

Rios, Luis A., [redacted]
 Ritchie, Ronald W., [redacted]
 Rittmanic, Mark B., [redacted]
 Rivera, Enrique S., [redacted]
 Roberts, Henry D., Jr., [redacted]
 Roberts, Jeanne C., [redacted]
 Robinson, Bruce H., [redacted]
 Rodgers, Johnny O., [redacted]
 Rodriguez, Francis X., [redacted]
 Rosbeck, Ronald C., [redacted]
 Rosenberg, David C., II, [redacted]
 Ross, John M., [redacted]
 Ross, Keith J., [redacted]
 Rouse, John E., [redacted]
 Runyon, Susan E., [redacted]
 Sadler, John R., II, [redacted]
 Salassi, Louise A., [redacted]
 Sanders, Charles R., Jr., [redacted]
 Savage, Marilyn J., [redacted]
 Schambach, Paul D., [redacted]
 Schiavoni, Stephen J., [redacted]
 Schimkat, Peter A., [redacted]
 Schodlbauer, Robert A., [redacted]
 Schons, Mark F., [redacted]
 Schumacher, Ruth A., [redacted]
 Scott, Michael P., [redacted]
 Sell, John P., [redacted]
 Seuffer, Paul M., [redacted]
 Seymore, Roger D., [redacted]
 Shaffer, Michael E., [redacted]
 Shepherd, John C., [redacted]
 Shimabukuro, Dennis Y., [redacted]
 Shrives, Mark W., [redacted]
 Shuman, Jeffrey S., [redacted]
 Simkins, Hiram D., [redacted]
 Simon, Alfred J., [redacted]
 Simpson, Paul M., [redacted]
 Singleton, Daniel G., [redacted]
 Skeen, David L., [redacted]
 Slaughter, Charles D., [redacted]
 Slayton, Bernard, [redacted]
 Sloan, Diane R., [redacted]
 Smart, Leroy P., [redacted]
 Smith, Beatrice, [redacted]
 Smith, Clayton G., [redacted]
 Smith, Ernest A., Jr., [redacted]
 Smith, James B., [redacted]
 Smith, Jon R., [redacted]

Smith, Michael J., [redacted]
 Sozio, Michael A., [redacted]
 Speaker, Gregory C., [redacted]
 Spiker, Robert P., [redacted]
 Spring, Michael Y., [redacted]
 Stafford, Arthur T., III, [redacted]
 Stark, Kenneth J., [redacted]
 Steckel, Paul W., [redacted]
 Stephens, Loren D., [redacted]
 Stevenson, David, [redacted]
 Stith, Lonnie L., [redacted]
 Stoetzer, Charles E., [redacted]
 Storey, Cynthia J., [redacted]
 Strader, Lacy E., [redacted]
 Street, Victor L., [redacted]
 Strong, Cynthia C., [redacted]
 Stull, Robert W., [redacted]
 Sturup, Warren B., [redacted]
 Styer, John C., [redacted]
 Sullivan, Michael J., [redacted]
 Swaringen, Mark A., [redacted]
 Swarts, John C., [redacted]
 Tammany, Thomas, [redacted]
 Taylor, William C., [redacted]
 Terrell, Constance E., [redacted]
 Tippet, David E., [redacted]
 Thomas, Randolph J., [redacted]
 Thompson, Bonnie M., [redacted]
 Tosi, Amadio J., [redacted]
 Toski, Mary P., [redacted]
 Trent, Neal H., [redacted]
 Tryon, John A., [redacted]
 Turner, Michael G., [redacted]
 Underwood, Anthony P., [redacted]
 Uphoff, Frederick M., [redacted]
 Urban, Stephen A., [redacted]
 Uson, Jose, Jr., [redacted]
 Vantresca, Guy P., [redacted]
 Vega, Raymond A., [redacted]
 Vermillion, Michael L., [redacted]
 Vinacco, John J., Jr., [redacted]
 Vincent, James C., [redacted]
 Vogl, Mark K., [redacted]
 Walcott, Craig R., [redacted]
 Walker, Brett D., [redacted]
 Wall, James A., [redacted]
 Wall, Marvin O., [redacted]

Wallace, Alan L., [redacted]
 Wallace, Stephen O., [redacted]
 Waller, James L., [redacted]
 Walsh, Michael J., [redacted]
 Wanstall, Catherine R., [redacted]
 Warne, Richard N., [redacted]
 Warren, Robert S., [redacted]
 Watson, Cynthia J., [redacted]
 Watson, Larry, [redacted]
 Waugh, Michael L., [redacted]
 Webb, Anthony M., [redacted]
 Webb, Charles B., [redacted]
 Webb, Harold W., [redacted]
 Weed, John L., [redacted]
 Weidenthal, Kurt, II, [redacted]
 Wells, John E., [redacted]
 Wells, Thomas D., [redacted]
 West, William T., Jr., [redacted]
 White, Wayne M., [redacted]
 White, William A., [redacted]
 Widener, Michael A., [redacted]
 Wilde, Terry L., [redacted]
 Wilde, Vicki L., [redacted]
 Wilhide, David C., [redacted]
 Williams, Barry J., [redacted]
 Williams, Robert L., Jr., [redacted]
 Williamson, Ronald A., [redacted]
 Wollenberg, Larry E., [redacted]
 Wynn, James E., [redacted]
 Yandl, Steven J., [redacted]
 Yates, Douglas R., [redacted]
 York, Jay A., [redacted]
 York, Ken C., [redacted]
 Young, Hazel L., [redacted]
 Yurk, Michael J., [redacted]
 Yuzakewich, Michael D., [redacted]
 Zamecnik, David C., [redacted]
 Zimmerman, David C., [redacted]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Ernest LeRoy Boyer, of New York, to be Commissioner of Education, vice Edward Aguirre, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Elsa Allgood Porter, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice Joseph E. Kasputys, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 14, 1977

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid, neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee.—Joshua 1: 9.

Eternal Father of us all, in the quiet reverence of this sacred moment, we lift our hearts anew unto Thee praying that Thy grace will cleanse us, Thy power strengthen us, and Thy love create in us a greater spirit of good will. May Thy wisdom be our wisdom as we make our decisions this day. May Thy strength be our strength as we stand firmly for what is right. May Thy patience make us patient, Thy forgiveness make us forgiving, and Thy love make us loving, too.

Amid the disturbances of our day and the tenseness of our time keep us calm, hold us steady, and give us enough understanding to listen and to do what is right and good for all concerned.

