill product comes into the United States in anything but a finished form. The bulk of the stainless steel coming in is in finished form. The automobiles coming in are in finished form. The watches and clocks and every item we can shake a stick at, and electronics are in finished form.

But why perpetrate a fraud? Why not just drop it or at least amend it to say any product containing Rhodesian chrome. It is easy, the gentleman says, to detect whether or not the chrome comes from Rhodesia. All the products we get from Japan contain Rhodesian chrome because they imported 200,000 tons last year. Twenty-one countries export ferrochrome itself to the United States and make their products from ferrochrome or from the chromite they buy and turn into ferrochrome for the U.S. market.

The second part of the amendment states simply that the particular subsection (C) is stricken and it says that—

"(C) Under such circumstances as he deems appropriate, the Secretary may release from customs custody for entry into the United States, under such bond as he may require, any shipment of a steel mill product containing chromium in any form.

But we know what the Secretary of the Treasury will do. We have handed the Secretary of the Treasury 686 complaints, verified by facts and figures, of dumping in the United States. In all

that time they have found only four cases of dumping and one recently which they are going to throw out before the month is over. Do we think they are not going to allow clocks and watches to come in? Do we think they will not allow electronics to come into the United States?

By the way, if we do this honestly there will not be any watches in the United States because the only watches we get are from Russia and Japan and Switzerland, and Switzerland has never abided by the sanctions. They put the economic welfare of their people ahead of a theoretical and moralistic issue. They never followed through with it. We have kicked Taiwan out of the U.N. Red China came in, and we made Taiwan into a prostrate form, and Red China is in the U.N. They do not abide by the sanction.

If it is, as the gentleman has said, a positive requirement that the United States must obey the dictates of the Security Council, then Red China assumed those responsibilities when it came in.

This is something we ought to know. Sixty percent of all the Rhodesian production of chrome goes to China. They cannot use 60 percent of that productivity if they took 100 years to use only 1 year's production. So what is it? It is a funnel into the other markets. Twenty-one of the nations that signed this, including France and Luxembourg and Spain and Italy and the Netherlands, are all brokers for Rhodesian chrome into the United States.

I say if we are going to put this thing through at least we should clear it up. We should not be party to a fraud, particularly such an abject fraud which absolutely cannot stand the light of honesty to shine on it. How can we say steel mill products and not other products? The products that bring the Rhodesian chrome into the United States are the finished products that appear on the shelves of our marketplace. Take golf clubs. I doubt if there is a set of golf clubs in the United States that does not contain Rhodesian chrome and in all honesty we will have some trouble in trying to find the source or point of origin. It is very simple to buy 5 tons of chromite in Turkey or the Philippines or Russia and buy all the rest one needs from Southern Rhodesia. How, as the gentleman has said, are we going to enforce it? But we will find a way because we did find a way.

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

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, as we know, for a long time Red China was embargoed by the United States. Any time someone comes out of Hong Kong, out of Taiwan or anywhere, if he had a product, he had to have a country of origin before he was allowed to bring it into the United States. If we are going to do it, please vote for this amendment, because unless we do, it is a fraud and if we are going to pass the bill, which I pray we do not, at least let us make it what we say it is going to do

and it will not do it unless we pass this amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should make clear that I am in opposition to the resolution before us, but if we are to pass that resolution it seems incumbent upon us that we pass this amendment to the committee amendment, because the imposition of an embargo upon Rhodesian chrome is a paragon of a highly inconsistent foreign policy which the United States persistently engages in in its dealings with some foreign countries. The United States, in attempting to force the Rhodesian Government to guarantee to all its citizens the most basic human and civil rights, which were talked about by one of our colleagues, when we as contemplated signed the United Nations resolution declaring sanctions against that country, did not realize what it was doing. In the years since that declaration we have not seen the Rhodesian Government yield to this economic pressure. If we reimpose the embargo, we are in the incongruous position of acquiring a heavy dependency upon the Soviet Union for a strategically important commodity. Maybe this is an attempt to bolster the economy of Russia. I do not know whether it is or not; but it seems to me, in talking with my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), the gentleman pointed out that we used to be heavily dependent upon Russia for some of our chrome. When we objected to the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, we had an embargo of Russian chrome; so, maybe, in the sense that we are now engaged in a détente with Russia, we are trying to bolster Russia's economy. But we certainly know that the Soviets do not guarantee to all their citizens the civil rights that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DUGGS) referred to and they do not guarantee the same rights to their citizens that we insist that the Rhodesian Government guarantee to their citizens by the intent of this resolution.

If we were to pass this resolution, we would be in a uniquely vulnerable position vis-a-vis Russia. Past experience shows us that the prices for this material will jump soon, if we can believe the quotation from the U.S.S.R. regarding the 1975 prices at \$160 per ton. We do know that during the previous embargo, the price of Soviet ore doubled.

Now, if we wish to punish the Rhodesian Government, in order to reform its internal policies, ought we not take a more firm position with regard to our economic relations with the Soviet Union as well? An attempt to do so last year through the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Reform Act brought disastrous results and should certainly make every U.S. policymaker question the desirability and the advisability of interfering in the internal policies of other nations. If we judge one nation by that standard, ought we not judge all nations and all of our partners by the same measure?

We have severely criticized the Arab exporting nations for the oil embargo of 1973 and 1974 which they established

against us for political reasons, which may be more logical than those we have heard today. Today we seek to establish an embargo which not only forces us to rely on other sources for chrome, which sources are guilty of the same violations we seek to punish Rhodesia for, but which also goes further in attempting to force other nations to likewise reestablish an embargo of Rhodesian chrome.

In requiring certification of origin from nations which stand to lose economically from honest reporting, we merely encourage them to continue certification falsification which has already proved impractical and thereby allow such nations to provide iron ore to the United States at a price lower than our own producers can manufacture. There would be no way of monitoring the source of our chrome, as my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) pointed out, the U.S. imports, apart from further investigations into the internal affairs of the exporting nations.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman may not know of it, but one of the most important things that has been overlooked is that when we were most dependent in our lives on chrome from Russia, as the gentleman pointed out, during the Czechoslovakian situation or incident, they shut off our chrome.

What about the "Seven-Day War"? In the Seven-Day war, Russia shut off all shipments of chrome to the United States. Someone tell me who in this room is going to guarantee that they will not do it again.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have heard for the last 20 minutes a number of speakers who have stood up and first spoke against the committee amendment, section 2, of the bill, and then offered an amendment that, if passed, would essentially kill H.R. 1287, which I think is one of the most significant resolutions which we have had before us in this House of Representatives.

I intend to support strongly the bill. I also intend to support section 2 of the bill, which deals with the certificate of origin provisions. This section is necessary. It is symbolic; it is the symbolic statement of our intent to be full partners with the world in the embargo, not a policy whose intent is only to go through the motions.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the moral implications of this bill ought to be highlighted at this point. Many speakers on both sides have raised the economic questions of this issue, and whether the bill is going to have a national security impact on the United States.

But, I think there is a deeper issue, the very much more important issue, the issue of whether we as a member of a world community are going to participate in that world community as a co-equal member, or whether we are going to adopt meaningful words in the United Nations and let that simply stand as a verbal announcement. The United States has turned its back on the other

nations of the world and the United Nations.

I strongly affirm this bill and affirm section 2, because I think it is our opportunity to stand up and be counted; to recognize the interdependency of the nations of the world and how important it is for us to work with those nations for our future.

The future holds for us many open-ended questions. Our energy resources are not national issues, but are issues which relate to all the peoples of the world. The world economic situation has a great impact on who we are as a nation, but a greater impact is whether we can be counted on as a nation to stand firm on the moral issues which face us. I think that H.R. 1287 speaks to that. I would like to remind my colleagues that we had some of the same language in the bills against Cuba and against China. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) does a very unusual thing with his amendment.

He not only amends the bill to include "or any products containing chromium in any form," but when he goes on to say that one of the reasons we ought to kill the bill is because that very language which he is offering as an amendment is placed in the bill.

I urge all of the Members to look carefully at the amendment and reject it. I urge the Members to support the bill strongly.

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

Mr. EDGAR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS).

Mr. TSONGAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to inquire as to a previous statement about the mayor and the deputy mayor of Soweto, a black district outside of Johannesburg.

I wonder if the gentleman who made that remark would inform this body as to how the mayor and the deputy mayor are chosen in the district.

Mr. ICHORD. I am sorry, I did not hear the gentleman's statement.

Mr. TSONGAS. I wonder if the gentleman can help us about how the mayor and deputy mayor of the black district outside of Johannesburg are chosen.

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman will yield, I believe they are chosen by vote of the people in the township of Soweto. But I did not inquire of the two individuals, the mayor and the deputy mayor.

I would point out to the gentleman that the mayor of Soweto and the deputy mayor of Soweto met with the delegation, with the hope of getting a better deal for the black man in South Africa, better working conditions, better pay, et cetera. And I asked them if they thought that black men were in a better position in Rhodesia than they were in South Africa, and they replied in the affirmative.

Then I asked both of them how they thought about sanctions either against South Africa or Rhodesia, and they replied they were opposed to sanctions because it would hurt the black man more than it would hurt the white man. In other words, it would reduce jobs for the black man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EDGAR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EDGAR was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDGAR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TSONGAS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I believe the mayor and the deputy mayor are appointed by the government in Victoria, and the record would show that.

Mr. Chairman, the second point I would like to make is to remind the body that in 1963 the Organization of African Unity met in South Africa, and the theme of that meeting, some 12 years ago, was "Africa for the Africans."

Since that time, the world has recognized that Africa is for the Africans. The administration has recognized that and Secretary of State Kissinger has recognized that. I think it is about time that the U.S. Congress recognize that as well.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. EDGAR. I will yield to the gentleman just briefly for a question.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, formerly our colleague the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DRIGGS) stated that within a year, it was his opinion, the Government of Rhodesia would be changing from the white minority to the black majority. And so I would like to inquire if this is in fact true: Would it not be in the best interests of the black majority in Rhodesia to sell their chrome and, therefore, keep the economy a viable economy so that when they take over the government they would be in a better economic position?

Mr. EDGAR. It is my opinion, with respect to that question we and the other nations of the world can lift the embargo at such time as the nation of Rhodesia lives up to its commitments.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by just stating that this bill would restore our lost respect in the world community which has been understandably diminished as a result of bad policies.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and, in doing so, to raise the voices of the world community against subverting the embargo against Rhodesia. I ask support of the bill and the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. Chairman, our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), in his zeal would like to enlarge section 2 which, as it stands, would cover bulk steel products shipments into the United States and require a certificate of origin. He would like to include everything, which would make chrome, of course, unenforceable.

The gentleman also in his same amendment wants to take out the provision that would provide administrative flexibility, which would allow a shipment of bulk steel to be released to the person who had bought it with the posting of a

bond, as provided for in section (C) on page 3.

I the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) is agreed to, it will destroy the administrative flexibility, and I guess he would like that. I do not want to impugn wrong motives to him. I know that the motives of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) are as pure as the driven snow. However, I believe that it is true that he does not want the bill to pass, and I think he wants to make section 2 unenforceable and unworkable.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the gentleman's amendment is voted down.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with the gentleman in his statement that the amendment reduces administrative flexibility, but the gentleman from Minnesota said that it makes the rest of the bill unenforceable.

How can one enforce an embargo with a certificate of origin on a bulk steel product any better than one can do it on a manufactured steel product?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman heard me relate the experience of the European Community with certificates of origin. They say their companies try to avoid the position of signing false certificates, because they have their business reputations and their reputations with their customers to protect.

They say they have used this and find it effective. We have also used it, as the gentleman knows, in applying our restraints on trade with Cuba and China.

In addition, let me point out that this bill was drafted with the technical assistance of the members and staff of the Department of the Treasury, and they used their technical knowledge and they helped draft it. That is why I would be reluctant to see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) adopted.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, he is not answering the question.

The question is: Given a certificate of origin, why is the certificate of origin any better against a big sheet of rolled steel than it is against an automobile with Rhodesian chrome in the bumper?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, the answer to the question is that once this gets to the consumer level, there are thousands and thousands of products, and the amount of paperwork that would be involved would be enormous.

However, in the case of bulk steel shipments we are dealing with a relatively small number of countries that have significant shipments. In that case we are dealing with large shipments, not a lot of small shipments, and it would be easier to get it enforced.

I know the gentleman is skeptical about this, but it is already in the statute with respect to Cuba and China.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, on that line of thought also, the gentleman said, according to my best recollection, that the section as it is is what the Treasury let us believe they could enforce.

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And they had reservations about their capability to enforce a section that would go as far as does the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT).

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will find it possible to vote down the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRASER) there were—ayes 42, noes 31.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 237, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 548]

AYES—160

Abdnor	Guyer	Myers, Pa.
Archer	Hagedorn	Nichols
Ashbrook	Haley	O'Brien
Bafalis	Hammer-	Passman
Bauman	schmidt	Pettis
Beard, Tenn.	Hanley	Poage
Bevill	Hansen	Quillen
Bowen	Harsha	Randall
Breaux	Heinz	Regula
Brinkley	Henderson	Roberts
Brown, Mich.	Hightower	Robinson
Burgener	Hillis	Rogers
Burke, Fla.	Hinshaw	Rooney
Burleson, Tex.	Holland	Roush
Butler	Holt	Runnels
Byron	Hubbard	Russo
Carter	Hutchinson	Santini
Casey	Hyde	Satterfield
Cederberg	Ichord	Schneebeli
Chappell	Jarman	Schulze
Clancy	Johnson, Colo.	Sebelius
Clawson, Del.	Johnson, Pa.	Shriver
Cleveland	Jones, N.C.	Shuster
Cochran	Jones, Okla.	Sikes
Collins, Tex.	Jones, Tenn.	Skubitz
Coughlin	Karth	Slack
Crane	Kazen	Smith, Nebr.
Daniel, Dan	Kelly	Snyder
Daniel, R. W.	Kemp	Spence
Daniels, N.J.	Ketchum	Staggers
de la Garza	Kindness	Steed
Delaney	Lagomarsino	Steelman
Dent	Landrum	Stephens
Derwinski	Latta	Stratton
Devine	Lent	Stuckey
Downing, Va.	Lloyd, Calif.	Sullivan
Duncan, Oreg.	Lloyd, Tenn.	Symms
Duncan, Tenn.	Long, Md.	Taylor, Mo.
English	Lott	Teague
Evans, Ind.	Lujan	Thone
Evins, Tenn.	McClory	Thornton
Flood	McCollister	Treen
Florio	McDonald	Vigorito
Flowers	Mahon	Waggonner
Flynt	Milford	Wampler
Fountain	Miller, Ohio	Whitehurst
Frey	Mills	Wiggins
Fuqua	Mollohan	Winn
Gaydos	Montgomery	Wyder
Ginn	Moorhead,	Yatron
Goldwater	Calif.	Young, Alaska
Gonzalez	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Fla.
Goodling	Murtha	Young, Tex.
Grassley	Myers, Ind.	Zeferetti

NOES—237

Abzug	Andrews, N.C.	Badillo
Adams	Andrews,	Baldus
Addabbo	N. Dak.	Baucus
Ambro	Armstrong	Beard, R.I.
Anderson,	Ashley	Bedell
Calif.	Aspin	Bell
Anderson, Ill.	AuCoin	Bennett

Bergland	Hechler, W. Va.	Patterson,
Biaggi	Hefner	Calif.
Biester	Heilstoski	Pattison, N.Y.
Bingham	Hicks	Pepper
Blanchard	Holtzman	Perkins
Blouin	Horton	Peyser
Boggs	Howard	Pickle
Boland	Howe	Pike
Bolling	Hughes	Pressler
Bonker	Hungate	Preyer
Brademas	Jacobs	Price
Breckinridge	Jeffords	Pritchard
Brodhead	Jenrette	Quie
Brown, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Railisback
Broyhill	Jones, Ala.	Rangel
Buchanan	Jordan	Rees
Burke, Calif.	Kasten	Reuss
Burke, Mass.	Kastenmeier	Rhodes
Burlison, Mo.	Keys	Richmond
Burton, John	Koch	Rinaldo
Carney	Krebs	Roe
Carr	Krueger	Roncalio
Chisholm	LaFalce	Rosenthal
Clay	Leggett	Rostenkowski
Cohen	Lehman	Roybal
Collins, Ill.	Levitas	Ruppe
Conable	Long, La.	Ryan
Conte	McCloskey	St Germain
Corman	McCormack	Sarasin
Cornell	McDade	Sarbanes
Cotter	McEwen	Scheuer
D'Amours	McFall	Schroeder
Danielson	McHugh	Seiberling
Davis	McKay	Sharp
Dellums	McKinney	Shipley
Derrick	Madden	Simon
Diggs	Madigan	Smith, Iowa
Dingell	Maguire	Solarz
Dodd	Mann	Spellman
Downey, N.Y.	Martin	Stanton,
Drinan	Matsunaga	J. William
du Pont	Mazzoli	Stanton,
Early	Meeds	James V.
Eckhardt	Melcher	Stark
Edgar	Meyner	Steiger, Ariz.
Edwards, Calif.	Michel	Steiger, Wis.
Ellberg	Mikva	Stokes
Emery	Miller, Calif.	Studs
Esch	Mineta	Symington
Evans, Colo.	Minish	Taylor, N.C.
Fascell	Mink	Thompson
Findley	Mitchell, Md.	Traxler
Fish	Mitchell, N.Y.	Tsongas
Fisher	Moakley	Ullman
Fithian	Moffett	Van Deerlin
Foley	Moore	Vander Jagt
Ford, Mich.	Moorhead, Pa.	Vander Veen
Ford, Tenn.	Morgan	Vanik
Fraser	Mosher	Walsh
Frenzel	Mottl	Waxman
Giaimo	Murphy, Ill.	Weaver
Gilman	Natcher	Whalen
Gradison	Neal	White
Green	Nedzi	Whitten
Gude	Nix	Wilson, C. H.
Hall	Nolan	Wilson, Tex.
Hamilton	Nowak	Wirth
Hannaford	Oberstar	Wolf
Harkin	Obey	Wright
Harrington	O'Hara	Wylie
Harris	O'Neill	Yates
Hastings	Ottinger	Young, Ga.
Hawkins	Patman, Tex.	Zablocki
Hayes, Ind.	Patten, N.J.	