In the spirit of Him who calls us to do justly we pray. 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 joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 269. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, for disaster relief.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11. An act to increase the authorization for the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 11) entitled "An act to increase the authorization for the Local Public Works Capital Development and Investment Act of 1976, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. BURDICK,

Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. STAFFORD, Mr. CHAFFEE, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mr. McCLEURE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 213. An act to amend the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 to provide for the audit, by the Comptroller General, of the Internal Revenue Service and of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms;

S. 964. An act to provide that the salaries of certain positions and individuals which were increased as a result of the operation of the Federal Salary Act of 1967 shall not be increased by the first comparability pay adjustment occurring after the date of the enactment of this act.

S. RES. 104

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Mr. Cannon of Nevada, Mr. Allen of Alabama, and Mr. Hatfield of Oregon.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Mr. Cannon of Nevada, Mr. Pell of Rhode Island, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Griffin of Michigan, and Mr. Baker of Tennessee.

The message also announced that the chairman of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, pursuant to section 712(a)(1) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, appointed Mr. PROXMIER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. BROOKE, and Mr. TOWER to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Joint Committee on Defense Production for the 95th Congress.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to section 6968(a), title 10 of the United States Code, appointed Mr. BUMPERS (Armed Services), Mr. SASSER (Appropriations), Mr. MATHIAS (Appropriations), and Mr. CHAFEE (At-Large) to be members, on the part of the Senate, of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 85-474, appointed Mr. SPARKMAN (chairman), Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. DURKIN, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. STAFFORD to attend, on the part of the Senate, the Interparliamentary Union Conference, to be held in Canberra, Australia, April 11 to 16, 1977.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

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

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to extend for 2 years the Defense Production Act of 1950. The act is due to expire on September 30, 1977. My bill would simply extend it to September 30, 1979.

The Defense Production Act is the statutory mechanism by which our Government can insure that our industrial capacity and resource inventories remain at levels necessary to safeguard the national security.

Briefly, the act provides authority for the President to: First, give priority to vital defense contracts; second, allocate materials and facilities needed for defense programs; third, expand the Nation's productive capacity to insure that defense needs can be met, including the making of loans and loan guarantees to private business enterprises; fourth, encourage increased participation by small business enterprises in defense contracts; fifth, request various elements of the private sector to enter into voluntary agreements to develop preparedness programs and to expand productive capacity and supply, with such agreements providing an affirmative defense against antitrust prosecution; and sixth, establish a national defense executive reserve—a pool of trained executives to be available to the Government in the event of a required rapid mobilization. Extension of the Defense Production Act would also continue the Joint Committee on Defense Production.

In all, some 18 departments, agencies, and boards of the Federal Government participate directly in the implementation of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Defense Production Act was first passed during the Korean war, and it has been extended by every Congress since then. I believe it is neces-

sary legislation and should be extended for another 2 years.

RESOLVED: EVERY MEMBER OF CONGRESS SHOULD PREPARE HIS OWN INCOME TAX RETURN

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

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase the report of Capt. Oliver Hazard Perry on his historic victory in 1812, and with apologies for grammatical license, "We have met the enemy and they are us?"

This is the personal report of at least one Member of Congress who has emerged victorious from the menacing labyrinths of Federal income tax form 1040. To be sure, it is a relatively modest victory. More important, any impulse to heroics is subdued by the sober realization of the responsibility which the Congress must bear for the complex, abstruse, productivity-limiting tax code upon which the tax forms are based. But if we had to reach the present maddening level of mystifying tax codification in order to be prodded into change then there may be some promise of eventual victory. And if we do lay siege to the burdensome tax structure, it would appear that we are not without a powerful ally in the Executive, judging from the President's endorsement of tax simplification during his recent telephone hook-up with the Nation.

In the thought that added incentive to the process of demolition and reconstruction may be necessary, I am today introducing a resolution to require that every Member of Congress prepare his own income tax return without assistance until Congress exercises its responsibility to lift the burden on the rest of the Nation's taxpayers. The text of the resolution follows:

H. CON. RES. —

Whereas recent tax legislation has made Federal tax laws increasingly complex;

Whereas this increase in complexity has forced many persons to seek professional assistance to prepare their tax returns;

Whereas Congress, while bearing responsibility for the complexity of the Federal tax laws and with the authority to simplify them, has not enacted tax simplification legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of Congress that every Member of Congress must prepare his own income tax return without assistance until Congress exercises its responsibility and prerogative to ease the burden that the complex and obtuse tax laws place on taxpayers.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2647, INCREASING SBA LOAN LIMITATIONS AND SURETY BOND AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2647) to amend the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase loan limitations and to increase surety bond authorizations, and ask unanimous consent that the

statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 8, 1977.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this matter is non-controversial and has bipartisan support; and it should not take very long.

The House has already passed H.R. 692, an omnibus bill which would specify program levels at which SBA would be authorized to operate for fiscal years 1978 and 1979. The Senate has already commenced holding hearings on this bill.

In the meantime, the bill H.R. 2647 is an interim measure which merely increases the amount of loans which may be outstanding at any one time and it also increases the authorization for appropriation to the surety bond guarantees fund.

The program levels at which SBA is designed to operate for the remainder of this fiscal year have already been approved by the Appropriations Committee and subsequently by the Congress and the President. It is the primary purpose of this bill to allow SBA to continue operating at these previously approved levels and also to have some flexibility to operate at higher levels if the Congress and the President so desire without our committee being required to bring additional legislation to the floor to increase the limitations.

The bill agreed upon in conference would increase the Small Business Administration's overall loan ceiling to \$7.4 billion from the present \$6 billion—the House bill would have increased it to \$8 billion and the Senate amendment would have increased it to \$6.8 billion—increase the sublimitation for economic opportunity loans to \$525 million from \$450 million—as provided in the House bill; no comparable Senate provision—and for financial assistance to small business investment companies to \$887.5 million from \$725 million—the House bill would have increased it to \$1.1 billion and the Senate amendment would have increased it to \$775 million. The surety bond guarantees fund would be increased to \$110 million from \$56.5 million—as provided in the House bill; the Senate amendment would have increased it to \$68.5 million.

I believe that this is a good compromise and that it will provide SBA with the needed flexibility and I urge my colleagues to approve it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in wholehearted support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2647. It is extremely important to the Small Business Administration and its constituency that this conference report be approved immediately.

The bill, H.R. 2647, was passed by the House on February 1 of this year. It is a simple, noncontroversial bill which merely raises the ceilings on the amount of obligations the Small Business Administration may have outstanding. It raises the ceiling on the small business loan and investment fund, the subceiling on economic opportunity—minority enterprise—loans, the ceiling on small business investment company loans; and the authorization for surety bond guarantees.