NOT VOTING—36

Alexander	Erienborn	Mezvinsky
Annunzio	Eshleman	Moss
Barrett	Fary	Riegle
Brooks	Fenwick	Risenhoover
Broomfield	Forsythe	Rodino
Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	Rose
Burton, Phillip	Hays, Ohio	Rousselot
Clausen,	Hébert	Sisk
Don H.	Heckler, Mass.	Talcott
Conlan	Litton	Udall
Conyers	Macdonald	Wilson, Bob
Dickinson	Mathis	
Edwards, Ala.	Metcalfe	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Annunzio for, with Mr. Riegle against.
Mr. Risenhoover for, with Mr. Metcalfe against.

Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Phillip Burton against.

Mr. Rose for, with Mr. Rodino against.
Mr. Fary for, with Mr. Barrett against.
Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Conyers against.
Mr. Mathis for, with Mr. Moss against.

Messrs. ANDREWS of North Carolina, PATMAN, STEIGER of Wisconsin, FASCELL, KASTEN, SARASIN, TAYLOR of North Carolina, PICKLE, HEFNER, and CHARLES H. WILSON of California changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to the point where we are going to vote on the committee amendment. I think the Members should be aware of exactly what the procedural situation is, because it is kind of complicated. When the original bill came before the committee it was a straight repealer of the Byrd amendment, just as was the one we have voted on here 2 or 3 years ago; but in committee by a vote of 13 to 10 we added section 2. Section 2 is the one that requires a certificate of origin for any steel product being imported into the United States. That section requires every country that is exporting to the United States to sign a piece of paper, presumably under oath, that says, "We promise none of the chromium in this steel came from Rhodesia."

Now, that is what the section does. I think it is a mistake. I have argued against it earlier. It is putting the United States into the domestic affairs of other countries. It is trying to play policeman to the World. I think it is setting back our foreign policy a great step.

I also think it is unenforceable, because there is no test by which we can tell whether the steel coming in has been made with Rhodesian chrome or not. There is absolutely no way to enforce it, other than to take this piece of paper, which may or may not be fraudulently signed, and we have no way of determining it. So when the vote comes, the vote is on the committee amendment. If anyone is against certificates of origin, he should vote no. If he is for certificates of origin, he should vote yes.

I would urge that we all vote no.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would support this bill with or without the committee amendment, but let me explain why the committee recommends it to the committee here on the floor.

First of all, this section 2 was drafted with the assistance of the Treasury Department experts.

No. 2, it is a similar procedure in that we already have a similar procedure on the books dealing with trade restrictions.

Finally, the Treasury Department is familiar with how it works and has worked.

No. 3, it offers some protection to the domestic steel mills, that they will not be faced with companies that may cheat by bringing in Rhodesian chrome. The steelworkers are very much for this amendment. We worked it out very carefully. The committee supports it. We think it offers a degree of protection. So I would urge support for the committee amendment.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to my colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. FRENZEL. Does the gentleman have any idea how we are going to know, in a piece of steel, whether it is made with Rhodesian chrome?

Mr. FRASER. My information came from discussing this with an officer of the European Economic Community, the EEC. They use certificates of origin in their transactions, and they say that the practice works fairly well because companies do not like to make false statements because of their reputations and their business relationships. So, even though they have the same thing, the companies are still competitors and they watch each other so that, in fact, because most people observe the law carefully, in practice it has worked very well.

Mr. FRENZEL. Those same companies who accept these certificates of origin, are they the ones who are honoring the embargo of Rhodesia?

Mr. FRASER. Well, in some cases the companies may not. They would have to go backward to find out where it came from. This would invite them to do so.

Mr. FRENZEL. If the gentleman will yield further, I thank him for the information. I think it is a bad arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FRASER) there were—ayes 108; noes 119.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman if he was on his feet.

Mr. FRASER. At what point, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the division was announced. Before the division was announced, was the gentleman on his feet?

Mr. FRASER. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Apparently the gentleman was not.

Mr. FRASER. I do not remember, but I am told that I was not.

The CHAIRMAN. In that event, the gentleman's request comes too late.

So the committee amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon I addressed the House on this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I explained this bill, as best it could be explained, but the attendance was at a rather low ebb, and I thought it would be useful for the country and for the Members if I repeated a few of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, first, may I compliment the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). He is a very honest man, as he just demonstrated. It is unfortunate, however, that his honesty does not follow over to logic in consideration of this measure.

Let me just sum up the issue before us. There has been a lot of exaggeration this afternoon, unnecessary exaggeration. This is a very, very simple issue.

Now that we have eliminated the committee amendments, we are at the point where we separate the men from the boys. The issue, basically, is this: If the repeal of the Byrd amendment is passed, we then put the United States at the mercy of the Soviet Union for chrome ore. That is an economic issue, and that is the only issue before us at the present time.

When we do so, we do not do this ignoring the civil rights of anyone in Rhodesia or any other country in Africa. We might ask ourselves if perhaps there are civil rights in the Soviet Union that are continually being trampled on. Our dear friend, Mr. Solzhenitsyn, who has been embraced by many Members of Congress, would wonder why we are giving the masters of the Kremlin a hold on the American economy.

Furthermore, the charge that the black African nations are going to vote against us in the U.N. and develop anti-U.S. economic policies unless we repeal the Byrd amendment is sheer nonsense.

The fact of life is that the nations of black Africa welcome the U.S. economic relations because of the value of our dollar.

Do we in any way lose our strength and our effectiveness in dealing with the diplomats of black Africa? They know what our economic strength is. They know we have been honest. They know the Japanese and the Western Europeans and the Eastern Europeans violate the embargo, hypocritically. They know that. And this is no excuse for the votes they may cast against us at the U.N. If they are going to cast a vote against us, they will find another reason for it.

If I might remind the Members, the issue before us is not just black or white, the people of Rhodesia, the black majority, will control the country. The issue is a vital product that we no longer mine in the United States, that we have not produced for 14 years. We must not place ourselves at the mercy of the Soviet Union for that vital commodity. That is the only issue before us, and I urge the defeat of this resolution.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is it not also true that if we pass this resolution the effect of it is to deny the American people of the right to engage in commerce?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, that is the practical effect, yes.

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), and I wish to associate myself with his comments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will try not to take my full 5 minutes, but I do think, since there are so many more Members here at this time than have been here pre-

viously, I should say something about this bill.

In the first place, I think this bill is invalid as a bill, for the simple reason that the United Nations Charter never authorized any representative of the United States to vote for a sanction in an internal matter, and that is what this sanction is.

This is an internal matter; it is not an international war. There is no war involved. There is nothing but a colony involved; there is no war between the colony and the mother country. So it is an invalid thing from the very beginning.

More importantly, in the few moments I have left at my disposal, I would like to discuss briefly two points: First of all, we need chrome; it is absolutely essential to our national defense.

There are not 3 years of adequate tonnages of chrome in our stockpile, as there should be. There are standards that are being looked at today to see how much more chrome we should add to the stockpile.

We asked the Department of Defense what they felt about this bill, and so did the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER). The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) received a letter on July 17, 1975, from the Department of Defense. Let us listen to what they say. Here is what the Department of Defense said:

* * * the Deputy Secretary of Defense has recommended to the National Security Council that the assumptions and policies controlling the levels of strategic and critical materials to be held in the National Stockpile be reexamined and has further recommended that action be taken to defer the disposal of any stockpile materials since this reexamination may lead to recomputation of stockpile objectives.

I hope this will assist you in your review of chrome ore matters.

Then I have a letter from President Ford dated August 28, 1975. This letter was written to me, and it says as follows:

* * * The Executive Branch has undertaken a thorough review of stockpile policies, including each of the planning assumptions.

Mr. Chairman, assumptions have everything to do with what we need to do in keeping a stockpile. There is no valid reason for thinking we have an adequate stockpile today for 1 year or 2 years or 3 years. There is none whatsoever. The whole matter is under consideration.

That is the reason why I asked the Committee on Rules to postpone a rule on this bill until January, when we can expect to have these reports. General Bray, who is the man in charge of this matter, told me that the conditions and requirements as to chrome could actually be increased. We may have a deficiency of chrome in the national stockpile.

So I plead with the Members not to pass this bill because this is improper from the standpoint of law and it is dangerous to the national defense of this country.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has pointed out that this bill will

have an adverse effect upon our national security interests. I would like to have the chairman of the subcommittee advise the House as to what the testimony of witnesses before the subcommittee was as to how much this would cost the United States economically.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, it runs into billions of dollars, and it means a great deal of unemployment. It means billions of dollars of cash to the Treasury and billions to the general economy.

It is my responsibility to try to defend and help the Members defend our Nation in the interests of national defense. We have been told that they feel insecure about this matter, and I have asked the President to have this reexamined. The President advised me within the week that it is being reexamined.

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

Mr. Chairman, along with the President of the United States, who cares about our national security, and along with the Secretary of State, Secretary Kissinger, who is chairman of the National Security Council, I rise to urge the Members to vote for this bill to repeal the Byrd amendment.

One of the primary reasons I do so is because I believe this is the way to serve our national security interests, and I believe this is the way to serve our long-term economic interests as well.

The fact is, if we want to look beyond the end of our noses, we must recognize that the 5-percent minority regime which now controls Rhodesia is a doomed government.

If we would protect our long-term access to two-thirds of the world's chrome that exists in that country and if we would protect our long-term national security and economic interests, I say it is time, while there is yet time, to put ourselves down on the side of the people of Rhodesia, the people who will soon inherit that country's government.

How much do we need Rhodesian chrome? Through this year of 1975, only 8 percent of our metallurgical grade chrome and only 23.7 percent of our high-carbon ferrochrome came from Rhodesia.

We do have a stockpile, and we may have to get by with that now, as the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, because it is quite likely that this landlocked country in the near term will be blocked off from the export of any chrome. However, in the long run we must have access to these rich reserves if we would protect our national security interests. I join the President and the Secretary of State in urging that we vote for this bill.

I might add that in this Bicentennial year, we ought to put our country firmly down on the side of human rights and human self-determination.

In that connection, at this moment there is a man in Rhodesia named Bishop Muzorewa, who is a leader of the black forces. He is a moderate. He seeks to protect the rights of the white minority as well as those of the black majority. There is still some chance that we can

end with him in charge of the country instead of having a radical, leftist, anti-American government in control of two-thirds of the world's supply of chrome, if we act now to strengthen his hand.

As a final point, if we want, in this bicentennial year, to do what we believe is right for our country, I would join the President and Secretary of State and say that this is the way to take a stand for human rights and for self-determination and to put our country firmly down on the side of right in this matter.

As to what other countries are doing or may do, I would simply ask the House:

"If gold doth rust, then what will iron do?"

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there are any further amendments.

I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to read, of course, what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) has said. Not being a preacher, I do not have that oratorical skill.

I believe that we have cleaned this bill up. We struck out the bad part of the bill that required the certificates of origin.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that the House pass the bill in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. Roush, 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. 1287) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome, pursuant to House Resolution 722, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

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.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY
MR. DERWINSKI

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1287 to the Committee on International Relations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 209, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 549]

YEAS—187

Abzug	Ford, Mich.	Nolan	Fuqua	Lent	Russo
Adams	Ford, Tenn.	Nowak	Gilman	Levitas	Santini
Addabbo	Fraser	Oberstar	Ginn	Lloyd, Tenn.	Sarasin
Ambro	Frenzel	Obey	Goldwater	Long, Md.	Satterfield
Anderson, Calif.	Gaydos	O'Hara	Gonzalez	Lott	Schneebeli
Anderson, Ill.	Giaimo	O'Neill	Goodling	Lujan	Schulze
Ashley	Green	Ottinger	Gradison	McClory	Sebelius
Aspin	Gude	Patman, Tex.	Grassley	McCollister	Shriver
AuCoin	Hall	Patten, N.J.	Guyer	McDonald	Shuster
Badillo	Hamilton	Patterson,	Hagedorn	McEwen	Sikes
Baldus	Hannaford	Calif.	Haley	Mahon	Skubitz
Baucus	Harkin	Pattison, N.Y.	Hammer-	Mann	Slack
Beard, R.I.	Harrington	Pepper	schmidt	Martin	Smith, Nebr.
Bedell	Hawkins	Perkins	Hechler, W. Va.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Steiger, Ariz.
Bergland	Hayes, Ind.	Peyser	Hefner	Mollohan	Steiger, Wis.
Biester	Helstoski	Pike	Heinz	Montgomery	Stephens
Bingham	Holtzman	Price	Henderson	Moore	Stratton
Blanchard	Horton	Railsback	Hicks	Moorhead,	Stuckey
Blouin	Howard	Rangel	Hightower	Calif.	Sullivan
Boggs	Howe	Rees	Hillis	Murtha	Symms
Boland	Hughes	Reuss	Hinshaw	Myers, Ind.	Taylor, Mo.
Bolling	Hungate	Richmond	Holland	Myers, Pa.	Taylor, N.C.
Bonker	Jeffords	Rinaldo	Holt	Natcher	Teague
Brademas	Jenrette	Roe	Hubbard	Neal	Thone
Breckinridge	Johnson, Calif.	Roncalio	Hutchinson	Nichols	Thornton
Brodhead	Jordan	Rosenthal	Hyde	O'Brien	Treen
Brown, Calif.	Kastenmeier	Royal	Ichor	Passman	Vander Jagt
Collins, Ill.	Keys	Ryan	Jacobs	Pettis	Vigorito
Conable	McCormack	St. Germain	Jarman	Pickle	Waggonner
Conte	McDade	Sarbanes	Johnson, Colo.	Poage	Walsh
Corman	McFall	Scheuer	Johnson, Pa.	Pressler	Wampler
Cornell	McHugh	Schroeder	Jones, Ala.	Preyer	White
Cotter	McKay	Seiberling	Jones, N.C.	Pritchard	Whitehurst
D'Amours	Madden	Sharp	Jones, Okla.	Quie	Whitten
Danielson	Maguire	Shipley	Jones, Tenn.	Quillen	Wiggins
Dellioms	Matsunaga	Simon	Karth	Randall	Winn
Diggs	Meeds	Stark	Kasten	Regula	Wright
Dingell	Meicher	Studds	Kazan	Rhodes	Wydler
Dodd	Meyner	Symington	Kelly	Roberts	Wylie
Downey, N.Y.	Mikva	Thompson	Kemp	Robinson	Yatron
Drinan	Miller, Calif.	Traxler	Ketchum	Rogers	Young, Alaska
Duncan, Oreg.	Mineta	Tsongas	Kindness	Rooney	Young, Fla.
du Pont	Minish	Ulman	Krueger	Rostenkowski	Young, Tex.
Early	Mink	Van Deerlin	Lagomarsino	Roush	Zablocki
Eckhardt	Mitchell, Md.	Vander Veen	Landrum	Runnels	Zefaretti
Edgar	Moakley	Vanik	Latta	Ruppe	
Edwards, Calif.	Moffett	Waxman			
Ellberg	Moorhead, Pa.	Weaver			
Emery	Morgan	Whalen			
Evans, Colo.	Moser	Wilson, C. H.			
Fascell	Mottl	Wilson, Tex.			
Findley	Murphy, Ill.	Wirth			
Fisher	Murphy, N.Y.	Wolf			
Fithian	Nedzi	Yates			
Foley	Nix	Young, Ga.			

NAYS—209

Abdnor	Burke, Fla.	Davis	Alexander	Erlenborn	Metcalfe
Andrews, N.C.	Burleson, Tex.	de la Garza	Annunzio	Eshleman	Mezvinsky
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burlison, Mo.	Delaney	Barrett	Fary	Moss
Archer	Butler	Dent	Brooks	Fenwick	Riegle
Armstrong	Byron	Derrick	Broomfield	Forsythe	Risenhoover
Ashbrook	Carney	Derwinski	Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	Rodino
Bafalis	Carter	Devine	Burton, Phillip	Hays, Ohio	Rose
Bauman	Casey	Downing, Va.	Clausen,	Hébert	Rousselot
Beard, Tenn.	Cederberg	Duncan, Tenn.	Don H.	Heckler, Mass.	Sisk
Bell	Chappell	English	Conlan	Litton	Talcott
Bennett	Clancy	Esch	Conyers	Macdonald	Udall
Bevill	Clawson, Del.	Evans, Ind.	Dickinson	Madigan	Wilson, Bob
Biaggi	Cleveland	Evins, Tenn.	Edwards, Ala.	Mathis	
Bowen	Cochran	Fish			
Breaux	Collins, Tex.	Flood			
Brinkley	Coughlin	Florio			
Brown, Mich.	Crane	Flowers			
Broyhill	Daniel, Dan	Flynt			
Burgener	Daniel, R. W.	Fountain			
	Daniels, N.J.	Frey			

NOT VOTING—37

	Alexander	Erlenborn	Metcalfe
	Annunzio	Eshleman	Mezvinsky
	Barrett	Fary	Moss
	Brooks	Fenwick	Riegle
	Broomfield	Forsythe	Risenhoover
	Brown, Ohio	Gibbons	Rodino
	Burton, Phillip	Hays, Ohio	Rose
	Clausen,	Hébert	Rousselot
	Conlan	Heckler, Mass.	Sisk
	Conyers	Litton	Talcott
	Dickinson	Macdonald	Udall
	Edwards, Ala.	Madigan	Wilson, Bob
		Mathis	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Udall for, with Mr. Annunzio against.
Mr. Riegler for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Metcalfe for, with Mr. Risenhoover against.