Action is needed immediately in each of these areas, because the Small Business Administration has reached its statutory ceilings.

The House version of the bill raised the ceiling for the business loan and investment fund from \$6 billion to \$8 billion, the subceiling on EOL loans from \$450 million to \$525 million, the ceiling on SBIC loans from \$725 million to \$1.1 billion, and the surety bond guarantee authorization from \$56 million to \$110 million.

The new ceilings approved by the House were designed to carry the SBA through this fiscal year and into the next fiscal year. It was our intention to insure that the agency could continue to operate at the current or increased levels until the other body had an opportunity to act on another House bill, H.R. 692, which would provide annual levels of operation for the next 2 fiscal years.

The other body increased the ceiling for the business loan and investment fund from \$6 billion to \$6.8 billion. It failed to raise the subceiling on EOL loans. It raised the ceiling on SBIC loans to only \$887.5 million and the authorization for surety bond guarantees to only \$68.5 million.

We have received assurances that H.R. 692, which provides new ceilings for the fiscal years 1978 and 1979, will be acted on before the end of this fiscal year. For that reason, the House conferees did not insist on the House figures for the business loan and investment fund and the small business investment company loans. On the other hand, we felt that the figures adopted by the other body were too low to permit the SBA to operate at a desired accelerated pace through this fiscal year. Consequently, the conference substitute split the difference in these two areas.

The conferees agreed that the House figures in the other two areas, the economic opportunity loans and the surety bond program, were appropriate and needed. Consequently, the conference substitute adopts the House figures.

The conference substitute is a fair, adequate, and needed compromise. I remind my colleagues that the Small Business Administration must, due to statutory limitations, severely curtail its activity immediately if this conference substitute is not adopted.

For these reasons, I urge a favorable vote on approving the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 355, nays 1, not voting 76, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]
YEAS—355

Abdnor	Conte	Harsha
Addabbo	Conyers	Hawkins
Akaka	Corcoran	Hefner
Alexander	Corman	Heftel
Allen	Cornell	Hightower
Ammerman	Coughlin	Hollenbeck
Anderson,	Crane	Holt
Calif.	D'Amours	Hoitzman
Anderson, Ill.	Daniel, Dan	Horton
Andrews,	Daniel, R. W.	Howard
N. Dak.	Danielson	Hubbard
Annunzio	Davis	Huckaby
Archer	de la Garza	Hughes
Armstrong	Delaney	Hyde
Ashbrook	Dent	Ichord
Ashley	Derrick	Ire and
Aspin	Derwinski	Jacobs
AuCoin	Devine	Jeffords
Badham	Dicks	Jenkins
Bafalis	Diggs	Jenrette
Baldus	Dingell	Johnson, Calif.
Barnard	Downey	Johnson, Co. o.
Baucus	Drinan	Jones, N.C.
Bauman	Duncan, Oreg.	Jones, Okla.
Beard, R.I.	Duncan, Tenn.	Jones, Tenn.
Beard, Tenn.	Early	Jordan
Bedell	Edgar	Kasten
Bellenson	Edwards, A.a.	Kastenmeier
Benjamin	Edwards, Okla.	Kazen
Bennett	Elberg	Kelly
Bevill	English	Ketchum
B'ingham	Erlenborn	Keys
Blanchard	Ertel	Kildee
Blouin	Evans, Co'o.	Kindness
Boggs	Evans, Del.	Koch
Bolling	Evans, Ga.	Kostmayer
Bonior	Fary	Krebs
Bonker	Fascell	Lagomarsino
Bowen	Fenwick	Latta
Brademas	Fisher	Le Fante
Breaux	F'ithian	Leach
Brinkley	Flippo	Lederer
Brodhead	Flood	Leggett
Brooks	Flowers	Lehman
Broomfield	Flynt	Lent
Brown, Mich.	Fo.ey	Levitas
Brown, Ohio	Ford, Mich.	Lloyd, Calif.
Broyhill	Forsythe	Lloyd, Tenn.
Buchanan	Fountain	Long, La.
Burke, Calif.	Fraser	Long, Md.
Burke, Fla.	Frenzel	Lott
Burke, Mass.	Gammage	Luken
Burleson, Tex.	Gaydos	Lundine
Burlison, Mo	Gephardt	McClory
Burton, John	G'iamo	McCloskey
Burton, Phillip	Gibbons	McCormack
Butler	Ginn	McDade
Byron	Glickman	McFall
Caputo	Goodling	McHugh
Carney	Gore	McKay
Carr	Gradison	McKinney
Carter	Grassley	Madigan
Cavanaugh	Gudger	Maguire
Cederberg	Hagedorn	Mahon
Chisholm	Hall	Mann
Clausen,	Hamilton	Markey
Don H.	Hammer	Marks
Clawson, Del	schmidt	Marriott
Cleveland	Han'ey	Martin
Cochran	Hannaford	Mathis
Coleman	Hansen	Mattox
Collins, Tex.	Harrington	Mazzoli
Conable	Harris	Meeds

Meyner	Quie	Stanton
Michel	Quillen	Stark
Mikva	Rahall	Steed
Miller, Calif.	Rallsback	Steers
Mineta	Rangel	Stratton
Minish	Regula	Studds
Mitchell, Md.	Rhodes	Symms
Mitchell, N.Y.	Rinaldo	Taylor
Moakley	Risenhoover	Thompson
Moffett	Roberts	Thone
Mollohan	Robinson	Traxler
Moore	Roe	Treen
Moorhead,	Rogers	Trible
Calif.	Roncallo	Tsongas
Moss	Rooney	Tucker
Mottl	Rose	Udall
Murphy, Ill.	Rosenthal	Ullman
Murphy, N.Y.	Rosenkowski	Van Deerlin
Murphy, Pa.	Rousselot	Vento
Murtha	Roybal	Volkmer
Myers, Gary	Rudd	Waggonner
Myers, Ind.	Runnels	Walgren
Myers Michael	Russo	Walker
Natcher	Ryan	Walsh
Nedzi	Sarasin	Wampler
Nix	Satterfield	Watkins
Nolan	Schroeder	Weaver
Nowak	Schulze	Weiss
O'Brien	Sebelius	Whalen
Oakar	Seiberling	White
Oberstar	Sharp	Whitehurst
Obey	Shipley	Whitley
Fanetta	Shuster	Whitten
Patten	Sikes	Wiggins
Pattison	Sisk	Wilson, Bob
Pease	Ske ton	Wilson, Tex.
Pepper	Skubitz	Winn
Ferkins	S'ack	Wirth
Pettis	Smith, Iowa	Wolf
Pickie	Smith, Nebr.	Wright
Pike	Snyder	Wylder
Poage	So.arz	Wylie
Pressler	Spellman	Yates
Preyer	Spence	Yatron
Price	St Germain	Young, Mo.
Pritchard	Staggers	Young, Tex.
Quayle	Stangeland	Zablocki