Mr. Phillip Burton for, with Mr. Fary against.

Mr. Erlenborn for, with Mr. Rose against.
Mr. Brown of Ohio for, with Mr. Conlan against.

Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Rousselot against.

Mr. Conyers for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Mr. Rodino for, with Mr. Madigan against.
Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Broomfield against.
Mr. Barrett for, with Mr. Mathis against.
Mr. Mezvinsky for, with Mr. Alexander against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Litton.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Sisk.

Mrs. Fenwick with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Forsythe with Mr. Don A. Clausen.

Mr. Bob Wilson with Mr. Talcott.

Messrs. McDADE, BOLAND and HELSTOSKI changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FRASER. 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 (H.R. 1287) just considered.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m., on tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

FURTHER LEGISLATION PROGRAM

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce the program for tomorrow, Friday, September 26.

We will consider the following bills:

H.R. 9524, Emergency Petroleum Act, that is, with agreement to the Senate amendments; we are expecting that the Senate will act on this this evening and it will be before us.

Following that we will consider H.R. 6844, the Consumer Product Safety Act.

This will be followed by H.R. 8841, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act amendments.

Mr. Speaker, may I also announce to the Membership that by agreement of the leadership on both sides that it is the intent of the House to rise at 4 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

S. 2203: SEEKING MILITARY AID RESUMPTION MUST BE DEFEATED

(Mr. BIAGGI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, it was exactly 2 months ago today when this body voted 223 to 206 against legislation which would have restored arms aid to Turkey. Our message was clear at that time as it was when the embargo went into effect on February 5—no aid to Turkey until and unless she initiated meaningful negotiations aimed at ending the 14 months of conflict and occupation on Cyprus.

Despite this mandate from the House and despite the absence of initiative by Turkey to start negotiations, the House International Relations Committee has reported to the House floor, S. 2203, leg-

islation seeking a limited resumption of military aid to Turkey. This bill is wrong, it deserves to be soundly defeated and in fact does not deserve to even reach the House floor at all.

Consider the fact that as recently as September 12, talks initiated by Secretary General Waldheim of the United Nations collapsed as a result of Turkey's failure to present a viable plan for determining the boundaries between the Greek and Turkish federal states on Cyprus. Consider the fact that to this day Turkey remains in illegal control of 40 percent of Cyprus as well as 60 percent of her agricultural and industrial production. Consider also the fact that there remain on Cyprus some 200,000 Greek refugees, helpless and homeless victims of Turkey's invasion and occupation.

All these factors clearly point out the fallacy of the House considering legislation to resume arms shipments to Turkey, the same arms used by Turkey to invade and control Cyprus. I would prefer to have the International Relations Committee report out legislation mandating that Turkey and Greece commence with negotiations immediately. I would prefer to see this administration take the lead in bringing the warring factions together for negotiations instead of lamenting over the consequences of cutting off aid to Turkey.

The passage of this bill would be a betrayal to the Greek American Community as well as condonation of violations of law to resume arms to Turkey without working on other alternatives more likely to bring peace to Cyprus would be a profound tragedy. I hope for the support of not only the 223 Members who opposed the earlier bill but of all Members committed to a restoration of peace and justice for the people of Cyprus and well as those who seek integrity in our foreign policy.

CONGRESSMAN HAMMERSCHMIDT ADDRESSES WORLD WAR I VETERANS

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, addressed the 23d Annual National Convention of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. in Kansas City, Mo. The gentleman, in his address, exhibits the perceptiveness that has distinguished his service as a member of my committee.

The text of Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT's address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN PAUL HAMMERSCHMIDT

Thank you, Master of Ceremonies, James King.

Commander Byers, Senior Vice Commander Zaruba, Junior Vice Commander Bennett, President Victoria Wendel, Don Skinder (representing VA Administrator Roudebush), officers and members of the Veterans of World War I (of the United States of America) and the Ladies Auxiliary; your honored guests.

I bring you the warmest greetings from our distinguished Committee Chairman, Ray Roberts, certainly a great friend of World War I veterans, as you all know and recognize; and from all the members of the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

Since leaving Washington for the Congressional recess on August 2nd, a busy four weeks has passed.

At the invitation of the Secretary of Defense, I joined with a few other Congressmen in travelling to the Mid-East, to meet with Israeli Prime Minister Rabin, Defense Minister Peres, the Minister of Commerce, and other officials in that very troubled part of the world.

I left that tour in Cairo, Egypt, to return to Washington in time to accompany President Ford to Fort Smith, Arkansas, to dedicate a new hospital there. While in Arkansas, the President also visited Fort Chaffee, one of the four processing centers for Vietnamese refugees.

The following few days were filled with Aviation Subcommittee hearings on airport noise abatement.

My schedule called for attendance at this year's DAV National Convention, at which an Arkansas man, Buddy Spivey of Fort Smith, was named the Outstanding Disabled American Veteran of the Year. Buddy truly has overcome tremendous disabling handicaps and serves us by his outstanding example of courage in adversity. Regrettably, responsibilities in my home district prevented me from attending.

Having scheduled three weeks of travel throughout the 21 counties of my Congressional District, I visited with folks, met with groups, and participated in several community Bicentennial celebrations.

If, by some miracle, in this bicentennial year, it were possible for me to address the veterans of the American Revolution, I would of course, feel greatly honored.

Yet, I could not be more honored than by this opportunity to address you, the Veterans of World War One, here this evening.

The men of the Revolution fought for America's freedom from tyranny.

You fought to preserve that freedom, and to extend it to others. You did it well; so well that you more than repaid those who came out of Europe to help General Washington and his men give life to the noble words of the Declaration of Independence.

With the men of that generation, and with those who have followed, you have one great common denominator:

Dedication to the liberty and dignity which God intended for the human-beings whom he created.

Like the men of the American revolutionary generation, and like those who have followed, you were the product of your times.

And in your own time, you, too, were the flower of America's youth.

In that milieu:

You danced to Irving Berlin.

You marched to John Philip Sousa.

You got a kick out of "K-K-K-Katy."

You had fun with "The Mademoiselle from Armentieres."

You sailed to the rousing strains of "Over There."

You found sadness in "The Rose of No-Man's Land."

And the throat still tightens a bit at the haunting sound of "My Buddy."

You thrilled at being part of the announcement, "Lafayette, We Are Here."

You found pride in helping fortify the vow, "They Shall Not Pass!"

You did your job of winning "The War To End All Wars," and "To Make the World Safe for Democracy."

But, the politicians, and the diplomats, failed.

So, less than a quarter-century later, your

sons sailed off to an even more engulfing holocaust. Some of you sailed with them.

And this was soon repeated, in Korea, and most recently, in Vietnam. There, your grandsons also served.

It has been thus because, from the ugly bloom of that first world conflict, fell the noxious seeds of further, deeper conflict.

The men in Peking call it "The Protracted Conflict."

The men in Moscow call it "The Perpetual Revolution."

But their goals are the same.

And, for that reason, as you know, America must never let down her guard. America must forever be sure that she has a defense posture second to none.

This, America owes to the men of the American Revolution.

This, America owes to you, and to all those who, since, have served this nation and its cause of freedom.

This, in final analysis, America owes to herself. For the option could be enslavement, if not annihilation.

I know, of course, that you are very much aware of these things. I recognize certainly, that you, the Veterans of World War One, will take a back seat to no one in standing firm on the need for this adequacy of modern defense.

I know, too, that you feel just as strongly about the companion need to maintain our great American tradition of properly remembering, and honoring, those who already have served that noble and necessary cause.

So, as you begin putting together your program for the next year, it may be helpful for me to offer a brief report on the key veterans' issues of the moment as seen from my vantage point.

Obviously, the most important veterans measure which, each year, the Congress must consider, is the annual appropriation for the Veterans Administration.

From this appropriation must come the monies needed to underwrite the various benefits authorized, initially, by our Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This annual measure falls under the direct jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee. But our Committee frequently has the opportunity to present information which leads to VA appropriations more responsive to the VA need than might otherwise be obtained.

For example:

It should be quite obvious that, in recent years, our veterans' population has increased substantially. Yet, as the old expression has it: "There is always someone who didn't get the word."

In the case of the planning for the most recent VA budget, this "someone" proved to be the Office of Management and Budget.

OMB produced a budget which not only failed to recognize the resultant increase in the VA workload, but which actually proposed a reduction of personnel needed to properly administer the veterans benefit program.

Discovering this oversight, our Committee quickly developed detailed information which clearly demonstrated VA workload increases in such critical areas as:

Claims for compensation and pension, educational benefits applications, correspondence, telephone calls, etc.

Presented with these facts, the Appropriations Committee promptly increased the VA budgetary request to add the 1,000 staff positions needed to keep pace with the increased workload, and to process it in timely fashion.

The Senate Committee has now approved an appropriation of more than \$17.8 billion for VA's operation in the current fiscal year (FY '76).

This represents an increase of 155 percent. In dollar terms, that is \$10 billion over the past 10 years in the VA budget.

During this same 10 year period, average VA employment has increased by 48,000 positions. Significantly, more than 44,000 of these positions are in VA hospitals.

Among other things, this record VA budget will do the following: It will provide compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation payments in the amount of \$4.6 billion to 2.6 million veterans and their survivors.

It will authorize pension payments in the amount of \$2.7 billion to 212 million veterans and survivors in financial need.

It will provide inpatient hospital, nursing home, and domiciliary care for more than 1.2 million veterans.

It will accommodate veteran outpatient visits which will approach 15 million, with an additional 1.5 million eligible dependents and survivors receiving treatment paid for by the Veterans Administration.

As for some of the major legislation with which our Veterans' Affairs Committee is more directly involved, none is more important to you than legislation concerning VA hospital and medical care.

All of our veterans, of course, have the right to expect a continuation of the quality medical care which, at Congressional insistence, has for years, been the hallmark of VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery.

Yet, this hard-earned reputation for excellence will be jeopardized, seriously, if urgently-needed pay increases for VA physicians are not quickly forthcoming.

VA's Chief Medical Director has advised our Committee of increasing difficulty in recruiting and retaining physicians who meet VA's high standards.

This difficulty stems from two basic conditions:

For about five years, the federal government's top salary level has been frozen at \$36,000. During that same period, the cost-of-living has risen about 46 percent.

Meanwhile, discontinuance of the military's doctor draft made it necessary to authorize physician bonuses of up to \$13,500 in order to recruit doctors for our Armed Services.

Consequently, about two-thirds of our federal physicians (the military and the Public Health Service) now receive salaries substantially greater than their VA colleagues.

I can, of course, sympathize with the income plight of our VA physicians. But my principal concern is that you, the veteran, do not suffer a deterioration in the medical care to which you are entitled, and which you must continue to receive.

To remedy this problem, the House, just before the August recess, passed a bill which I was pleased to co-author: A bill to give VA physicians up to \$13,500 in additional annual pay, thereby making their salaries more nearly comparable with those of their federal colleagues.

The measure will provide this additional income through a carefully-considered combination of bonus and incentive pay for such things as a full-time status, length of service, and special educational achievements.

A similar measure was passed by the Senate on August 1st, the last day before the recess. It is now urgent that we resolve the differences in the two versions and send it to the President.

Meanwhile, our Hospitals Subcommittee is involved in several related actions of interest to you: hearings to ascertain the adequacy of funding and staffing of VA hospitals; consideration of legislation to increase the number of VA's nursing-care beds; and consideration of measures to authorize the federal government to pay a greater share of the cost of hospital, domiciliary, or nursing care in state veterans' homes.

Understandably enough, no veterans' issue produces more Congressional mail than that of non-service-connected pension. Nor is any

issue more important to the older, totally-disabled veteran; for, in many cases, it represents his sole means of support.

Last January, the Congress increased pension rates by 12 percent; and the annual income limits by \$400. Since then, the Consumer Price Index has jumped another four percent.

On July 1st, Social Security payments were increased by eight percent. This, however, will not affect VA pensions until 1976. It is important however, that pensioners know, as soon as possible, what is to be done to offset the adverse effect of that Social Security increase.

And I can assure you that something will be done—and very soon—on this important matter. For, by 1976, just four months from now, the cost-of-living is expected to rise to eight percent.

Consequently, I have co-authored a bill which would do the following: authorize an eight percent across-the-board increase in monthly pension benefits, and a \$300 increase in the annual income limitation determining the amount of pension a veteran or widow may receive.

That \$300 increase in income limits would prevent a veteran's being removed from the pension rolls solely because of that recent increase in Social Security benefits.

Our Chairman has assured me that hearings on this matter will be scheduled, soon, by the Subcommittee on Compensation, Pension and Insurance.

In addition to the basic pension increase measure, I have introduced two bills to provide more generous pension benefits for older veterans, and for our more seriously disabled veterans.

One would authorize the so-called "house-bound" pension rate of \$49 monthly, in addition to the basic pension, to be paid to any veteran who has achieved the age of 75.

My second bill would permit veterans seriously disabled and receiving the aid and attendance pension rate, to continue to do so in the event of the death of their wives. This would be permitted so long as such veterans' income from other sources did not exceed a married veteran's income limitation.

Under existing law, such a seriously disabled pensioner may lose his pension upon the death of his spouse because his income exceeds the maximum income limit allowed for an unmarried veteran.

Of special interest to veterans with service-connected disabilities, and to the widows of those who died in the service, or of service-related disabilities, is the recently-enacted legislation which authorized increases in compensation and dependence and indemnity compensation.

Specifically, this measure increased monthly compensation payments by 10 percent for those with disabilities rated at 50 percent or less, and by 12 percent for the more serious disabilities. A 12 percent increase also was authorized in dependency and indemnity compensation payments for widows and children.

Another subject of considerable interest, of course, is the future of our national cemetery system. It is no secret that, at present, our national cemeteries are poorly distributed across the nation.

Nor is it a secret that they are rapidly becoming filled to the point of official closure.

Our recently-created Subcommittee on Cemeteries and Burial Benefits is attempting to respond to this problem by developing a regional cemetery system; a system which would provide at least one new national cemetery for each of the nation's 10 federal regions.

At this time, it appears that the first of these will be located at March Air Force Base, near Los Angeles, California.

Although our Veterans Affairs Committee never had jurisdiction over establishing dates for national holidays, I know that you join

me in rejoicing that the Senate has passed and the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has reported favorably, bills to put Armistice Day back where it belongs—to November 11th.

So, gentlemen, this ends my report to this distinguished convention on current key matters of legislative concern to you who can find great pride in being classified, with all due respect, as "Old Soldiers."

You will, of course, recall that great new meaning, dignity, and respect was given that term, "old soldiers," back in April, 1951, when the man who commanded your famous Rainbow Division addressed an historic Joint Session of the Congress. As he put it then, the world "had turned over many times" since he had taken his "oath on the plain at West Point."

That man, of course, was General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

As you of the World War One generation are very much aware, the world has, indeed, "turned over many times" in the great span of your own lives.

You are the generation which has seen, and which has contributed so richly to an incredible plethora of rapid, dramatic change. It ranges the full spectrum of human existence and endeavor.

Ever at the heart of that change, that progress, has been the United States of America, in whose uniquely free atmosphere, science, technology, and general human achievement have flowered beyond compare.

Within that atmosphere, you have seen our nation put man on wheels, and on wings, and into space, and on the moon. Surely, it has been a life span of experience unequalled by any other generation in the history of man.

In his 1951 address, General MacArthur, touching upon much of that history, recalled the old barracks ballad which proclaimed:

"Old soldiers never die; they just fade away."

Fortunately for America, we still have with us a great many "old soldiers" who refuse to "fade away."

They are men such as you, our veterans of World War One; some 200 thousand strong, with 51 departments, and more than 35 hundred barracks.

You are blessed with a ladies auxiliary which is dedicated, active, helpful—and certainly lovely.

In our nation's capital, you have an alert, well-informed legislative team, ever-busily at work for you, and for America.

It is, in fact, a straight-from-the-shoulder headquarters outfit which wastes no words in letting us know of your views and your needs.

Your able, widely-respected National Legislative Director, Harold Say, is always at work, ready to counsel us. Also, Quartermaster Adjutant John McIntyre and Mrs. Switzer are invaluable advisers.

And, this past year, Commander Byers has done an outstanding job of presenting your legislative program to our committee, and, in rendering overall, a great, cooperative and constructive performance.

And I thank him.

It is through such excellent, respected representation in Washington that you, the Veterans of World War One, continue to work with the Congress, and help us in our deliberations.

In so-doing, you continue to perform a very positive and useful service to this nation whose uniform, in your heart, you continue to wear.

And, we in the Congress are grateful. For, at no time in our 199 year history as a nation, have we been in greater need of the particular wisdom which can only flow from the deep well of long experience: the wisdom of our elders.

And this, you have, and this you give us, in great and valued measure.

So, thank you so much for refusing to succumb to the lyrics of that old soldiers' ballad.

Thanks for refusing to "fade away. . . ."

You are much too valued—and too much needed. So again, permit me to express my deep appreciation for this great honor of addressing you here in this great convention.

Thank you.

PHENOMENAL RISE IN MEDICAL COSTS

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

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the fact that medical costs, doctor bills, hospital expenses and medication prices have risen phenomenally over the past decade. Annual expenditures for health purposes in the United States were \$104.2 billion in fiscal year 1974 or 7.7 percent of the gross national product. In more manageable terms this means per capita expenditures of \$485 for every man, woman, and child in the country. Since 1950 the national health bill has increased almost ninefold.