NAYS—1

McDonald
NOT VOTING—76

Ambro	Ford, Tenn.	Fatterson
Andrews, N.C.	Frey	Pursell
Applegate	Fuqua	Reuss
Badillo	Gilman	Richmond
Blaggi	Goldwater	Rodino
Boland	Gonzalez	Ruppe
Breckinridge	Guyer	Santini
Brown, Ca. if.	Harkin	Sawyer
Burgener	Heckler	Scheuer
Chappell	Hillis	Simon
Cay	Holland	Steiger
Cohen	Kemp	Stockman
Collins, Ill.	Krueger	Stokes
Cornwell	LaFalce	Stump
Cotter	Lujan	Teague
Dellums	McEwen	Thornton
Dickinson	Marlenee	Tonry
Dodd	Metcalfe	Vander Jagt
Dornan	Mikulski	Vanik
Eckhardt	Milford	Waxman
Edwards, Calif.	Miller, Ohio	Wilson, C. H.
Emery	Montgomery	Young, Alaska
Evans, Ind.	Moorhead, Pa.	Young, F.a.
Findley	Neal	Zeferetti
Fish	Nichols	
Florio	Ottinger	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague with Mr. Andrews of North Carolina.
Mr. Zeferetti with Mr. Ford of Tennessee.
Mr. Ambro with Mr. Gonzalez.
Mr. Chappell with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Dellums with Mr. Milford.
Mr. Cotter with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Florio with Mr. Young of Alaska.
Mr. LaFalce with Mr. Miller of Ohio.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Marlenee.
Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Bergener.
Mr. Richmond with Mr. Gilman.
Mr. Stokes with Mr. Thornton.
Mr. Waxman with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Badillo with Mr. Eckhardt.
Mr. Blaggi with Mr. Cohen.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Kemp.

Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Dodd with Mr. Flindley.
 Ms. Mikulski with Mr. Reuss.
 Mr. Metcalfe with Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California.
 Mr. Holland with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Harkin with Mr. Goldwater.
 Mr. Breckinridge with Mr. Pursell.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Hillis.
 Mr. Clay with Mr. Scheuer.
 Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Cornwell.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Sawyer.
 Mr. Evans of Indiana with Mr. Dornan.
 Mr. Ottlinger with Mr. Vander Jagt.
 Mr. Vanik with Mr. Emery.
 Mr. Tonry with Mr. Young of Florida.
 Mr. Stump with Mr. Guyer.
 Mr. Simon with Mrs. Heckler.
 Mr. Santini with Mr. Steiger.
 Mr. Neal with Mr. Patterson of California.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Iowa moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS TO REPUBLICAN OFFICIAL OBJECTORS COMMITTEES FOR CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

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

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing my appointments to the Republican official objectors committees for the Consent and Private Calendars.

For the Consent Calendar, the Republican official objectors for the 95th Congress will be the gentleman from Florida, Mr. FREY, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SCHULZE, and the gentleman from California, Mr. BADHAM.

For the Private Calendar, the Republican official objectors for the 95th Congress will be the gentleman from California, Mr. ROUSSELOT, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. WYLIE, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. BAUMAN.

FREEDOM AS A REWARD FOR TERRORISM

(Mr. KREBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, last week this city and the rest of the Nation witnessed one more terrorist activity of the type that gave us Munich, Lydda, Maalot, Khartoum and other demented terrorists' outrages. For 38 long hours these outlaws threatened to decapitate their innocent hostages, after having murdered a 22-year-old reporter and having injured other innocent human beings.

Since then several of these criminals have been released without bail to walk the streets of this city as free men as a reward for their activities of last week.

I believe it is impossible for the American people to understand that we have a system of justice in any part of these United States which would tolerate this kind of judicial process. While we all commend the police of this city and the three ambassadors who were instrumental in the release of the hostages, I think it behooves the city of Washington to clean its house so as to make it possible for the American people to renew their faith in our system of justice.

FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON

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

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Frances Payne Bolton has removed from this earth a lady who became one of the most distinguished Members of this body during her 30 years of service from 1939 to 1969. Mrs. Bolton was the wife of one Member of Congress from Ohio, Representative Chester Bolton, and the mother of another, Representative Oliver Bolton.

Mrs. Bolton, who died last week at the age of 92, was more than just a Congresswoman. In Congress, she was an influential member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, but she also was a driving force for improvements in the nursing profession.

Out of Congress, she found time for massive philanthropic and public service activities, in which she recognized her responsibilities as one of the richest women in the world, and at the same time to pursue political activities in behalf of the Republican Party, serving as vice chairman of the national Republican program committee and a member of Ohio's Republican State Central Committee. When she left Congress in 1969, she was the senior Republican on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and had headed up a number of its subcommittees.

She will, I am sure, find herself a niche in the Valhalla to which we all aspire in our afterlives.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1746, UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945 TO HALT IMPORTATION OF RHODESIAN CHROME

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call

up House Resolution 397 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 397

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. 1746) 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 one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion 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 with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CHISHOLM) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes for the minority to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 397 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1746, a bill which amends the United Nations Participation Act in order to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate and is an open rule.

H.R. 1746 would amend section 5(a) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 by providing that an Executive order issued under this section that would reimpose the embargo against Rhodesian chrome will be enforceable, notwithstanding any other provision of any other law. In other words upon enactment of this bill the President could issue an Executive order banning the importation of Rhodesian chrome notwithstanding the provisions of the so-called Byrd amendment which amended the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act in 1971.

Under the terms of the bill, the President would be given the discretionary authority to exempt shipments that were already in transit at the time this bill was enacted so that there will be no undue hardship on importers.

The bill also seeks to prevent the indirect importation of chrome from Rhodesia via foreign-made specialty steels. Imported chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel products would have to bear a certificate of origin that stated that the material therein was not from Rhodesia.

Mr. Speaker, long-term U.S. economic interests in Africa will be aided by repeal of the Byrd amendment. African nations have large supplies of valuable natural resources and future American access to these resources could be denied if the United States fails to fully support the majority rule in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, at this juncture I yield

to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT).

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York has outlined the provisions of this 1-hour, open rule allowing for the consideration of H.R. 1746, a bill to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

What the legislation is designed to do is permit the President to reimpose the embargo on imports of chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel from Rhodesia. Since the President has indicated his strong support for the embargo and this bill, there is little doubt but that the import ban against Rhodesia will be implemented should H.R. 1746 be enacted into law.

It is my understanding that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) intends to offer an amendment to the bill, and I am sure there will be a number of other amendments, but the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) did come before the Rules Committee and discuss his amendment. It would authorize the President to suspend the operation of the embargo if in his opinion such suspension would promote meaningful negotiations for a peaceful resolution of the problems in Rhodesia. I understand the gentleman's amendment will be in order, according to the Parliamentarian, and I shall support it.

Mr. Speaker, there was testimony from both sides of the aisle before the Rules Committee, both pro and con, and certainly this is a very emotional issue and one this House has debated at length in the past.

What I find difficult to rationalize is this Nation's general abhorrence of economic boycotts with its apparent acquiescence in just such a boycott against Rhodesia. From what I have gathered from recent news accounts, the circumstances in Southern Africa have changed dramatically since very similar legislation to this was considered in the last Congress. Yet, only 1 day of hearings were held in the subcommittee before the bill before us today was reported.

One of the responsibilities of the Rules Committee is to make sure that legislation which comes before this body has been properly considered in the committee. I submit the political situation is so complex and volatile, we should take the time to adequately review the entire issue in the light of new developments. I would urge this body to proceed very cautiously and carefully in considering passage of such legislation to make sure we are not endangering the interests of the United States. I think there are some basic questions that have to be addressed in debate on this bill and I am sure they will be. How is the Soviet chrome less tainted for their violation of human rights than Rhodesian chrome?

How much is the price going to increase that we pay for Rhodesian chrome? How many members of the U.N. abide by the present embargo on Rhodesian imports and how many do not? I think we will be surprised by the number that do not abide by it. As a matter of

fact, we will probably be joining the minority of the members of the United Nations.

Finally, how well will the embargo be enforced against indirect imports of chrome from Rhodesia? In other words, will we be buying chrome at higher prices from Russia?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot oppose the adoption of this rule on parliamentary grounds, but I do oppose the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot oppose the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1746 which would amend the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome into this country. This legislation was supported by the previous two Republican administrations and now has the support of the present Carter administration. All this amendment would do would be to bring the United States back into full compliance with the U.N. economic sanctions against Rhodesia which we first approved in the Security Council in 1966, and again when they were expanded in 1968 to make them comprehensive. At the present time, the United States and South Africa are the only nations which openly flout these sanctions and thus publicly violate international law.

Mr. Speaker, there have been some who have argued in the past that U.S. support for the sanctions under chapter 7 of the U.N. Charter was mistaken because the Rhodesian minority regime's breakaway from Great Britain in 1965 did not constitute a threat to international peace and security as required by that chapter for the imposition of international sanctions. I seriously doubt if anyone today would make that argument given the volatile situation in southern Africa and all its international implications and pitfalls. This clearly is a situation which is fraught with peril for the international community, and the United States cannot sit idly by while that situation erodes, especially when the continuation of our economic support for the minority regime under the Byrd amendment only contributes to its resistance to majority rule.

Mr. Speaker, many of the old arguments used to oppose repeal of the Byrd amendment no longer apply. Innovations in the steel industry no longer make us as dependent on Rhodesian chrome as we were in the past. Moreover, the abandonment of this amendment is in the best long-term interest of U.S. foreign policy and national security interests. We have become increasingly dependent on raw materials from other African nations which view with disdain our continued flouting of sanctions against Rhodesia. By the same token, the imminence of majority rule in Rhodesia should give us sufficient cause for concern and action to insure future access to its resources and favorable treatment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think this is the most opportune and propitious time to abandon the Byrd amendment to demonstrate to the Smith regime and the world community, not only our strong support for human rights and majority

rule in Rhodesia, but to bring further pressure to bear on the Smith regime to go back to the negotiating table and work out a peaceful transition settlement for majority rule in that country.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK).

Mrs. FENWICK. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself most earnestly with the gentleman's fine remarks. I think they convey the feelings many of us have, and I am happy to be able to associate myself with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her contribution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would say that in addition to giving strong support today, I would hope, for majority rule, for human rights, that the result of this action might be, hopefully, to bring further pressure to bear on the Smith regime to go back to the negotiating table and to work out the peaceful transition settlement that will bring about majority rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from New York and my good friend (Mrs. CHISHOLM) for yielding to me, even though I think a great deal differently than she does on the proposal we are considering today.

I would think that the Members of the House are well aware of my feelings toward this repealer of the Byrd amendment, which has been discussed many times previously in this body. I have branded it as the most hypocritical resolution ever to come before this great parliamentary body. Ostensibly, the proposals predicate the repeal of the Byrd amendment on America's dedication to human rights, but still I would point out to the Members of the House that this measure prohibits the importation of chrome and nickel from Rhodesia, but it permits the importation of chrome from Russia, a nation which Henry Kissinger himself has testified before this Congress is less democratic than the nation of Rhodesia.

This measure, Mr. Speaker, is steeped in cleverness, but it is lacking in character. It is polluted with hypocrisy; it is short on principle. The proposed sanctions against Rhodesia were born in hypocrisy. Today, 11 years later, the sanctions are still wallowing in hypocrisy.

Why do I say so? To begin with, the sanctions are illegal. Why are they illegal? This is because the United Nations Charter itself only permits sanctions against a given nation if that nation is a threat to world peace. Is Rhodesia a threat to world peace? Is there any Member of this body who can stand up on the floor of this House and honestly state that Rhodesia is a threat to world

peace? Perhaps one might honestly do that, but I do not think that anyone on the Foreign Affairs Committee or anyone who actually knows about conditions in Rhodesia and southern Africa would believe that statement.

This is what Secretary Kissinger had to say about the matter less than 2 years ago, and I read from the record the testimony of Secretary Kissinger before the body:

Senator BYRD. Do you think our actions toward Rhodesia are just or unjust?

Secretary KISSINGER. I think it reflects the decisions of the international community and the general conviction about justice.

Senator BYRD. Well, I am not clear whether you regard it as just or unjust.

Secretary KISSINGER. Our action? Yes, I recognize it as just.

Senator BYRD. You recognize our action in embargoing trade with Rhodesia as being just?

Secretary KISSINGER. Yes.

Senator BYRD. Do you regard the Soviet Union as being governed by a tight dictatorship, by a very few persons over a great number of individuals?

Secretary KISSINGER. I consider the Soviet Union, yes, as a dictatorship of an oligarchic nature, that is, of a small number of people in the Politburo.