To the degree that this means improved medical care, new medical techniques and equipment, the money is well spent. Health care, through scientific and medical advances, has greatly improved, and patients with formerly fatal or totally debilitating illnesses can expect to survive, even recover, with extended hospital and medical care.

But there is the rub. How shall they afford what medical science has now made available? How many families can afford thousands of dollars for extended hospital or outpatient care for those with long-term diseases? People who must rely on kidney machines, or must undergo numerous and protracted transplant operations; those with strokes and the accompanying paralysis which requires intensive physical therapy; those required to take extensive and continued radiation therapy in association with surgery. Who will pay these costs?

No family can deny a member of that family the benefits of such treatment, nor do they want to have to do so, yet many times families do not have the money to buy these wonders of science; or they must mortgage their own and their children's futures to do so. This is a choice no family should have to make.

So I am introducing a bill today to help deal with the costs of these "catastrophic" kinds of illness. The bill I am introducing would reinsure private insurers, provide a Federal backup against loss, thus stimulating the insurance industry to provide coverage that would allow families to protect themselves against the costs of catastrophic illnesses. The legislation would encourage the creation of insurance pools similar to those available for flood insurance, but this time for catastrophic illnesses requiring extended care.

This proposal sets up a deductible formula which would be used to encourage each family to provide basic health-care protection. Only when this level is exceeded would the catastrophic insurance protection plan be utilized. An individual with an adjusted gross income of \$10,000

and an "adjusted income"—after the \$750 personal exemption—of \$9,250, would have an annual deductible of \$7,750 while a family of four with the same income would have a deductible of \$5,500. The deductible would be reduced by the amount of any out-of-pocket payments or any public or private third party payment made on behalf of an insured person.

This bill may not be a total and final solution to our problem. I do believe that it is a constructive beginning and merits careful consideration. I am open to changes and refinements that might be suggested.

The principle involved is a sound one. If American citizens cannot reap the rewards to be garnered from the advancement of medical knowledge and technology, then the funds we are spending for that purpose from the taxpayer's pocketbook had better be allocated elsewhere.

CAB MUST STOP CONCORDE SST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WOLFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the House of a petition I have joined asking the Civil Aeronautics Board, acting as a regulatory body, to deny entry to the British-French Concorde supersonic airliner because of the environmental and safety factors which are, by now, so well known by all.

While Federal law requires foreign air carriers to secure an operating permit from the CAB, all focus in the SST debate to date has been on the noise and environmental problems as being studied by the Federal Aviation Administration.

The FAA in March issued a preliminary environmental impact statement recommending regular commercial service next year at Dulles, controlled by the FAA, and at New York's John F. Kennedy Airport, controlled by representatives of the people of New York and New Jersey.

We learned last week, courtesy of the French Minister of Transport, that the FAA can be expected to follow through on its favorable recommendation on Dulles, despite the fact that its preliminary environmental study has been virtually demolished by the National Academy of Science, the White House's own Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency, and, finally, the FAA regional staff based at Kennedy.

I expect that the FAA will publish its favorable recommendation on Dulles early next week, despite the clear and present danger the aircraft represents to the health and safety of U.S. citizens. Accordingly, I have joined with the Environmental Defense Fund, through its able attorney, Mr. John Hellegers, in hopes that our petition will compel the CAB to do its duty, and, hopefully, provide a measure of protection for the American people which the FAA has historically refused to do.

This petition is just one in a series of actions in Congress, the regulatory agen-

cies, and the courts, which we will undertake, in cooperation with the environmental defense fund and other concerned groups and individuals, to make sure that the interests of the American people are truly served in the matter of this foreign SST.

As our petition states, Federal law and several current Federal court cases make it clear that the CAB will have no discretion in this matter, and that the CAB will have to hold public hearings on Concorde. I am confident that the negative evidence on Concorde's range, fuel capacity, noise levels, and exhaust pollution levels—all of which exceed U.S. legal limits, and which, at best, must require waivers—will compel the CAB to deny entry to Concorde.

Mr. Speaker, evidence from the FAA's own files has surfaced in recent weeks proving that Government experts have expressed grave reservations on Concorde's range and fuel reserve capacities, and warned that special landing and handling procedures will be a necessity if Concorde is to have any hope of landing at U.S. airports.

Today I take the liberty of urging our colleagues to consider why we should allow a foreign aircraft to brush aside American aircraft—filled with American passengers—regardless of the health and safety of Americans?

I urge our colleagues to contact the environmental defense fund, through Mr. Hellegers, at 833-1484, and to join in our petition to the Civil Aeronautics Board. The best interests of the American people have not been served to date by the FAA, and only concerted action by Congress, and such concerned groups as the environmental defense fund, will guarantee that this foreign aircraft is not rammed down our throats.

I now submit for the RECORD articles by Mr. Tom Love, of the Washington Star, and the able Newsday writers, Mr. Martin Schramm and Mr. Edward Hershey, which clearly outline the latest information on Concorde. I also submit two articles from the British press which show that English pilots are becoming increasingly alarmed at the prospect of Concorde actually going into service.

The articles follow:

SST SLIP QUICKLY GROUNDED
(By Edward Hershey and Martin Schramm)

Faster than an SST, word shot across the Atlantic yesterday that the United States had approved Concorde supersonic transport landings at Washington's Dulles Airport.

Minutes later, the French government issued a retraction, of sorts, leaving SST critics feeling that the decision already may have been disclosed.

"Personally, I think he simply let the cat out of the bag," Rep. Lester Wolff (D-Kensington) said after the declaration and retraction by a French government spokesman in Paris. ". . . It's obvious this is a charade they're conducting."

The transatlantic discourse began when French government spokesman Andre Rossi announced in Paris that Transportation Minister Marcel Cavaille had told the French cabinet that the U.S. government had approved two weekly Concorde flights from Paris to Dulles, starting April 10. Cavaille's words carried ample weight because he had recently returned from talks with U.S. Transportation Secretary William T. Coleman and Deputy Transportation Secretary John Bar-

num. The French minister even had dinner at Coleman's Washington area home one evening, according to one source.

The French spokesman's pronouncements were quickly carried to the United States by wire service reports, and minutes later, according to a source in Washington, an official of the U.S. Transportation Department was on the phone to Paris.

Soon after, Rossi was issuing an apparently carefully qualified retraction: "Contrary to what I said earlier . . . the U.S. government has not yet given formal authorization to the landing of Concorde."

In a press conference in Washington, Transportation Secretary Coleman declared flatly that no decision had been reached on whether the controversial supersonic transport jet would be able to land at Dulles Airport.

But the carefully couched words of the French spokesman's retraction seemed to leave open the possibility that Coleman or his deputy, Barnum, had given informal assurances to the French minister during his recent visit to Washington that the Concorde's landing soon would be approved. Barnum firmly denied that. "You're reading too much into a simple mistake by Mr. Rossi," he said. "Mr. Coleman and I did not give any assurances, formal or informal."

Barnum was asked whether the French minister was told anything that would have led him to conclude that such an approval were in the offing. "You are talking to a lawyer," he replied. "That question is poorly asked." He later answered it, however, saying that the French minister was told nothing that would indicate that the approval soon would be forthcoming.

While Coleman and Barnum were staunchly maintaining that no decision—formal or informal—had been made or conveyed to the French, there were others in the Transportation Department who were not convinced. "If he did make any informal assurance, he won't admit it," said one mid-level official. "He says he didn't. But you and I know they must have talked about it. And everyone in our government from Henry Kissinger on down wants it" (the SST).

Coleman and Barnum maintain that the SST decision will not be made until after the government assesses at the end of this month the environmental impact that the landings would have.

Experts say that the joint British and French built Concorde will not be a commercial success unless it is allowed to fly to, and from New York's John F. Kennedy Airport. But approval for flights to and from Kennedy also would have to be granted by the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, and there is sizable local opposition to the SST in the metropolitan New York area. In contrast, flights to and from Washington's Dulles Airport will need only the approval of the federal government—which many, including at least some officials in the Transportation Department, privately expect will be granted.

John Hellegers, attorney for the anti-Concorde Environmental Defense Fund, said yesterday that while Transportation Secretary Coleman might be unaware of it, he believed Cavaille has indeed been given assurances that the FAA will approve Concorde landings.

The EDF has said it will file suit to block FAA approval of Concorde landings on the ground that the plane is too noisy and cannot carry enough fuel to provide for a safe amount of extra flying time on the 3,868-mile Paris-to-Washington route.

In June, Newsday reported that when Richard Nixon was President, he wrote letters personally assuring the French and British heads of state that the U.S. planned to allow the Concorde to land at U.S. airports. Aides to President Ford also had

pressured various federal agencies to hasten approval of the landings in time for the plane's scheduled debut in commercial aviation in January.

WILL FUEL-SHY CONCORDE NEED TO LAND FAST?

(By Thomas Love)

The British-French Concorde supersonic transport cannot carry the fuel reserves required for other jet aircraft and therefore might have to be granted preferential landing treatment to avoid normal holding patterns if allowed to operate in this country, according to a confidential State Department report.

British Airways and Air France have applied for permission to operate two flights a day into Dulles Airport and four a day into John F. Kennedy Airport in New York. Environmental and other citizen groups have opposed the request, charging that the plane violates noise standards, pollutes the atmosphere, poses a danger to the earth's ozone layer and is unsafe.

A spokesman for the Federal Aviation Administration said that the U.S. government does not mandate safety standards for foreign-built aircraft operated by foreign carriers and accepts the manufacturing country's operating specifications under international agreements.

Thus, he said, the agency cannot require a larger fuel reserve than set by France and Britain. Only if the Concorde is operated by American airlines—and none has announced plans to buy any—can the FAA set any standards for the plane, he explained.

The State Department document reported that Charles Cary, FAA assistant administrator for international affairs, "described several problems the Concorde must face" before being certified for use by U.S. airlines.

The document, released to the Environmental Defense Fund in connection with a lawsuit involving Concorde noise levels, reports on a 1972 interagency meeting called to discuss what actions about the Concorde should be taken by the government.

"The French and British have asked FAA for an exception to U.S. standard operating procedures to permit the Concorde to arrive at U.S. airports with less than the normal fuel reserves," the document states.

Rep. Lester Wolff, D-N.Y., a leading opponent of Concorde operations within the United States, charged that the statement proves "backers of the Concorde are willing to risk lives by demanding a waiver of fuel reserve requirements imposed on all other aircraft to ensure life-safety margins in the event of emergency conditions."

Philip Rogers, a spokesman for British Aircraft, producer of the Concorde along with its French counterpart, yesterday insisted that a supersonic plane needs a smaller fuel reserve than subsonic jets because of the plane's higher speed and its unique operating characteristics.

Subsonic planes are required to carry a 7.5 percent fuel reserve for emergencies, he explained, but only 5 percent will be carried by Concordes. "We do not mean to operate unsafe aircraft," he said. The smaller amount in SSTs will be "statistically as safe" as the larger amount in other planes, he said.

The FAA is now preparing an environmental impact statement on the British-French request and expects to make a decision in 30 to 45 days, the spokesman said. The FAA must amend the airlines' operating certificates to include any newly introduced airplane.

Environmental Defense Fund attorney John Hellegers said, "The problem of fuel reserves is one which the FAA studiously avoided in its draft environmental impact study on the Concorde—except for an intriguing admission that the distance between Dulles and Paris exceeds the stated maximum range of the plane."

September 25, 1975

Rogers admitted that the stated maximum range is 3,800 miles while the Dulles-Paris distance is 3,838, but he said the 3,800-mile figure was only "approximate" and the plane could actually fly up to 4,000 miles, depending on conditions.

The State Department document also stated that the Concorde would not be able to meet noise limits required for subsonic planes and stated that night curfews at major airports could "substantially limit potential usefulness of the Concorde."

The document also raises the question of pollution from the plane's engines, danger to the ozone layer and the possible need for a 50 percent surcharge to make the plane profitable.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the White House, FAA, Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Management and Budget, the Council for Environmental Quality and the State Department.

EDF's Hellegers said yesterday the list of those attending the meeting proved the truth of previous charges that the executive branch is applying undue pressure on the FAA to approve the British-French request for diplomatic reasons.

PILOTS FEAR SAFETY CUTS ON CONCORDE (By John Keeble)

Britain's pilots are alarmed at moves to cut safety margins to suit Concorde.

They are particularly worried about planned noise abatement measures at New York's Kennedy Airport.

The procedure involves a climb-out turn at 100 ft. instead of the usual 300 ft.—plus of subsonic jetliners.

"If the aircraft can do it, we can," said Captain Jack Wickson, chairman of the British Airline Pilots Association.

"But we want it proved first. And it must be proved at Kennedy, where we will have to operate."

He added that pilots were also worried that if the procedure was adopted at Kennedy, other airports would demand it too.

Concorde, due in service in January with British Airways and Air France, has been flown in a 100 ft. turn during tests at Casablanca.

But it cannot be tested at Kennedy because of the Americans' refusal to allow it to land.

Pilots are worried, too, about reports that the plane's makers have asked the U.S. authorities to allow a reduction in the fuel reserve.

"We are not going to have any of the safety margins eroded," said Capt. Wickson. "There can be no new legislation written just for Concorde."

[Middlesex Chronicle (Hounslow and Brentford) Aug. 29 1975]

FEARS OVER CONCORDE LANDINGS

Normal safety could have been sacrificed during Concorde approaches to Heathrow in order to secure an accident-free record for the supersonic airliner, believes one Cranford man.

The allegation has been flatly denied by both British Airways and the British Aircraft Corporation whose pilots have been flying the aircraft.

Mr. John Leech of Waye Avenue, Cranford, believes that BAC test pilots may have used non-standard approach techniques which would minimise damage to property under the flight path.

"My fears are that the present damage-free approaches are deceptive and that roof damage and ground incidents will return when Concorde enters normal airline service," he says.

Mr. Leech, an engineer, has been a con-

sistent campaigner against noise and damage caused by aircraft.

VORTICES

Now, he has written to British Airways chairman Sir David Nicolson spelling out his current fears.

Mr. Leech says that in order to fly at the slow speed necessary on approach to the runway Concorde has to adopt a nose high angle. But he believes this angle can cause the vortices—trailing winds from the wing tips and edges—which caused damage to Cranford property during the plane's first landing approach over the area.

Now, he has told Sir David Nicolson Concorde has been observed to be coming in over the area at a much flatter angle. While this could minimise property damage caused by the vortices it would also mean that the plane was approaching at a faster speed than would otherwise be the case.

But a British Airways spokesman said this week that Concorde does normally make a faster landing approach than other aircraft.

A spokesman for BAC emphatically ruled out the possibility of Concorde pilots adopting any dubious flying techniques.

"All approaches made to Heathrow by Concorde are subject to the same strict safety rules that govern all landings and there can be no question of any relaxation or evasion of any safety regulations by Concorde," he said.

An astounding 140 perceived noise decibels were recorded on equipment at the fencing at the end of runway 28 when Concorde took off on Sunday with its 35 "lucky draw" passengers.

The figures, which are unofficial compare with the Department of Trade ceiling of 110 perceived noise decibels allowed.

AMENDMENT TO FIFRA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to the amendment Mr. PEYSER and I intend to offer to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, which is scheduled for floor action at the end of this week. The amendment, to be offered in the form of a substitute, reads as follows:

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 8841 REPORTED BY THE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

On page 1 strike line 3 and all that follows, and insert in lieu thereof the following: That section 27 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 136(y)) is amended by adding at the end of such section the following: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act for the period beginning October 1, 1975, and ending September 30, 1976, the sum of \$33,821,000."

Our reasons for offering such an amendment of simple extension are outlined in our dissenting views which were included in the committee report accompanying H.R. 8841. The report number is 94-497.

I am also including the remarks of the Friends of the Earth, the Sierra Club, and the National Audubon Society concerning the FIFRA bill as reported by the Agriculture Committee, and pesticide misuse in general, for the information of my colleagues:

FRINEDS OF THE EARTH,

Washington, D.C., September 22, 1975.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As you are aware, on September 15, H.R. 8841—the reauthorization of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act of 1972—was voted favorably out of the House Agriculture Committee *With numerous amendments*.

Several strongly worded dissents were expressed by members of the Committee at the nature of the amendments, because they are designed largely to increase the "red tape" in regulation of pesticides and other poisonous agricultural chemicals so much that it will become impossible for the Environmental Protection Agency to administer any successful regulatory programs.

The Friends of the Earth is seriously concerned with the amendments and opposed to them. Those of us who have spent much of our lives in farming find it impossible to believe that the cautious regulatory program of the Environmental Protection Agency involves any serious risk to commercial agriculture—indeed every effort has been made to find substitutes for regulated chemicals by that agency. Nothing has happened since 1972 to suggest that the original law was unwise or that E.P.A. has been unjust.

Friends of the Earth is opposed to the amendments for two basic reasons. Additional reasons are spelled out on the attached pages. *First*, there can no longer be any doubt that some of the pesticides and chemicals used in agriculture, in household use, and in lawn treatment can cause injury such as irreversible liver damage to the user and also cancer. We know this because of numerous animal tests and findings of the more recent bacterial mutation tests as well as field experience with farmers and farmworkers. Natural environment impacts are also important.

It seems a proper role of the Environmental Protection Agency to screen these chemicals for persistence and safety so as to protect those users who may be unaware of the hazard of the chemicals used as well as protect the general population of Americans who have been found by measurements to store and harbor a significant amount of pesticides in their bodies due to pesticide spill, misapplications, and residues on food. For example, it has been well documented that 50 percent of some pesticides applied by air never reach the crop intended, but float downwind to some other location.

Secondly, it is also of concern in a period of high unemployment and inflation that amendments would be introduced to increase the "red tape" and cost of administration of the pesticide program while at the same time stripping it completely of its substance. Programs that are set up to look as if they are effective without in fact being so are inflationary, and this is what the amendments are designed to accomplish.