Senator BYRD. In your judgment, is Rhodesia a threat to world peace?

Secretary KISSINGER. No.

Senator BYRD. In your judgment, is Russia a potential threat to world peace?

Secretary KISSINGER. I think the Soviet Union has the military capacity to disturb the peace, yes.

Senator BYRD. In your judgment, does Russia have a more democratic government than Rhodesia?

Secretary KISSINGER. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. I, Mr. Speaker, am not trying to preserve the status quo in Rhodesia. I was reared to loathe racism in any form. I was also reared to loathe hypocrisy. I have no personal economic interest, from the standpoint of my district, I would state to my colleagues in the House. I have no stainless steel industry. But I do have the unique experience of having Bishop Muzorewa, the greatest moral force in Rhodesia, the black Bishop Abel Muzorewa, to have gone to school in my congressional district. I met with Bishop Muzorewa when the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS) and I were in Rhodesia a little over a year and one-half ago.

Last Friday I talked to Dr. Chabunduku, who was the secretary to Bishop Muzorewa's party. I also talked to Ian Smith, by the way. I do not have time at this particular time to discuss my amendment in detail; but I hope and I plead with the gentleman from Minnesota that he accept my amendment. I know that he is now talking to the State Department about the amendment.

Why do I ask that this amendment be accepted? I charge, Mr. Speaker—and I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will concur in my statement—that there are very few people on the

floor of this House who actually know what is going on in Rhodesia. How many of the Members have been there? I charged last Monday, Mr. Speaker, on the floor of this House that our State Department, in the main, was ignorant about what was going on in Rhodesia. Why is the American State Department ignorant? Because we have no contact whatsoever with the nation of Rhodesia. The only intelligence that we have is the intelligence that we get through the British. I say to the Members that there could be no more biased intelligence than that coming from the British. In fact, I would state to my distinguished friend and colleague from New York that probably the reason why the brilliant and fair proposal of Henry Kissinger failed was because he made the mistake of putting the British in charge of the negotiations to transfer power from a minority government to a majority government.

Mr. Speaker, placing the British in charge of those negotiations would be just about like placing the British in charge of negotiations leading to a treaty between George Washington's newly formed American Government and the Indians in 1792 to give America back to the Indians.

There are very few white Rhodesians who trust the British in Rhodesia, and most of them are of British extraction.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that if we continue in this body acting out of ignorance, if my colleagues will forgive me for saying that, we could very well have on our hands the blood of thousands of people, and in fact I will predict that we will have on our hands the blood of not only thousands of white Rhodesians but thousands of black Rhodesians if we proceed blindly without checking the status of negotiations in Rhodesia.

I am not so much against the repeal of the Byrd amendment as I am against the timing. At this particular time we could very well, by imposing an external settlement in Rhodesia, impose a black minority instead of a black majority government upon the people. This is a state of affairs that none of us desire.

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

Mr. ICHORD. I will gladly yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Earlier the gentleman referred to an amendment which he has indicated he will propose to the bill when we reach that part of the proceedings.

I want to advise the gentleman that my understanding of his amendment is that it would give the President the discretion to withhold the enforcement of the provisions of the bill before us if in his judgment it would facilitate the peaceful transition to majority rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). The time of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) has expired.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

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

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the discretion which the gentleman seeks is contained in the bill at the present time, but in order to make absolutely clear that the discretion exists, it is my present intention—and I have consulted with some of the other members of the committee concerning this—to accept the gentleman's amendment at the time it is offered.

My understanding also is that if the amendment is agreed to, the present intention of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) would be to support the adoption of the bill as amended.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I would state to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) that it is my great fear that if we proceed without my amendment, the President will not take advantage of this discretion. I urge upon the Members that it is necessary that we write legislative history to make it clear that we want him to look into the situation to see how close they are to successful negotiations in Rhodesia and how close they are to a peaceful transition of power from a minority government to a black majority government.

In that event, as much as I feel that the measure is steeped in hypocrisy, I would still vote for it because I do not want the blood of thousands of blacks and whites on my hands.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN).

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have before us today the latest in a long series of liberal foreign policy initiatives regarding Africa which in my opinion could eventually culminate in the complete subjugation of the African Continent by communism. Many of the nations of that area are already under the control of leftist or Communist dictatorships, armed with Soviet weapons and in the case of Angola, aided by Castroite colonials.

Why would I make such a serious charge? Is not the real issue here the political and moral and human rights of the people of Rhodesia? Should not the Congress of the United States be willing to cast its vote for decency and humanity against the racist regime of Ian Smith?

We know the answers to those questions are not simple and yet this legislation before us is one of the simplest responses to a highly complex problem one could imagine.

There are many good arguments supporting the retention of the Byrd amendment, not the least of which is the economic effect its repeal will have on American industries and American consumers. We hear a great deal of collective wailing about the plight of consumers from our liberal brethren in this House, but today the fact that consumers will get socked with increased costs for specialty steel products as a result of this bill is the price unfortunate Americans must pay so that liberal foreign policy objectives can be attained.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the real cause at issue here is human rights, and so the

United States will move away from the politically and morally contaminated low-cost chrome of Rhodesia, which we need, and turn instead to increasing our purchases from the Soviet Union, a nation we all know to be a paragon of international virtue, where seldom is heard a dissident word, and the political prisons operate 24 hours a day. By our vote today we say to the world that America will have nothing to do with the white racists, but we will embrace the Red totalitarians who have subjected half the world to their tyranny, murder, and mass bloodshed. But then we were told only last month by our new Ambassador to the United Nations that communism is no threat to Africa, but racism is.

This despite the fact that Angola has fallen to the Communists, Mozambique is controlled by Communists, and the Soviet Union's shipments of arms, munitions, and Cuban mercenaries to numerous African states is somehow supposed to bring peace and freedom.

Or perhaps the legislation before us will force America to turn to South Africa as a source of more of our chrome. That nation has the second largest supply in the world. But, you say, is not South Africa constantly attacked by the self-same people who are pushing hardest for the enactment of the bill we will vote on today? Of course it is, and that nation will be next on the list for boycotts and trade restrictions, and our liberal brethren have already made that clear.

Mr. Speaker, of all the forums in the world which should set the standard for morality, it is laughable that we should be told that the United States has an obligation to follow the United Nations in its boycott of Rhodesia. This is the same U.N. which condemned Israel as a "racist" nation. The same U.N. whose Commission on—would you believe?—Human Rights refused last week in Geneva to investigate the bloody carnage which is and has been taking place in Idi Amin's Uganda, where more than 50,000 people have been slaughtered in an area not much bigger than the State of Maryland.