REAUTHORIZATION WITHOUT AMENDMENT AS THE CUSTOMARY PROCEDURE

We want to direct your attention to the remarks of Congressman Richard L. Ottinger on the bill, remarks that were printed in the Congressional Record of September 18, 1975.

In these remarks, Congressman Ottinger notes that reauthorization is the standard and customary procedure for new Agencies such as the pesticide program of E.P.A. Indeed that program is so new that regulations have not been issued to cover some of the legislation originally adopted.

Friends of the Earth wishes to urge you to vote a straight reauthorization without amendments for the pesticide, fungicide and rodenticide program. The Environmental Protection Agency deserves a chance to complete the establishment of their program.

Sincerely,

ERIK JANSSON,
Conservation Associate.

SIERRA CLUB,
Washington, D.C., July 28, 1975.

Re: FIFRA Reauthorization

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Public Law 92-516, the Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972, is the culmination of six decades of Federal regulatory measures to ensure that pesticides are unadulterated, effective for their intended purpose, and safe when properly used. This law, which substantially amended the 1947 Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), is well on its way to full implementation on the date Congress determined that it should be fully effective—October 1976.

However, well short of the fully operational legislative scheme provided by the authors, there is a serious effort underway to undo the amended FIFRA at a single stroke, or, failing that, on a piecemeal basis. The most serious challenge is being mounted by a coalition of some farm organizations, chemical companies, and professional pest control firms. Apparently believing that an agency which is not structured to deal with determinations about human health or environmental degradation will be more willing to subrogate these concerns—already balanced against social and economic factors by FIFRA—to food production or chemical sales, this lobby is supporting a bill to require the Agriculture Secretary to approve every significant action which Congress has made the legal responsibility of the EPA Administrator. Having ensured by the device of placing two heads on the body of one program that it will be powerless to follow the instructions of either, the proposal mandates an additional year to make the remaining features of the Act effective—requiring EPA to run in place for twelve months.

What are the statutory requirements regulating the sale and use of pesticides that would be so casually but completely discarded by these special interests? How has the EPA administration of the program been detrimental to these interests? Was there no basis for the concern reflected by the action of Congress in enacting the 1972 amendment of FIFRA?

Since 1947 all pesticides shipped in Interstate Commerce have had to be first registered by the Federal Government. Registration was contingent upon a showing that the product would be efficacious when used as directed and that its use could pose no undue harm to nontarget life when label directions and precautions were followed. The old label directions and precautions were followed. The old FIFRA also provided that the Secretary of Agriculture could cancel the registration of a product, rendering it unlawful for sale, for failure to meet the criteria for registration, in the light of current scientific knowledge. In the case of an imminent hazard to the public welfare the Secretary could suspend a registration. Neither authority was evoked to ban a pesticide in the 33 years the Act was administered by U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The administration of the old FIFRA was vested in the Administrator of EPA by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1970, as approved by Congress. The President observed, in transmitting this message:

"Almost every part of government is concerned with the environment in some way, and affects it in some way. Yet each department also has its own primary mission—such as resource development, transportation, health, defense, urban growth, or agriculture—which necessarily affects its view of environmental questions. . . . Because environmental protection cuts across so many jurisdictions, and because arresting environmental deterioration is of great importance to the quality of life in our country and the world, I believe that in this case a strong, independent agency is needed."

In 1971, the EPA initiated cancellation

proceedings under the old FIFRA against DDT, Mirex, Aldrin and Dieldrin. Although in widespread use at that time, these substances still constituted only a small percentage of the one billion pounds of active pesticide ingredients used annually in the United States. Almost all uses of DDT were cancelled in June 1972, based upon findings that it was highly persistent, accumulates in the food chain, poses a risk of cancer in man, and is a severe threat to non-target species. An internal scientific review has found that the evidence upon which this decision was reached has not been refuted by subsequent technical findings. Aldrin and Dieldrin pose similar problems and were recently cancelled for most uses, while Mirex is presently available only for use against the imported fire ant. In addition, Mercury pesticides have been the subject of administrative actions resulting in their virtual disappearance from the market place.

It is apparently for these few actions, many instituted prior to adoption of the 1972 FEPICA, that special interests want to see EPA punished by mischievous legislation. These proceedings have involved years of expert, on the record testimony relating to human health, availability of substitutes and economic factors, before the Administrator took action on behalf of the government to protect against, "unreasonable adverse effects upon man and the environment." The Committee has not, of course, nor would it be expected to, review the extensive and highly technical record of those proceedings. It has not taken direct testimony of its own, in any systematic fashion at least, on these points of scientific controversy. Neither has it availed itself of the legislative branch independent resource for evaluation of highly technical issues—the Office of Technology Assessment.

These suspensions and cancellations have not meant that there are no effective products available for use—indeed there are approximately 1,200 active ingredients contained in nearly 36,000 federally registered products. Not that removal of chemicals from the market is the only means to mitigate adverse environmental effects. Indeed additional safeguards enacted with the 1972 FEPICA, give the Administrator several intermediate steps to ensure that pesticides which might otherwise be banned can remain on the market. If allowed to become fully effective these new features provide a further margin of safety to farmers, other pesticide users, consumers, and additional protections to the environment generally, including the incidentally exposed human population, commercial fisheries and other renewable natural resources and wildlife.

This is done by making the label directions and precautions on pesticide packages legally enforceable. Neglect or willful failure to abide by these safeguards is a violation of law. Further, all registered products will be classified by EPA for "general" use, that it by the public at large with no requirement for special know-how or in the case of more acutely toxic, persistent, or dangerous formulations, "restricted" use. A restricted product may only be used by, or under supervision of an applicator who is certified competent. States would certify the competence of applicators based on some demonstration of knowledge and ability in handling poisons.

In recommending that the 1947 FIFRA be strengthened by these and other provisions the House Agriculture Committee reported as follows in 1972:

"The Committee found that the greatest need for revision of existing laws to be in the area of strengthening regulatory control on the use and users of pesticides, speeding up procedures for barring pesticides found to be undesirable; streamlining procedures for making valuable new control measures, procedures, and materials broadly available; strengthening enforcement procedures to

protect against misuse of these biologically effective materials; and creating an administrative and legal framework under which continued research can produce more knowledge about better ways to use existing pesticides as well as developing alternative materials and methods of pest control . . . old FIFRA is changed from a labelling to a regulatory program."

EPA's pesticide regulatory program explicitly requires a balancing of economic and social considerations with health and environmental risks. This responsibility has not been lightly regarded by the EPA Administrator. The gravity of the risks involved mandate that EPA's role in pesticide regulation be reaffirmed rather than restricted.

Sincerely,

LINDA M. BILLINGS,
Washington Representative.

NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY,
Washington, D.C., July 24, 1975.

PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS TO THE USE OF POISONS FOR PREDATOR CONTROL

1. Poisons are indiscriminate and kill many animals which in no way harm livestock. For example, the M-44 cyanide device, while more selective than baited carcasses, still is capable of killing non-target species. In April, 1975, the emergency program of the Fish and Wildlife Service utilized 4,255 devices to protect 137,271 sheep, cattle and goats. During the month, 206 coyotes were killed; also killed were 44 foxes, 10 "feral" dogs, 7 raccoons, 25 skunks, and 31 opossums.

Baited carcasses or drop baits are far worse, since typically strichnine or compound 1080 is used in the carcasses. Both poisons are extremely cruel, both are slow acting so that the animal may travel a long ways from the bait station before succumbing. Compound 1080 persists in the environment and can cause secondary poisoning, i.e. animal A feeds on a carcass and succumbs; animal B feeds on the carcass of animal A and also succumbs. In addition, because compound 1080 causes the victim to vomit, other animals may pick up the poison in this way. Studies such as the Aztec monograph cited during the Agriculture Committee's hearings have been used by the proponents of poison to argue that the chance of secondary poisoning is remote. However, it should be remembered that trying to distribute the poison in even doses throughout a carcass under field conditions is an entirely different situation than laboratory conditions. (See article, "1080 is a Selective Poison . . .") It is true that some species are more tolerant of 1080 than others, with members of the canine family being the most susceptible, but despite the assertions of the Aztec study, golden eagles as well as other non-target species have been killed by 1080 and the Department of Interior's own autopsies verify this. Since in the past no one bothered to keep very careful records of all the non-target species killed by poisons, existing records are fragmentary—but still demonstrate the power of poison to kill innocent wildlife.

2. All coyotes do not kill sheep, and simply trying to kill as many coyotes as possible—as was done for many years with poisons—does not necessarily solve the problem. Predator control should be aimed at the nuisance animal which is killing livestock, not at any and every coyote. The State of Kansas, for instance, for many years relied on the extension trapper system—with one man taking care of the coyote problem for the whole state. There is a large and flourishing coyote population in Kansas, and there is a large population of livestock. Livestock management tends to be different than on the rangeland of the mountain states, with smaller flocks. Coyote control was carried out by trapping and shooting and proved effective. Within the last year, a limited

number of M-44s were authorized for use in Kansas, but figures are not yet available to determine whether ranchers found them more effective than trapping.

3. Since the segment of the sheep industry which complains loudest about losses to predators raises its sheep on the public lands for bargain basement grazing fees, the public has a right to complain about the destruction of wildlife on the public's own land. The sheep industry is a dying industry and has been declining for many years. Much of the problem relates to the development of synthetics, competition from cheaper and better imported wool, and the inefficiencies of the industry itself. It is easy to see why a rancher would find it convenient to blame his problems on something visible like a coyote, since he is helpless to deal with things like world markets. If sheepmen want to continue grazing their flocks on public lands, they must accept the public's will about wildlife and its destruction.

4. Since the poison ban was enacted, a wide variety of research projects have been undertaken by USDA and the Interior Department. Some of those studies are well advanced and should be published this summer if they are not suppressed. Loss statistics have always been mostly guesswork, and the Economic Research Service of USDA has been trying to get an accurate picture of predator losses, along with answers to other economic questions related to the issue. Some of the key ERS studies are due to be published this summer, and it makes no sense to make a change in policy now before the results of those studies are available.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FARMERS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the IRS' preliminary statistics of income for individuals for the year 1973 is a gold mine of information and provides a strong argument for tax reform. For example, I pointed out recently that the statistics indicate that there are 24 individuals with adjusted gross income of \$1 million or more who in 1973 were able to avoid any Federal income tax.

There is another interesting statistic on page 24 of the IRS publication: In 1973 there were 240 individuals living in the District of Columbia who claimed farm losses—net profit less net loss—of \$2,653,000 or an average loss of \$11,054.16 per D.C. farm income return filed with the IRS.

I am not familiar with any farm areas in the District of Columbia. But perhaps I have been missing something. Are there 240 Washingtonians who rush over after work each day and hoe gardens on Tiber Island? Is someone claiming the National Botanical Garden as a flower farm? Is there someone who mows the Washington Monument grounds and counts it as a haying operation? Are 240 apartment dwellers along upper Connecticut Avenue claiming losses on their window-boxes? Do the quarter million dollar penthouses on the top of the Watergate support truck farm operations?

Actually, Mr. Speaker, it is probable that these 240 individuals are filing tax loss deductions for farm operations on either absentee farming land that they own or they are tax loss farmers—gentlemen farmers who have never even gotten their feet muddy.

The Ways and Means Committee has recently tentatively adopted provisions limiting the amount of artificial losses one can claim for farming operations. I am hopeful that this provision will end the abuse of tax loss farming partnerships.

I believe that the absurdity of 240 Washingtonians losing an average of \$11,054.16 apiece on farms in one tax year will convince even the most skeptical that tax reform is needed.

HEARINGS ANNOUNCED ON NATIONAL WOMEN'S CONFERENCE BILL, H.R. 8903

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. ABZUG) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that on Tuesday, September 30, the Subcommittee on Government Information and Individual Rights, which I chair, will hold hearings on H.R. 8903, a bill to direct the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year 1975, to organize and convene a National Women's Conference no later than December 31, 1976.

Under the provisions of this bill, the Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, created by executive order on January 9, 1975, would be responsible for organizing and convening a national conference to assess the progress made to date by both the private and the public sector in promoting women's rights. This conference will consist of representatives from local, State, regional, and national institutions, agencies, organizations, unions, and associations which work to advance the rights of women; men and women involved in policymaking and decision-making in government, private industry, education, child care and social welfare, the media, and other fields; and members of the general public. The national conference would be preceded by local, State, and regional meetings of a preparatory nature.

The celebration of Internal Women's Year and our Nation's 200th anniversary are, indeed, appropriate occasions on which to focus attention on both the current status of American women and on the means to improve that status.

Witnesses will include several Members of Congress as well as representatives of a number of national organizations, unions, and interested groups of citizens. The hearing will be held in room 2247 beginning at 10 a.m. on September 30. It is open to the public. Those interested in presenting testimony or written statements should contact the subcommittee office.

FATHER YVO TYMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DE LA GARZA), is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, a pioneer missionary Roman Catholic priest in my south Texas district will observe his 96th birthday on the 30th of September. I call the attention of my colleagues

to the life of this man. Father Yvo Tymen, because he provides a shining example of dedicated service to mankind, an inspiration to all who know what he has done.

Father Tymen, now retired and living in the historical rectory of Immaculate Conception Cathedral in Brownsville, Tex., is the last survivor of the "Cavalry of Christ," members of which in the early years of this century rode horses to visit the ranchos and missions in that area. Ordained a priest by the bishop of San Antonio in 1907, he was sent to the community of Roma located in Starr County in the lower Rio Grande Valley. During his 6 years in that outpost of the church, he traveled by horseback to bring the Catholic faith to the scattered residents of Starr and Zapata counties. Here was his first association with my family as he would come to Zapata and the ranches of Randado and San Antonio Viejo where my father's family lived. Father Yvo would come on horseback and he would spend the night. He would hold Rosary services and mass and then he would sing in Spanish and French into the night with the families of the ranch. He loved to sing, and even to this day, whenever I have the pleasure of seeing him, I remind him of this, and he breaks out with a song.

Later, in 1913, Father Tymen was placed in charge of a motorized chapel, a large truck converted to a chapel on wheels. He used this vehicle to travel, under hardship conditions, to the area's distant and widespread missions until fatigue overtook him and his Provincial at San Antonio gave him permission to return to his native France for a 6-month rest from the rigors of frontier life.

He reached his homeland in Brittany 2 weeks before the outbreak of World War I. He immediately joined his hometown unit and spent the next 3 years caring for the wounded on European battlefields. He was gased twice before the war ended.

Following his return to the United States and to south Texas, Father Tymen served in churches all over the lower Rio Grande Valley until his retirement in 1962.

It was while he served in Mission, Tex., in the thirties that I became acquainted with Father Yvo. While attending Our Lady of Guadalupe Parochial School, I became an altar boy. It was on the Feast Day of Our Lady of Guadalupe in 1934 that I first attended at mass which the good Father Yvo celebrated.

He truly was a missionary. He built the small chapels in the surrounding communities or remodeled the ancient ones. With the help of his altar boys and a few older gentlemen from our church, we would go in the back of a covered pickup in the late afternoon, work on the chapel and then have rosary.

Returning that night he would teach us songs in French and we would teach him the Spanish songs of the border country. He loved those missions. Once on a Christmas Eve, so they could have "midnight mass," he celebrated mass—and I was thrilled to be one of the altar boys—at 11 p.m. and then every hour or so thereafter at a different rural

community until the last one at 5 a.m. the next morning when, with the Sun breaking out of the clouds in the east, we headed for Mission and home.

He loved to go to the old monastery and novitiate called "La Lomita" on the banks of the Rio Grande south of Mission. Always he would take his altar boys with him. There we would work and sneak a few minutes to play and swim in the river before going home. The stories could go on for days about this holy man.

I was privileged recently to be present when he was decorated by the Government of France for his service to humanity. Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing that such a man as Father Tymen belongs to the human race. He has spent his life serving his God and church by doing good to others. I honor him on the occasion of his 96th birthday, and I remember with pride that as an altar boy I served my first mass with this great and good man.

HEARINGS TO BE CONDUCTED BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES RELATING TO READINESS OF RESERVE FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEDZI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office recently released a study which concluded that certain inadequacies exist in the Reserve training program. The Personnel Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services will conduct a series of hearings commencing on September 29, 1975, to review the findings and recommendations of this study, as well as other operational—not personnel benefit—problems relating to the readiness of Reserve forces.

Members of Congress are invited to appear or submit for the record their recommendations for improvements in the readiness of Reserve forces. Other interested individuals who wish to present their views on these issues may submit them in writing, or appear in person as time permits. Inquiries may be directed to the committee.

A STATE-DEFENSE COMMUNICATIONS GAP?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FASCELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, in recent days press stories have indicated some difference of opinion between the State and Defense Departments with respect to the commitment by the United States to consider sales of Pershing missiles to Israel. The gist of the press stories is that there was apparently little if any consultation by State with the Defense Department about the possible Pershing missile sale. If these stories are true, there would appear to be a serious lack of communication within our Government with potentially grave implications for our own military preparedness.

I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that this

does not appear to be an isolated case. Recently the Subcommittee on International Political and Military Affairs, which I have the honor to chair, conducted a review of the planned sale of Hawk missiles to Jordan. From our review it now appears that the final form of the proposed missile sale, which differed from an earlier one, was never referred to the Defense Department for their professional military evaluation.

Mr. Speaker, the apparent lack of consultations and communications between our two primary national security agencies must not be allowed to continue. I hope the President will immediately resolve this urgent problem.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was not present for three recorded votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 541, a motion to recommit the conference report on H.R. 8121 with instructions to insist on the House language in section 104, and "yea" on rollcall No. 542, a motion to recommit from disagreement to the amendment No. 8 of the Senate. Further, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 545, the amendment offered by Mr. Moss, to prohibit a consumer product safety standard from requiring sampling plans.

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROVERSY OVER STUDENT AID

(Mr. YOUNG of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how should Federal student aid be distributed? Should limited financial resources be spread out in small amounts to a larger number of students, or should it be concentrated on those who have little or no funds of their own to use? A stated policy of the Federal Government is to assure equal educational opportunity to all students even if they are from the poorest of families. Should we allow the refocusing of funds now targeted at the most needy students away from those students?

A bill to extend student aid legislation introduced by Representative JAMES O'HARA, chairman of the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, would make important changes in the way Federal student grants and loans are awarded.

The following article which appeared in the Capitol Hill Forum attempts to answer these and other questions concerning Mr. O'HARA's bill.

[From the Capitol Hill Forum, Sept. 22, 1975]

CONGRESSIONAL CONTROVERSY OVER STUDENT AID

(By Patricia Fleming)

The Education Amendments of 1972 were an anomaly, for in 1972, the retreat from programs with a poverty focus had already begun. The Great Society, only partially realized, was a fading dream. The Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOGs)

program—a student aid program in which grants are awarded solely on the basis of need—was a proposal that originated in a paper by Alice Rivlin in 1968 when she was assistant secretary at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. A similar idea was mentioned by President Nixon in his 1970 education message, but the actual basic grants legislation was drafted and introduced in 1971 by Sen. Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Education subcommittee. This program was the heart of the new congressional thrust toward equal educational opportunity at the post-secondary level. It was adopted by the 92nd Congress.

The Education amendments, authorizing Basic Grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, State Students Incentive Grants, College Work-Study, and the student loan programs, expires on June 31, 1976, the end of this fiscal year. There is about a year left in which the Congress can make any changes in the programs it desires, and authorize them for several more years.

In the House of Representatives, Congressman James O'Hara (D-Mich.) now chairs the subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, formerly headed by Edith Green. Rep. O'Hara has introduced a bill, H.R. 3471, that reauthorizes student aid programs, extending them through fiscal year 1980, with some significant and controversial alterations.

The O'Hara bill, when introduced, caused an immediate negative reaction among groups and individuals concerned with the struggle for equal access for minority and low-income students. What appeared in the form of legislation was a new direction for the student aid programs—turning away from the goal of equal educational opportunity, at least as it was defined by groups with low-income or minority constituencies.

Congressman O'Hara's conception of equal educational opportunity is education "for the masses." To him, equal educational opportunity means universal access to education for any person, at any level, at any time of life. Ideally, he says, education should be a life-long undertaking, meaning an individual should be able to move in and out of the education process whenever necessary or desirable, "for any reason, at any age." Education, he says, should be free. No charge.

He asked a black witness at the student aid hearings which of the following two alternatives he would select if he had the choice: to increase total college enrollment with proportions of minority and white students remaining the same as they are now, but having a larger number of blacks, as well as whites, in higher education; or to increase the proportion of minority students to reach a larger number as well as a larger percentage of non-white students.

The witness chose the second alternative—James O'Hara chose the first. This points out the major difference in definitions of equal educational opportunity. Rep. O'Hara does not think in terms of race and the effects of generations of discrimination on a person trying to enter college. Evidence for this can be found in Section 498 of his bill. Section 498 is the nondiscrimination provision. It bars discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, and age. However, it also prohibits preferential treatment. It says, in effect, that no person shall be admitted to participation in, or provided the benefits of, programs under this title on the basis of race, sex, and so forth.

A report of the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education advocated focusing federal student aid on students from the lowest income groups. Rep. O'Hara says this ignores the needs of the middle and lower-middle class family. A student with "exceptional need" can now get a full basic grant of \$1400 plus a supplemental grant, bringing his grant up to \$2900 to attend a prestigious private institution. He asks why

a family earning \$15,000 and sending their children to a school like McComb Community College (which is in his congressional district) should support with their taxes the "exceptional need" student at a school like Harvard or MIT. For Rep. O'Hara, equal access means that students from both families could go to McComb Community College.

In considering the relationship between dollars and equity of access, it is simpler to talk about access for all low-income students, rather than for minority students, or black students.

However, we must remember that at every income level, black students are underrepresented. In Virginia Fleming's compilation of data on "Equal Access and Student Financial Aid," she notes, "It is clear that economic inequities strongly affect the opportunities of black students . . . for higher education. However, the heritage of segregation and unequal opportunities for high school preparation also play a part in restricting opportunity. . . . At every income level in America, more whites than blacks attended college in 1970. Discrimination has many aspects." As an example, 59 percent of white families earning \$15,000 a year or more sent children to college, as compared with only 39 percent of black families.

Census data demonstrates that the black male has no prospect of earning as much as the white male high school graduate unless he has four years of college. If the trade union movement were open to blacks, perhaps there would not be such a great and overriding need for higher education. But it is not.

Last year, the O'Hara subcommittee held a lengthy series of hearings on student aid, then went to work on the legislation. The bill he drafted was introduced in February of this year without co-sponsors. In his introductory statement on the House floor, O'Hara said, "I will take the full responsibility for H.R. 3471 and for its manifold imperfections. I hope and trust that during the course of our concluding hearings and mark-ups, the normal working of the legislative process will identify those imperfections and help us improve the product. But the final legislation will not be the work of any one legislator, or any one group. It will be the best kind of combination of hard thinking, hard work and hard bargaining, in a free and open forum." Rep. O'Hara, in other words, is flexible. He will respond to the pressures and suggestions from other members of the committee.

Several weeks of additional hearings were held after the bill had been circulated. Since the hearings, the decision has been to wait until the criticisms and other reactions from the world of higher education have simmered down before holding a subcommittee mark-up. Mark-up will not be scheduled until late September or October, which gives other members of the subcommittee some time to come up with alternatives to existing proposals.

The O'Hara bill is, comprehensive, complex, and controversial. It represents a significant change in philosophy from the current federal aid programs which aim to extend educational opportunities to students regardless of income. Rep. O'Hara's goal seems to be to get the maximum number of students possible into institutions with low or no tuition. His concept of equal educational opportunity is to provide access to low-cost colleges for the majority of young people. He would add some special assistance for exceptional students which would be awarded on the basis of merit. He has written a bill which would be of most assistance to families such as those in his own congressional district in Michigan—working class, non-minority families who have, he feels, been neglected by federal aid programs. The alterations of the student aid programs are

clearly not designed to help the student from a poor family who may have some educational disadvantage.

In April, Virginia Trotter, Assistant Secretary for Education, and Terrell Bell, Commissioner of Education, testified before the subcommittee on Post-secondary Education. Their objections to the bill were numerous. Dr. Bell said, "We would urge that the goal of equalizing opportunity remain the foremost priority of federal student assistance efforts, and that we continue to concentrate the limited funds available on those young people with the greatest financial need. Given rising educational costs and limited federal resources, it seems now more than ever that the funds available must be directed towards those with the greatest financial need."

In the O'Hara bill, the basic grant program, otherwise known as BEOGs, has two major changes:

(1) The half-cost limitation has been removed. Under current law, a basic grant may not exceed one-half the actual cost of college attendance—tuition, fees, room and board, books and other expenses. This is a positive move toward greater access for low-income students. The half-cost provision has been demonstrated to be one of the most inequitable provisions in the law as it now exists, because it only affects low-income students attending low-tuition institutions.

(2) Assets are removed from the determination of family contribution. Research being done by Lois Rice at the College Entrance Examination Board indicates that if assets are eliminated from the basic grant calculations, about 350,000 new eligible students will be drawn into the program, and almost three-fourths of them will come from families with incomes greater than \$9,000. An additional \$300 million would be required to fully fund the current program if assets are eliminated. Removal of assets would greatly simplify the program, but unless BEOGs become an entitlement program, which means funding to the level required to fully fund all eligible students, the removal of assets redistributes scarce resources away from low-income students to middle-income students.

A provision that is neither in current law nor in the O'Hara bill is one recommended by Lois Rice in a paper presented last October at an American Council of Education meeting, and subsequently offered by the Carnegie Council and the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) in their most recent reports. They suggest the basic grants be restructured to provide only for students' noninstructional costs. These are the reasons for the proposal: Basic grants could be focused on access to post-secondary non-instructional education. Whereas tuition varies widely from zero to \$4,000 a year, costs are by far more uniform from state to state and institution to institution. Thus, a grant based on such costs would tend to meet the needs of all students and could establish a national standard for the size of the basic grant. Annual adjustments in response to inflation would be simple. If basic grants covered a portion of non-instructional costs, other federal and state grant programs could provide for tuition. This would create a clear division of function between basic grants and other student grant programs. Basic grants could be focused on access to post-secondary education. Another important step recommended by Rice, Carnegie, and COFHE is to make basic grants a real entitlement program. Since 1972, BEOGs has not been fully funded. Grants to students have had to be reduced according to a complicated reduction formula. Their recommendation is to treat the basic grants program like the veterans' education benefits under the G.I. bill, making it an open-ended entitlement, providing for grants up to the maximum amount for all students meeting eligibility conditions.

Even though BEOGs is referred to as an "entitlement" now, there is no entitlement

when a student gets only a portion of his grant. The size of the grant is determined in part by the amount of the appropriation for any given year. Only when BEOGs is a true entitlement program can access for low-income students be assured.

The Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant program, known as SEOGs, provides assistance to students with exceptional financial need. The award cannot exceed \$1,500 or one-half the sum of the other grants, loans, and work program assistance the student is getting. A supplemental grant is made through a participating institution rather than directly to the student.

O'Hara's bill changes student eligibility for SEOGs. First it requires that a student be eligible, on the basis of need, for a basic grant, but secondly, the student must qualify on the basis of academic promise as indicated by a national list of such promising students. In his floor statement, Rep. O'Hara stated, "While the bill does not so specify, I had the National Merit Scholarship list in mind as one possibility."

Education officials Trotter and Bell, as well as many others, took exception in their congressional testimony, to the shift from need-based programs to eligibility based on the almost indefinable concept of "academic promise" or outstanding academic performance. The National Merit Scholarship list referred to as an indicator of academic merit contains the names of only an insignificant number of black students, and very few low-income students of any ethnic background. Problems associated with measuring student ability in general, and low-income students in particular, are well known.

Rep. O'Hara's version of SEOGs would provide for the full cost of education—both instructional and non-instructional, minus the expected family contribution and the amount of any basic grant to the student.

Both the Carnegie Council and COFHE recommend the continuation of SEOG as a grant to cover instructional cost only, as a supplement to BEOGs, which they suggest should be applied to the student's non-instructional expenses. They further recommend that SEOG be structured to meet more effectively the needs of low and middle income students attending moderate and higher priced institutions. Thus, supplemental grants would focus on the problem of enhancing choice more than equalizing access.

Were there enough support for it among members of his subcommittee, Rep. O'Hara would be willing to drop the merit basis for awarding supplemental grants, while at the same time focusing SEOGs on a second dimension of equal opportunity, which is choice.

The State Student Incentive Grant program (SSIG), is designed to stimulate increased state efforts in student financial aid. Federal monies are matched on a 50-50 basis by the states and grants are awarded to students demonstrating "substantial financial need." By now all 50 states have scholarship and grant programs in operation or are planning them. Before the first year of SSIG, only about 27 states had student aid programs. The increase in state aid is largely, a result of SSIG. This remarkable response to a program which is funded at a relatively low level (\$20 million in 1975, as compared with \$660 million for BEOGs), demonstrates the growing commitment of the states to student financial aid programs.

Once again, Rep. O'Hara takes need out of the picture. In his bill, the term "eligible student" is left undefined, thus making the SSIG available to all students. In addition, it removes the \$1,500 a year ceiling on individual grants. These two modifications could result in major changes in the population served by the program. They mean that the SSIG funds would be spread out over the

entire college population in a state, reducing the average per-student grant drastically and diminishing the impact of the program. Once again, low-income students would be hurt most.

The bill would further allow states to channel SSIG into low or no tuition institutions, causing the gap between the costs of public and private institutions to widen even more.

A clearer definition of the relationship between federal and state student aid is required. If legislation authorizing basic grants is amended to allow them to cover only non-instructional costs, perhaps SSIG, as well as supplemental grants, should be limited to aid for instructional costs.

The legislation authorizes \$200 million for SSIG, a dramatic expansion from its current funding level of \$20 million. States match the federal funds dollar-for-dollar. It is open to question whether most states would be able to appropriate such increased new funds very quickly. A gradual increase over the entire authorization period of the bill would be more realistic.

A change in SSIG policy that is widely recommended is that states be allowed and encouraged to make grants to students who are attending out-of-state institutions. This would allow students greater choice in attempting to find schools which best serve their needs.

College work-study is another need-based program that the O'Hara bill would make available to the entire student population. Current law requires that college work-study provide assistance to students with the "greatest financial need." This includes students from low-income families but can also include middle-income students attending high-cost institutions. The federal subsidy is 80 percent of the student's salary and for this reason, among others, it is an extremely popular program.

There is good reason to keep the need focus of college work-study and, in addition, to expand appropriations for the program at the present time. With unemployment levels reaching for the moon, private employers are likely to provide fewer jobs for students on a non-subsidized basis than in times of a more stable economy. Again, it is the low-income student who is more likely to need the additional funds generated by a job. The college work-study program now enhances equal access.

A higher appropriation level for this program would be totally justified, for a study conducted at Columbia University indicated that about 80 percent of college work-study administrators could provide more jobs if additional funds were obtained.

The National Direct Student Loan program and the Guaranteed Student Loan program are 17 and ten years old, respectively. But there are still many policy questions regarding these and other loan programs that have never been adequately addressed by Congress.

What is the most effective balance of grants and loans to achieve maximum access? What is the proper role of loans in the entire student aid picture? Should loans be focused on low-income students and not on others? Or should they be primarily geared toward middle-income students? What roles should the federal and state governments, educational institutions and financial institutions play in student loan programs?

These and other questions need to be considered this year, before Congress enacts the Educational Amendments of 1976.

In the O'Hara bill, the National Direct Student Loan program, which is designed to provide campus-based, low-interest loans, would be phased out in one year. Funds administered by participating institutions would be transferred to those institutions to be used by them for their own student

lending if they wish to maintain such a program.

The legislation would also totally abolish the direct federally insured student loans of the Guaranteed Student Loan program. The bill would encourage the expansion of state guarantee agencies which Rep. O'Hara believes, would take up the slack. To make equity matters worse, he limits the definitions of "eligible lender" to banks, credit unions, and other commercial lenders, fully acknowledging that the elimination of college-based lending programs will make it much harder for low-income and minority students to obtain loans. In his floor statement O'Hara said, "I am offering one other new provision which I think will help with the default problem. And it reminds me of a sign in a pizza parlor not far from this very chamber. On the walls of the pizzeria, it says: 'We have an agreement with the bank. We won't cash checks if they won't sell pizzas.' Later, in a more serious vein, he continued, "I believe that asking those students to borrow who have come from the most economically deprived groups and who are going to have, whatever their education, a tougher time than most to find gainful and stable employment when they get out of school, is not offering them 'assistance.' It is adding to their burdens at a time when we should be trying to lighten those burdens."

The loans programs constitute the most difficult and complicated portions of current student assistance law as well as the O'Hara bill. It is likely the committee will try to continue its patching efforts rather than making a major reform effort.

There is some cause for alarm among advocates of greater minority participation in post-secondary education. However, influential members of the House Education and Labor Committee are alarmed as well. Growing out of quiet discussions, the possibility for consensus among some of these members may result in a bipartisan effort to reinforce and expand the equal opportunity thrust of current student aid programs. There is no question that the O'Hara bill will be modified in the House committee.

As Congress moves toward extension of student aid programs, those concerned must be prepared to document and support with cogent arguments, the fact that the plight of the middle-class is not anything close to the plight of the lower class, in a time of economic crisis. Low-income families do not have the flexibility in their budgets that can cushion the shock waves of inflation. The low-income worker is also more likely to be hit by unemployment. While the cost of education continues to rise, the opening up of eligibility for federal grants to the middle-class student is justifiable. However, any expansion of eligibility for federal student aid must be contingent on increased appropriations. Without an increase in funding, the result will be like taking food from a starving man to give it to one who is merely hungry.

In Congress this year, we have witnessed a new budgetary consciousness among members who would traditionally have been the proponents of increased aid for poor students. We have seen them, in the name of fiscal responsibility, vote against increases for subsidized lunch programs and other social service programs. Thus, I believe it unlikely that this Congress will vote any substantial increases in student aid funding that would compensate for an upward expansion of eligibility.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. MURPHY of New York (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, Sep-

tember 26, 1975, on account of official business.

Mr. BREAUX (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, September 26, 1975, on account of official business.

Mr. DODD (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, September 26, 1975, on account of official business.

Mr. HUGHES (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, September 26, 1975, on account of official business.

Mr. DU PONT (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, September 26, 1975, on account of official business.

Mr. BAUMAN (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, September 26, 1975, on account of official business.

Mr. MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. O'NEILL), for Friday, September 26, 1975, on account of official business.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today, on account of an injury.

Mr. ESHLEMAN (at the request of Mr. RHODES), from September 24, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOWNEY of New York) to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matters.)

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of California, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. VANIK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ABZUG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOCH, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DE LA GARZA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEDZI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FASCELL, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BUCHANAN, and include extraneous matter on the bill H.R. 1287 considered today.

Mr. YOUNG of Georgia and to include extraneous matter notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$715.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. REGULA), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. CARTER in two instances.

Mr. STEELMAN.

Mr. McCLOSKEY.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. MCKINNEY.

Mr. LENT.

Mr. HARSHA.

Mr. McCLORY.