Lastly, by our action here today, if we do repeal the Byrd amendment, we are indeed giving what one of our colleagues has called "a strong signal to the world community," not as he suggests, that America is committed to achieving majority rule in southern Africa by peaceful means, but rather a signal that the United States will join, even though tacitly, with the forces of darkness and violence that wish to crush all hope of freedom for the people of Rhodesia, both black and white.

I hold no brief for Ian Smith and his government. In a matter of months that government will be gone, even as Mr. Smith himself finally has pledged to transfer power to a new government representative of all the people of his nation. But by our unnecessary slap at Rhodesia today we will lend encouragement to the guerrilla forces, armed with Soviet weapons and trained by their Cuban clients, who are slaughtering blacks and whites, bishops, nuns, ministers, priests, mothers, fathers, children indiscriminately. By our vote we will dis-

courage those democratic black elements in Rhodesia who might be seeking a peaceful transition to majority rule.

And, Mr. Speaker, a question must be raised here today and again and again in the future as to just what our liberal brethren mean when they say "majority rule." Nothing could better underscore the need to define that high-sounding phrase than the bill before us today.

Is the repeal of the Byrd amendment really going to bring about a free and democratic system in Rhodesia? Are we really lending encouragement to freedom in that troubled land? The situation has changed in Rhodesia. Only a few days ago Mr. Smith forced through his Parliament one of the broadest grants of civil rights to Rhodesian blacks ever enacted, and he did so with the votes of some of the black members. Oh, you say, it's about time, and I agree, but think what we signal the world if we vote against the Byrd amendment.

We are saying, purely, and simply, that no amount of progress toward a peaceful solution in southern Africa will gain the blessing of the United States. Instead we will align ourselves with the most extreme elements aiming not at establishing majority rule but those who desire control at any price, including collaboration with communism.

Look at the map of Africa and see, one after another, the tyrannical rulers who have subjected their people, black and white, not to freedom but to political slavery and worse. If we vote for this bill today we make it all but inevitable that one more nation will fall back into a new darkness which is descending over Africa.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROUSSELOT).

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are considering today (H.R. 1746) does nothing, I repeat nothing, for human rights.

I think the comments of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) who is a member of the committee, and by his own statement in the minority views, states that he cannot vote for the bill because it is totally inconsistent with commonsense. This bill is the height of hypocrisy. And for that reason alone I cannot support it. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a shame that in the name of human rights we believe we are going to help establish civil rights in Rhodesia by the passage of this legislation. When it is known it will do nothing of the sort. Unfortunately most members of the Committee on International Affairs know that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING). I hope that my other colleagues will at least review the views he has presented in the report of the committee. As I say, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member of this committee and he has tried desperately to find a way to determine whether he really was contributing in a positive way to human rights by voting for this repeal, but he knows we will not be. Neither will this House.

Mr. Speaker, another reason I cannot support H.R. 1746 is that it sets a dan-

gerous precedent in American foreign policy which deserves the attention of the Members.

Let us look at the basic principles which underlie this country's proposed embargo of Rhodesian chrome. When all the peripheral issues are eliminated, and I am sure the proponents of H.R. 1746 will agree with this, the Rhodesian embargo is based on the Smith government's alleged denial of human and political rights to Rhodesia's black majority. I do not want to enter at this time into the question of to what extent those rights are or are not actually recognized. What should be pointed out, however, is the fact that H.R. 1746 singles out Rhodesia as an object of revulsion, without reference to the continuous denial of human and political rights which goes on elsewhere in the world, and in Communist bloc countries in particular.

For a systematic and coldly executed suppression of human and political rights, no parallel exists for the Communist systems. Certain national variations must exist, but the underlying principles remain the same throughout. Whether it is in Cambodia, where at least 1.2 million people have been quietly massacred since 1975 by the Khmer Rouge; in the People's Republic of China, where political dissent brings lengthy terms of "reform through labor"; or in the Soviet Union, where dissenters are arrested, confined to mental institutions, or in the more fortunate cases exiled, free political expression is a nonexistent commodity throughout the Communist world. This is not random political suppression; it is institutionalized, and for that reason it is more dangerous. Why do we insist on closing our ears to the courageous words of Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Dr. Sakharov, Mr. Bukovsky, and others who tell us again and again of the smothering of political rights, of political expression, and of political participation on the Soviet Union?

The administration has recently had some strong words to say on human rights in the U.S.S.R.; and we are all expected, no doubt, to take this as a sign of the administration's clearcut commitment to the defense of human rights throughout the world. I fear, though, that our interest will stop there, that with a token gesture made it will prove too inconvenient to translate those words into action. In the case of Rhodesia, however, we are seeking to impose sanctions, because that is convenient. The world—that same world which continues to covertly trade with Rhodesia on a large scale will likely applaud. The Soviet Union will certainly applaud too, despite the fact that it has been cited by the U.N. for "massive sanctions breaking" in contravention of the Rhodesian embargo.

The ninth report of the special Security Council committee established to oversee the embargo, dated this year, cites the Soviet Union and five Soviet bloc countries for "regular trade" with Southern Rhodesia through three Swiss trading companies, which are said to exist "solely to provide a seemingly legitimate cover for a major sanctions-breaking operation." This trade is car-

ried out through the state trading organizations of these countries, which exchange chemicals, metals, and agricultural items for Rhodesian tobacco and other agricultural commodities. And it is this same Soviet government, which actively trades with Rhodesia yet suppresses the political and human rights of its own citizens, from which the United States proposes to import fully half its chromium.

These facts should be considered by the members of this board. We all, I am convinced, believe in the importance of fundamental human and political rights, and we must defend those rights. The real question is: Is morality, as we conceive it, relevant to only certain times and certain situations. Can it be selectively applied, ignoring those cases which threaten to be inconvenient or embarrassing? If this is so, then our Government's avowed defense of human rights is a farce, and our moral standard no more than a propaganda tool. Both justice and logic demand that if the United States is to insist on enforcing its moral standards against other nations, that that policy is pursued consistently and impartially. If the standard of human and political rights is to be used for sanctions against Rhodesia, then those sanctions should be enforced no less against the Soviet Union and other nations which affront our values—or else they should not be enforced at all. The pious application of a double standard in the case of Rhodesia, in response to the clamoring of nations which also follow a double standard, sets a dangerous precedent in American foreign policy which this House must firmly oppose.

I hope my colleagues can be persuaded not to support the repeal of the Byrd amendment because it does not, in fact, improve human rights.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK).