Mr. ABDNOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DOWNEY of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McDONALD of Georgia in four instances.

Mr. WOLFF in 10 instances.
 Mr. BADILLO in 10 instances.
 Mr. SOLARZ in two instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. BARRETT.
 Mr. FISHER in two instances.
 Mr. MATSUNAGA in six instances.
 Mr. WAXMAN.
 Mr. MAZZOLI in 10 instances.
 Mr. HELSTOSKI.
 Mr. NIX in two instances.
 Mr. HARRINGTON.
 Ms. ABZUG in 10 instances.
 Mr. RANGEL.
 Mr. DRINAN.
 Mr. BINGHAM in 10 instances.
 Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California in two instances.
 Mrs. BURKE of California.
 Mr. DE LA GARZA.
 Mr. GAYDOS.
 Mr. MURTHA.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2375. An act to extend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended, for 3 months; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HAYS of Ohio, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on September 24, 1975, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4005. An act to amend the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act to revise and extend the programs authorized by that act.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOWNEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 26, 1975, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1792. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed amendments to S. 1267, a bill to expand competition, provide improved consumer services, strengthen the ability of financial institutions to adjust to changing economic conditions, and improve the flow of funds for mortgage credit; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

1793. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1794. A letter from the Secretary of the

Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to restrict the authority for inspection of returns and the disclosure of information with respect thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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:

Mr. FINDLEY: Committee on International Relations. House Concurrent Resolution 402. Concurrent resolution welcoming Their Majesties, the Emperor and Empress of Japan (Rept. No. 94-516). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9861. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 94-517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 9836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow divorced individuals to take the dependent-care deduction for certain children in their custody; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9837. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ban the usage of diethylstilbestrol (DES) as a growth stimulant; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORSYTHE (for himself, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. PIKE, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. JAMES V. STANTON, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. VANDER VEEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 9838. A bill to provide for the conservation and management of fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon):

H.R. 9839. A bill to provide for the Federal payment of State unemployment compensation benefits which are attributable to services performed by certain employees of State or local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JENRETTE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOCH, Mr. LENT, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MEZZVINSKY, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. O'HARA, and Mr. O'NEILL):

H.R. 9840. A bill to provide for the con-

servation and management of fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9841. A bill to amend the Crime Control Act of 1973 to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9842. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$825 the maximum amount of the lump-sum death payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 9843. A bill to limit the 1975 cost-of-living adjustment of Federal executive salaries to 5 percent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESSLER:

H.R. 9844. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to provide for a mandatory death penalty for premeditated assassination or premeditated attempted assassination of a President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H.R. 9845. A bill to provide that the recently enacted provisions authorizing increases in the salaries of Senators and Representatives be limited only to the increase which will take effect October 1, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RINALDO (for himself and Ms. HOLTZMAN):

H.R. 9846. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to increase the amount of the Federal grant which may be made for certain mass transportation projects from 80 to 90 percent of the costs of such projects; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9847. A bill to provide that the recently enacted provisions authorizing annual salary increases for Senators and Representatives be limited only to the increase which will take effect October 1, 1975; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SARASIN:

H.R. 9848. A bill to provide for additional sentences for commission of a felony with use of a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STUDDS (for himself, Mr. YATRON, and Mr. ZEFERETTI):

H.R. 9849. A bill to provide for the conservation and management of fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (for herself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. AMBRO, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BELL, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. CONTE, Mr. COTTER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOWNEY of New York, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EARLY, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GINN, and Ms. HECKLER of Massachusetts):

H.R. 9850. A bill to provide for the conservation and management of fisheries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Ms. ABZUG (for herself, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 9851. A bill to allow Federal employees to participate in a flexible work scheduling program which, for an initial period, shall be established on a temporary basis, and thereafter, subject to congressional disapproval, on a permanent basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Michigan, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. FAUNTRY, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. FORD of

Tennessee, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. REES, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 9852. A bill to amend section 2 of the National Housing Act to increase the maximum loan amounts for the purchase of mobile homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. MCCOLLISTER, Mr. PAT-TISON of New York, Mr. THONE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VIGORITO, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9853. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the supplementary medical insurance program for optometric and medical vision care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. KREES, and Mr. VANDER VEEN):

H.R. 9854. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of certain psychologists' services under the supplementary medical insurance benefits program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOWERS:

H.R. 9855. A bill to repeal the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. KINDNESS:

H.R. 9856. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow individuals a deduction for tuition expenses for the higher education of themselves, their spouses, or their dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVITAS (by request):

H.R. 9857. A bill to amend section 518(b) of the National Housing Act for the purpose of providing benefits under such section to former owners of houses assisted under such section and to persons presently owning but not residing in such houses; to the Committee on Banking, Currency and Housing.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 9858. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make Thomas Jefferson's birthday a legal public holiday; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUSH:

H.R. 9859. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a national catastrophic illness insurance program under which the Federal Government, acting in cooperation with State insurance authorities and the private insurance industry, will re-insure and otherwise encourage the issuance of private health insurance policies which make adequate health protection available to all Americans at a reasonable cost; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H.R. 9860. A bill to require termination of investment insurance issued by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation in any case in which the insured investor engages in bribery of a foreign official; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 9861. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and the period beginning July 1, 1976, and ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.J. Res. 670. Joint resolution to designate April 13, 1976, as Thomas Jefferson Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 671. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide

that, except in time of war or economic emergency declared by the Congress, expenditures of the Government may not exceed the revenues of the Government during any fiscal year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H. Con. Res. 407. Concurrent resolution to promote and encourage the removal of architectural barriers to the access of handicapped persons to public facilities and buildings; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 738. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that optometric services be included in medical assistance programs; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RINALDO:

H. Res. 739. Resolution to review, evaluate, and further amend the Wagner-Peyser Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SOLARZ:

H. Res. 740. Resolution in support of the people of Portugal; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

267. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to South Lake Tahoe airline service; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

268. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to income tax deductions for geothermal drilling expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 6844

By Mr. BUTLER:

Page 20, strike out line 23 and all that follows down through and including line 22 on page 21.

Redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly.

H.R. 8603

By Mr. SIMON:

Page 14, strike out line 19 and all that follows through page 22, line 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following new sections:

Sec. 3. (a) Chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out subchapters I, III, and IV;

(2) by redesignating subchapter II as subchapter I, and by redesignating subchapter V as subchapter II;

(3) by redesignating sections 3621 and 3622 as sections 3601 and 3602, respectively, by redesignating section 3623 as section 3604, by redesignating sections 3626 and 3627 as sections 3605 and 3606, respectively, and by redesignating section 3681 through section 3685 as section 3621 through section 3625, respectively; and

(4) by striking out sections 3624, 3625, and 3628.

(b) Subchapter I of chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by inserting immediately after section 3602 the following new section:

“§ 3603. Changes in rates and fees

“(a) The Postal Service may make one change in postal rates and fees during any fiscal year, in accordance with the provisions of this section.

“(b) Except as provided by paragraph

(4), if the Postal Service proposes an increase in any class of postal rates and fees in any fiscal year, and the percentage increase in such rates and fees is greater than the percentage increase in the price index during the preceding fiscal year (as certified by the Secretary of Labor under subsection (e)), then the Postal Service shall publish such proposal in the Federal Register and transmit such proposal, together with any other proposed changes in any class of postal rates and fees, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate, no later than 30 days after such certification, for review in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

(2) In any case in which the Postal Service is required in any fiscal year to transmit a proposed increase in any class of postal rates and fees, the percentage increase of which is greater than the percentage increase in the price index during the preceding fiscal year, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate under paragraph (1), no proposed changes in any class of postal rates and fees, whether or not any such proposed change constitutes an increase which is greater than the percentage increase in the price index during the preceding fiscal year, may take effect during the period established under paragraph (3) for consideration of such proposed increase by each such committee.

(3) (A) Any proposed increase in any class of postal rates and fees, the percentage increase of which is greater than the percentage increase in the price index during the preceding fiscal year, which is transmitted by the Postal Service to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate in accordance with this subsection may take effect, upon 10 days notice published by the Postal Service in the Federal Register but no earlier than 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after such proposed increase is transmitted, unless either such committee, during such 60-day period, disapproves such proposed increase through appropriate action.

(B) The continuity of a session of the Congress is broken only an adjournment of the Congress sine die. Any day on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain is excluded from the computation of the 60-day period.

(4) The Postal Service, in making any change in the rate of postage for any class of mail established in accordance with the second sentence of section 3604(c), may round off to the nearest whole cent the rate established by such change. In any case in which such action causes the increase in such rate to be greater than the percentage increase in the price index during the preceding fiscal year (as certified by the Secretary of Labor under subsection (e)), the Postal Service shall not be required to transmit a proposal with respect to such change under paragraph (2).

(c) If the Postal Service proposes an increase in any class of postal rates and fees in any fiscal year, and the percentage increase in such rates and fees is equal to or less than the percentage increase in the price index (as certified by the Secretary of Labor under subsection (e)), then such rates and fees may take effect 10 days after the Postal Service publishes notice of such rates and fees in the Federal Register. Any proposed increase which is subject to the provisions of this subsection shall take effect no later than 30 days after such certification. If the Postal Service fails either to transmit a proposal under subsection (b)(1) or to place such increase in any class of postal rates

and fees into effect during such period, the Postal Service may not make any change in such class of postal rates and fees during the fiscal year involved.

(d) If the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate disapproves a proposed change in any class of postal rates and fees under subsection (b) (3) (A), the Postal Service may place into effect, at such time as it determines during the fiscal year involved, any change in any class of postal rates and fees if such change is not subject to disapproval by such committees in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) (3) (A).

(e) At the beginning of each fiscal year, as there become available necessary data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, the Secretary of Labor shall certify to the Postal Service the per centum difference between (1) the price index for the 12 months preceding such fiscal year; and (2) the price index for the next preceding 12-month period.

(f) For purposes of this section, the term 'price index' means the average over a 12-month period of the Consumer Price Index (all items—United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(c) Section 3604 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) by striking out subsections (a), (b), and (c), and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

(a) The Postal Service shall establish a mail classification schedule, and from time to time may make changes therein, in accordance with the policies of this title and the following factors:

(1) the establishment and maintenance of a fair and equitable classification system for all mail;

(2) the relative value to the people of the kinds of mail matter entered into the postal system and the desirability and justification for special classifications and services of mail;

(3) the importance of providing classifications with extremely high degrees of reliability and speed of delivery;

(4) the importance of providing classifications which do not require an extremely high degree of reliability and speed of delivery;

(5) the desirability of special classifications from the point of view of both the user and the Postal Service; and

(6) such other factors as the Postal Service may deem appropriate.

(b) The Postal Service, before making any change in the mail classification schedule, shall transmit such proposed change to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate. Any such proposed change may take effect no earlier than 60 calendar days of continuous session of the Congress after such proposed change is transmitted, unless either such committee, during such 60-day period, disapproves such proposed change through appropriate action. Computation of such 60-day period shall be made in accordance with the provisions of section 3603(b) (3) (B); and

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(d) Section 3602 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) by striking out subsection (a);
 (2) by striking out that portion of subsection (b) which precedes paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Changes in rates of postage and fees for postal services shall be made by the Postal Service in accordance with the policies of this title and the following factors:"; and

(3) in paragraph (8) thereof, as so redesignated by this subsection, by striking out "Commission" and inserting in lieu thereof "Postal Service".

(e) Section 3605 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) by striking out "this subchapter" the second place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3603"; and

(2) by inserting immediately after "so that" the following: "notwithstanding sections 3602 and 3603".

(f) (1) Section 3601 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by striking out "Governors are" and inserting in lieu thereof "Postal Service is".

(2) Section 3606 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended by striking out "3626" and inserting in lieu thereof "3605".

(3) Section 409(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "Except as provided in section 3628 of this title, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The".

(4) Section 2003(e) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "and, subject to the provisions of section 3604 of this title, all of the expenses of the Postal Rate Commission".

(5) Section 2401(c) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "3626" and inserting in lieu thereof "3605".

(6) Section 3621 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesignated by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking out "after proceedings in accordance with the provisions of section 3628 of this title"; and

(B) by striking out "subchapter II" and inserting in lieu thereof "subchapter I".

(7) Section 3622(c) of title 39, United States Code, as so redesigned by subsection (a), is amended by striking out "subchapter II" and inserting in lieu thereof "subchapter I".

(8) Section 3624 of title 39, United States Code, as so redesigned by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by striking out "Governors" and inserting in lieu thereof "Postal Service";

(B) by striking out "3627" and inserting in lieu thereof "3606"; and

(C) by striking out "3682 and 3683" and inserting in lieu thereof "3622 or 3623".

(g) The table of sections for chapter 36 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"Chapter 36.—POSTAL RATES, CLASSES, AND SERVICES

 "SUBCHAPTER I—RATES AND CLASSES OF MAIL

 "Sec.

 "3601. Authority to fix rates and classes.

 "3602. Rates and fees.

 "3603. Changes in rates and fees.

 "3604. Mail classification.

 "3605. Reduced rates.

 "3606. Adjusting free and reduced rates.

 "SUBCHAPTER II—GENERAL

 "Sec.

 "3621. Reimbursement.

 "3622. Size and weight limits.

 "3623. Uniform rates for books; films; other materials.

 "3624. Limitations.

 "3625. Filing of information relating to periodical publications."

Sec. 4. The General Accounting Office shall no later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, transmit a report to each House of the Congress which shall contain a review of the operation of amendments made by section 2, together with recommendations with respect to whether such amendments should remain in effect.

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

Page 22, line 3, strike out "Section 3622

(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 3602".

Page 22, line 10, strike out "Section 3626" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 3605".

Page 23, strike out line 17 and all that follows through page 24, line 13.

Page 24, strike out the material which appears immediately below line 13 and immediately above line 14.

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

Page 24, strike out line 14 and all that follows through page 25, line 14.

Page 25, strike out the material which appears immediately below line 14 and immediately above line 15.

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

Page 26, strike out line 1 and all that follows through line 23.

And redesignate the following sections accordingly.

Page 29, beginning on line 5, strike out "particularly the functions and responsibilities of the Postal Rate Commission".

Page 29, line 8, strike out "If the".

Page 29, strike out line 9 and all that follows through line 11.

Page 29, line 12, strike out "viewed independently outside the Postal Service".

Page 29, line 20, strike out "section 3622 (b)" and insert in lieu thereof "section 3602".

H.R. 8841

By Mr. BROWN of California:

(Amendment in the nature of a substitute to the committee amendment.)

On page 2 strike line 1 and all that follows through line 21 page 10 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 27 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 138 (y)), is amended by adding at the end of such section the following: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this Act for the period beginning October 1, 1975, and ending September 30, 1976, the sum of \$33,821,000".

FACTUAL DESCRIPTIONS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Prepared by the Congressional Research Service pursuant to clause 5(d) of House Rule X. Previous listing appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 9, 1975, page 28054:

H.R. 9306. September 3, 1975. Public Works and Transportation. Amends the Airport and Airway Development Act of 1970 (1) to extend the authority of the Secretary of Transportation to make grants for airport development through fiscal year 1980; (2) to limit the consideration of the environmental impact of airport development outside of standard metropolitan statistical areas; (3) to require the preparation of environmental impact statements in projects under this Act; (4) to limit the requirement for public hearings on development projects; (5) to provide an alternate method of computing the Federal share of certain project costs; and (6) to change the tax on air fares.

H.R. 9307. September 3, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Establishes the Electric Power Authority with the duty to assure that adequate supplies of electric energy are available to meet anticipated demand. Directs the Authority to assist in the construction of new electric power plants and transmission facilities, with preference to be given to those facilities fueled with domestic energy supplies other than crude oil derivatives.

H.R. 9308. September 3, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Communications Act of 1934 to revise the procedure for consideration of applications for renewal of broadcast licenses. Extends the maximum term of license for the operation

of broadcasting stations from three to five years.

H.R. 9309. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Prohibits any officer or employee of the United States from willfully administering any drug to any person for research purposes without that person's written, informed consent, obtained without coercion.

H.R. 9310. September 3, 1975. Rules. Amends the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to require that the appropriate congressional committees conduct a comprehensive review of all Federal programs every two years. Specifies the review method to be followed.

H.R. 9311. September 3, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Social Security Act to stipulate that in determining the eligibility of a paraplegic for assistance under a State medicaid plan, the financial responsibility of such individual's spouse shall not be taken into account. Requires that each State medicaid plan include the provision of private duty nursing services for paraplegics.

H.R. 9312. September 3, 1975. Judiciary; Rules. Declares that certain rules proposed by Federal agencies shall take effect only if, after a certain period of time, either House of Congress does not pass a resolution disapproving such proposed rule. Establishes procedures for exercising Congressional disapproval of such proposed rules.

H.R. 9313. September 3, 1975. Judiciary; Rules. Declares that certain rules proposed by Federal agencies shall take effect only if, after a certain period of time, either House of Congress does not pass a resolution disapproving such proposed rule. Establishes procedures for exercising Congressional disapproval of such proposed rules.

H.R. 9314. September 3, 1975. Judiciary; Rules. Declares that certain rules proposed by Federal agencies shall take effect only if, after a certain period of time, either House of Congress does not pass a resolution disapproving such proposed rule. Establishes procedures for exercising Congressional disapproval of such proposed rules.

H.R. 9315. September 3, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Requires skilled nursing and intermediate care facilities participating in Medicare and Medicaid programs under the Social Security Act to publish a statement of the rights and responsibilities of their patients.

H.R. 9316. September 3, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act to impose additional requirements on State unemployment compensation programs relating to hearing procedures available to persons denied unemployment compensation following an initial determination of eligibility.

H.R. 9317. September 3, 1975. Post Office and Civil Service. Entitles certain prevailing rate Federal employees to night differential pay as part of their basic pay for purposes of determining such pay in conversions to the General Schedule.

H.R. 9318. September 3, 1975. Education and Labor. Revises the Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act to authorize additional standards to protect the health and safety of miners. Includes provisions to authorize inspections by Federal officials, to require reporting of major accidents, and to establish procedures for enforcement of standards and emergency relief.

Establishes the Office of Assistant Secretary for Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety in the Department of Labor. Transfers regulatory and enforcement authority from the Secretary of the Interior to the Assistant Secretary, to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to the newly-established Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Commission.

H.R. 9319. September 3, 1975. Education and Labor. Amends the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 by directing the Secretary of Labor to (1) render on-site con-

sultation and advice to any employer, upon the request of such employer, concerning compliance with the act; and (2) establish programs for the education and training of employers and employees concerning hazards in particular industries.

H.R. 9320. September 3, 1975. Interior and Insular Affairs. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Wallace House as part of the Petersburg National Battlefield in Virginia.

H.R. 9321. September 3, 1975. Public Works and Transportation. Deauthorizes a portion of the Nansemond River project in Virginia.

H.R. 9322. September 3, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a unified credit against the income tax for the expenses of education above the 12th grade paid by the taxpayer for providing an education for himself or any other individual.

H.R. 9323. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Increases the sentences for dangerous special criminal offenders and habitual violent criminal offenders.

H.R. 9324. September 3, 1975. Government Operations. Amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the Administrator of General Services to assign to the Attorney General for disposal such surplus real property previously utilized for Federal court purposes as the Attorney General recommends is needed for court and law enforcement use.

H.R. 9325. September 3, 1975. Agriculture. Revises the formula for allocating Federal matching grants to State agricultural experiment stations for construction purposes. Authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make such grants to land grant colleges.

H.R. 9326. September 3, 1975. Agriculture. Amends the Federal Laboratory Animal Welfare Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate standards for the transportation, handling and care of certain animals in interstate or foreign commerce. Prohibits the attendance at, promotion of, or supply of, animal fighting ventures. Sets forth regulations with respect to the transportation and handling of certain classes of animals.

H.R. 9327. September 3, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a limited deduction for amounts paid by an individual during the taxable year to any qualified handicapped child trust which was established by such individual.

Exempts such qualified handicapped child trust from taxation or the benefits from such trust from inclusion in the gross income of the beneficiary.

H.R. 9328. September 3, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (1) to increase the Federal share of rail service continuation subsidies; and (2) to extend the authorization of appropriations for such subsidies for an additional three years.

H.R. 9329. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Amends the Clayton Act to specifically prohibit the acquisition of the assets of one corporation by another corporation where the activities of either corporation are in or affect commerce and the effect of such acquisition may be to substantially lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly.

H.R. 9330. September 3, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act to stipulate that no State shall be required to administer individual means tests for provision of education, nutrition, transportation, recreation, socialization, or associated services provided thereunder to groups of low-income individuals aged sixty or older.

H.R. 9331. September 3, 1975. Banking, Currency and Housing. Repeals the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.

H.R. 9332. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Permits Federal courts, upon the recommendation of the United States prosecutor, to place certain persons charged with Federal

crimes in programs of community supervision and services.

H.R. 9333. September 3, 1975. Banking, Currency and Housing. Repeals the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.

H.R. 9334. September 3, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Amends the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to make certain sales of natural gas exempt from the provisions of such act.

H.R. 9335. September 3, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exempt aircraft used primarily for agricultural operation from the tax imposed on the use of civil aircraft. Provides for the refund of the tax on gasoline where fuel has been used for farming purposes in an aircraft and by an aerial applicator who was the ultimate purchaser thereof, and the owner, tenant, or operator of the farm has waived the right to any payment, credit, or refund on such fuel.

H.R. 9336. September 3, 1975. Post Office and Civil Service. Amends the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to deny Members of Congress any increase in pay under any law passed, or plan or recommendation received, during a Congress unless such increase is to take effect not earlier than the first day of the next Congress.

H.R. 9337. September 3, 1975. Education and Labor. Amends the Age Discrimination in Employment Act by extending the coverage of the act to individuals 60 years of age or over.

H.R. 9338. September 3, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act to include optometrists' services and medical vision care under the medicare supplementary medical insurance benefits program.

H.R. 9339. September 3, 1975. Interior and Insular Affairs. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to include in the National Register 15 covered bridges located in Kentucky.

H.R. 9340. September 3, 1975. Judiciary; Standards of Official Conduct. Requires lobbyists to: (1) register with the Federal Election Commission; (2) make and retain certain records; and (3) file reports with the Commission regarding their activities.

Requires certain officials of the executive branch to record their communications with lobbyists.

Repeals the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

H.R. 9341. September 3, 1975. Banking, Currency and Housing. Establishes a National Rebuilding and Development Bank to assist in the construction of housing and community facilities. Authorizes the Bank to make loans and guarantees for such construction under a National Rebuilding and Development Program.

H.R. 9342. September 3, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code to allow a person who is 65 years or over at the close of a taxable year to elect to be exempt from social security taxes on employment or self-employment income which does not exceed \$2,520.

H.R. 9343. September 3, 1975. Agriculture; International Relations. Requires prior approval by the Secretary of Agriculture of the export sale of wheat, wheat flour, feed grains, or other agricultural commodities designated by the Secretary.

H.R. 9344. September 3, 1975. Armed Services. Directs the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands in Oklahoma known as Camp Gruber to the State of Oklahoma for the use of the Oklahoma National Guard. Enumerates certain terms and conditions relating to future rights retained in such lands by the United States.

H.R. 9345. September 3, 1975. Government Operations. Sets forth guidelines to be followed in the classification of material as "Defense Data" for purposes of determining whether its dissemination must be limited in the interest of national defense.

H.R. 9346. September 3, 1975. Interior and

Insular Affairs. Authorizes the addition of certain lands to Mount McKinley National Park and Katmai National Monument in Alaska.

Designates certain lands and waters in Alaska as additional units to the National Park System and the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 9347. September 3, 1975. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Requires the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to insure that female individuals shall be eligible for appointment and admission to the Coast Guard Academy, based upon the same academic and relevant standards as male individuals.

H.R. 9348. September 3, 1975. Public Works and Transportation. Names a certain building in Texas the W. R. Poage Federal Building.

H.R. 9349. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Declares a certain individual lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 9350. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Declares a certain individual lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 9351. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Declares a certain individual the natural-born alien son of certain citizens of the United States, for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 9352. September 3, 1972. Judiciary. Authorizes classification of a certain individual as a child for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 9353. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay a specified sum to a certain individual in full settlement of such individual's claims against the United States for the loss of certain household goods.

H.R. 9354. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Declares that a certain widow of a Federal employee is entitled to a monthly compensation payment for the death of such employee.

H.R. 9355. September 3, 1975. Judiciary. Declares a certain individual eligible for naturalization under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 9356. September 3, 1975. Armed Services. Authorizes the President to appoint a certain individual to the grade of rear admiral on the Reserves retired list.

H.R. 9357. September 4, 1975. Education and Labor. Authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 1976 for manpower and employment programs contained in the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973.

H.R. 9358. September 4, 1975. Ways and Means. Revises the eligibility requirements for Disability Insurance benefits for blind persons under the Social Security Act. Revises the method of computing the primary insurance amount for blind persons under the Social Security Act.

H.R. 9359. September 4, 1975. Public Works and Transportation. Redefines the composition of the Federal-aid secondary highway system as "rural collector routes."

H.R. 9360. September 4, 1975. Judiciary. Amends the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit the adoption of more than two alien children by a United States citizen.

H.R. 9361. September 4, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a fuel stamp program to assist certain low-income elderly households to meet fuel costs.

H.R. 9362. September 4, 1975. Ways and Means. Requires States which have entered into agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for coverage of State and local employees under the Social Security Act to make payments and reports

to the Secretary of the Treasury on a calendar-quarter basis.

H.R. 9363. September 4, 1975. Public Works and Transportation. Terminates the authorization for the Tocks Island Reservoir project in New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Requires that property acquired by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to such authorization be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior.

H.R. 9364. September 4, 1975. Post Office and Civil Service. Repeals recently enacted authorizations of pay increases in the salaries of Senators and Representatives.

H.R. 9365. September 4, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Emergency Jobs and Unemployment Assistance Act of 1974 to make individuals performing services for an educational institution or agency ineligible for special unemployment compensation under the Act for periods between academic years or terms.

H.R. 9366. September 4, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation the specific criteria and procedures used to audit returns and to report certain information regarding audits completed in the previous twelve months.

H.R. 9367. September 4, 1975. Atomic Energy. Directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Energy Research and Development Administration to limit the export of nuclear fuel or nuclear technology to those nations which are parties to certain international agreements and which have also restricted the flow of nuclear technology to parties of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Authorizes the President to waive such restrictions if the export of such technology is deemed to be in the national security interests of the United States.

H.R. 9368. September 4, 1975. Veterans' Affairs. Extends the entitlement of veterans to educational assistance from thirty-six months to forty-five months.

H.R. 9369. September 4, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to limit the deductions attributable to farming which can be used by a taxpayer to offset nonfarm income.

H.R. 9370. September 4, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Tax Reduction Act of 1975 to allow recipients of social security, railroad retirement, or supplemental security income benefits to receive the special \$50 payment so long as their entitlement to such benefits for March 1975 is established before August 31, 1975, regardless of when the check is actually issued.

H.R. 9371. September 4, 1975. Armed Services. Amends the Military Selective Service Act to delete the requirement that Reserve officers ordered to active duty for training be ordered to such active duty for not less than three months.

H.R. 9372. September 4, 1975. Armed Services. Authorizes the President to sell certain naval vessels to the Government of Spain.

H.R. 9373. September 3, 1975. Education and Labor. Directs the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps to provide employment for unemployed persons in projects connected with the conservation of the Nation's land and water resources. Authorizes grants for State conservation projects which meet eligibility requirements under this Act.

H.R. 9374. September 3, 1975. Banking, Currency and Housing. Amends the Defense Production Act of 1950 to authorize the President to make commitments to purchase products produced from coal gasification and liquefaction for Government use or resale in order to encourage the development of such fuels.

H.R. 9375. September 4, 1975. Merchant

Marine and Fisheries. Amends the Federal Boat Safety Act of 1971 to authorize appropriations through fiscal year 1978, and to specify various duties of the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating.

H.R. 9376. September 4, 1975. Interior and Insular Affairs. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to establish and maintain the Tallgrass Prairie National Park in Kansas.

H.R. 9377. September 4, 1975. Government Operations. Authorizes appropriations to the State and Local Government Fiscal Assistance Trust Fund for revenue sharing purposes through fiscal year 1981.

Stipulates that payments under the State and Local Government Fiscal Assistance Act which are waived by the Indian tribe or Alaskan Native Village entitled to receive them shall become part of the entitlement of the county government in which such Tribe or Village is located.

H.R. 9378. September 4, 1975. Judiciary. Declares a certain individual eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant student under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

H.R. 9379. September 5, 1975. Post Office and Civil Service. Requires the United States Postal Service to provide any person residing in a rural area which does not receive postal delivery service with rent-free use of a postal lock box located at the rural station or branch nearest to the residence of such person.

H.R. 9380. September 5, 1975. Banking, Currency and Housing. Amends the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to extend coverage of the national flood insurance program to include losses from landslides which result from high-intensity precipitation.

H.R. 9381. September 5, 1975. Interior and Insular Affairs. Directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands in Florida to the present owners or owners of record.

H.R. 9382. September 5, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a limited tax credit in an amount equal to the amount of post-secondary education expenses paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year which are attributable to the attendance of any individual as a student at an institution of post-secondary education.

H.R. 9383. September 5, 1975. Ways and Means. Excludes service performed by police officers of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority from coverage under certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and the Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance program of the Social Security Act.

H.R. 9384. September 5, 1975. Government Operations. Authorizes Federal payments to county governments to compensate for the tax immunity of Federal lands within their boundaries.

H.R. 9385. September 5, 1975. Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Revises existing laws relating to the management of the National Wildlife Refuge System. Establishes a Bureau of National Wildlife Refuges in the Department of the Interior.

Establishes a system of classification of component units within the National Wildlife Refuge System. Designates certain lands in Alaska for inclusion in the system as national wildlife refuges or wildlands.

H.R. 9386. September 5, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from income amounts received by an individual during a taxable year as a pension, annuity, or other benefit under a State or local public retirement system.

H.R. 9387. September 5, 1975. Banking, Currency and Housing. Directs the Secretary of the Treasury to issue two-dollar bills bearing the portrait of Susan B. Anthony.

H.R. 9388. September 5, 1975. Post Office and Civil Service. Repeals recently enacted authorizations of pay increases in the salaries of Senators and Representatives.

H.R. 9389. September 5, 1975. Banking, Currency and Housing. Repeals the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.

H.R. 9390. September 5, 1975. Judiciary; Rules. Requires that whenever any officer or agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government proposes to prescribe certain rules and regulations or to make changes in rules or regulations, such proposals must be submitted to each House of Congress with a report containing a full explanation thereof. Stipulates that such rule, regulation, or change shall become effective unless either House of Congress disapproves within 60 days.

H.R. 9391. September 5, 1975. Interior and Insular Affairs. Revises the boundaries of the Manassas National Battlefield Park in Virginia. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire additional lands for the battlefield and to make minor revisions in the boundary. Establishes procedures to allow owners of property within the boundaries of the battlefield to retain a right of use and occupancy.

H.R. 9392. September 5, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Prohibits distributors and refiners of petroleum products from canceling franchises without cause and without prior notice.

H.R. 9393. September 5, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Establishes a National Commission on Regulatory Reform to study and make recommendations on the activities and effect on the economy of certain Federal regulatory agencies.

H.R. 9394. September 5, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Establishes a National Commission on Regulatory Reform to study and make recommendations on the activities and effect on the economy of certain Federal regulatory agencies.

H.R. 9395. September 5, 1975. Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Establishes a National Commission on Regulatory Reform to study and make recommendations on the activities and effect on the economy of certain Federal regulatory agencies.

H.R. 9396. September 5, 1975. Ways and

Means. Requires States which have entered into agreements with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for coverage of State and local employees under the Social Security Act to make payments and reports to the Secretary of the Treasury on a calendar-quarter basis.

H.R. 9397. September 5, 1975. Ways and Means. Amends the Social Security Act by allowing a State to terminate social security coverage for policemen and firemen without affecting the coverage of other public employees.

H.R. 9398. September 5, 1975. Public Works and Transportation. Amends the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to extend authorization provisions of the Act for an additional three fiscal years.

H.R. 9399. September 5, 1975. Post Office and Civil Service. Repeals recently enacted authorizations of increases in the salaries of Senators and Representatives.

SENATE—Thursday, September 25, 1975

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. JOHN GLENN, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

PRAYER

The Reverend Monsignor W. Louis Quinn, pastor, St. Matthews Cathedral, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, You have blessed our land with great and bountiful natural resources. You have endowed our citizens with a generous spirit and a desire to see all live in the free exercise of the rights with which You have created them. You have given us leaders who have challenged us to rise above petty selfishness and to concern ourselves with the good of all we can reach.

Forgive our failures, give us the courage to be sons and daughters worthy of You. We pray this day that You may guide and direct the minds and hearts of the Members of this Senate, that they may direct their energies in the pursuit of justice, truth, and the good of all whom they have been elected to serve. May they be worthy of the trust You and all of us have placed in them.

May Your will be expressed in all that they say and do and in all they seek for and from us. We ask this through Your Son, our Lord, Jesus Christ. 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 legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., September 25, 1975.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JOHN GLENN, a Senator from the State of Ohio, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GLENN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 24, 1975, be approved.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendars Nos. 331, 378, and 381.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FREE DUTY ON CERTAIN DYEING AND TANNING MATERIALS

The bill (H.R. 7715) to extend until the close of June 30, 1978, the period during which certain dyeing and tanning materials may be imported free of duty, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMERGENCY GRAIN STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1975

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) to provide emergency authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to restore confidence in the U.S. grain inspection system, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Emergency Grain Standards Amendments of 1975".

TITLE I—CRIMINAL OFFENSES AND PENALTIES

Sec. 101. (a) (1) Section 13 of the United States Grain Standards Act (39 Stat. 482, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 71, 74-79, 84-87, and 87a-87h) is amended by striking out the word "knowingly" wherever it appears in subsections (a) and (b).

(2) Section 6(b) of the United States Grain Standards Act is amended by striking out "knowingly".

(b) Section 13(c) of the United States Grain Standards Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) An offense shall be deemed to have been committed under this section only if it is shown that the person committing the offense had either an 'intentional', 'knowing', 'reckless', or 'negligent' state of mind with respect to the offense as defined in subsection (d) of this section."

(c) Section 13 of the United States Grain Standards Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The following definitions apply with respect to an offense set forth in this section:

"(1) 'Intentional'—A person's state of mind is intentional if it is his conscious objective or desire to engage in the conduct and to cause the result.

"(2) 'Knowing'—A person's state of mind is knowing if he is aware of the nature of his conduct, he is aware or believes that requisite circumstances exist, and he is aware or believes that his conduct is substantially certain to cause the result.

"(3) 'Reckless'—A person's state of mind is reckless if, with respect to a result of his conduct, he is aware of the risk that the result will occur but disregards the risk. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that its disregard constitutes a gross deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable person would exercise in such a situation.

"(4) 'Negligent'—A person's state of mind is negligent if, with respect to a result of his conduct, he ought to be aware of the risk that the result will occur. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that the failure to perceive it constitutes a gross deviation from the standard of care that a reasonable person would exercise in such a situation.