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak again to this question. I think that our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, has spoken eloquently on this. This bill is receiving some resistance because it is symbolic. It is far more important perhaps than it may seem to be on the surface. What we really are doing in the repeal of the Byrd amendment, which I earnestly hope we will vote to do, is sustaining the position of the United States before the world. We voted for it in the United Nations, and the Security Council unanimously sustained the vote not to buy from Rhodesia. In this we are joined, not just by a group of nations that mean nothing to us, but by our principal allies: Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, West Germany, most of the nations in the west, nations that stand for justice and order in this world. So this bill is indeed symbolic.

People have accused others of hypocrisy. How do we judge the hearts of others?

All I can say is that I accuse no one as to motives in this. If they resist repeal of the Byrd amendment they surely have reasons which I would not impugn. But I believe they are mistaken. It will in-

ure to the honor of this country that we vote repeal. It is important for the position of our Nation in the eyes of the world. It would be a great shame and a great pity if it does not pass.

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

Mrs. FENWICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentlewoman from New Jersey, about the fact that other nations have joined in this repeal of the so-called Byrd amendment concept, but, having done so, many of them have turned right around and have continued to buy chrome from Rhodesia. How does that affect human rights in Rhodesia?

Mrs. FENWICK. I would state to the gentleman from California that before the United States ever passed the Byrd amendment, we bought 50 percent of our chromium ore from Russia, and we are still buying 40 percent of our chromium ore from Russia. As to human rights—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

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

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this well many times on this Rhodesian chrome issue. I have told the President and I am telling the Members that my past position supporting the Byrd amendment was based upon the needs of my constituency and the economic needs of the country. I felt that unless we had access to Rhodesian chrome, the high-grade metallurgical ores, we could not produce the specialty steels that are critical to the American economy. The American specialty steel industry has now discovered and perfected a method by which it can use the lower grade non-Rhodesian ores. Thus, I have no further argument on the economics of this matter. The only thing that has to be done by this country is to assure that the other non-Rhodesian sources are made available to us.

I have talked to the chairman of this committee, Mr. FRASER, and he understands the economic situation. I have also talked to the White House and they understand the economic and supply situation. Both Mr. FRASER and the President agree that we cannot be put in a position where we are subject to economic blackmail by the Soviet Union. Those steel producing countries that are competing with us are still buying their ore directly and indirectly from Rhodesia. At the time of the embargo, this Nation obeyed the sanctions of the U.N., but the other nations did not. By our actions today we must assure compliance with the embargo to protect our vital industries. I want to support the rule and will support the bill.

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

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

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to ask my colleague from Pennsylvania where this low-grade ore comes from.

Mr. DENT. From the Transvaal re-

gion of South Africa, Russia, Brazil, and other countries.

Mr. GOODLING. If the gentleman will yield further, so it is available from those human rights giants, the Soviet Union, South Africa, India, Albania, and Chile.

Mr. DENT. And Turkey.

Mr. GOODLING. All of those human rights giants, the Soviet Union, South Africa, India, Albania, Chile, and Turkey.

Mr. DENT. While I am fighting for human rights; I am also fighting for the honor of this country and its economic needs.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I will not repeat the issues that have been covered by other Members. But this is an incredibly complex subject, complex because one could argue an economic question while another Member could argue a civil rights issue, and never the twain shall meet. But there are a few points I wish to make for the record.

First, one of the implications in this attack on the Byrd amendment is that by passage of the Byrd amendment the United States has kept Rhodesia afloat. That is not true at all. Let me just recite a little history for the Members. The Rhodesian Declaration of Independence from Great Britain was adopted November 11, 1965. The British Government at the time was too weak or too afraid of home vote reaction to take any practical action to put down this revolt. They instead imposed economic sanctions which did not work. Then on December 16, 1966, the U.N. Security Council first voted sanctions. From that time, December 1966 until early 1972 the United States completely abided by the sanctions.

That was the period of the greatest economic boom for Rhodesia in which many other nations—some of them listed in U.N. reports, Japan, West Germany, Eastern European countries, and some countries in Africa, not just South Africa but other countries in Africa—continued to trade with Rhodesia.

With the passage of the Byrd amendment—and let me again make this point because it gets lost in rhetoric—the Byrd amendment did not mention either chrome or Rhodesia but rather stated that “any strategic material imported from Communist countries could not be banned from importation from non-Communist countries.” Basically that is the Byrd amendment. Chrome is a critical material and that is the issue.

If we repeal the Byrd amendment, what we do, in effect, is put ourselves in the position that we were in from 1966 to 1971, when there was a growing dependence on the chrome ore from the Soviet Union and this ore was available to us only at a constantly rising cost.

I do not defend at all the legality of that government in Rhodesia. My interest is in the economic well-being of the United States, its industries, and its consumers. When the U.S. industries have to acquire chrome ore from the Soviet Union at a much higher cost, that cost is going to be borne by the consumers, your constituents. That is the issue before us.

If Members wonder about violations, here we are in the United States by act of Congress abiding by these violations except for the strategic materials which Congress permits us to acquire from Rhodesia. The other countries, the ones who have been referred to by many Members as being the hypocritical lot, are carrying on extensive trade with Rhodesia. Recently a British report to the U.N. Security Council Sanctions Committee noted that Bulgaria, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union all were in violation of the sanctions. Other reports have indicated that Belgium, Italy, Japan, Switzerland, several African nations, Turkey, Iran, and Israel are in violation. These countries do not admit to be violating the sanctions. The United States openly does it by the act of Congress in passing the Byrd amendment.

Let me give the Members one other figure. The issue is made that we now depend more on ferrochrome than on chrome ore. One of the countries from which we import ferrochrome is Japan. Japan is not a producer of chrome ore. Japan has to import its chrome ore, and they refine it, and sell it to the United States. Where does Japan get its chrome ore? There is a very strong suspicion that a good deal of that Japanese chrome ore comes from Rhodesia.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ).

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with what seems to me to be the major argument which has been raised against this rule and legislation. I refer to the contention that by repealing the Byrd amendment we will somehow be engaged in an act of moral hypocrisy because, at the same time that we prohibit the importation of Rhodesian chrome, we will be simultaneously importing chrome from other countries, such as the Soviet Union and South Africa, which no one here could fairly characterize as exemplars of decency or as protectors of those human and civil rights which we hold dear in our own country.

It seems to me that the answer to this argument, which I think is a very serious and legitimate one, is that it would be nice if we could act in a completely consistent fashion, but in the world in which we live it is not really possible to formulate and to fashion a foreign policy which is completely consistent.

I suspect that Emerson was right when he said that "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." I would submit that our inability to act against immorality in one part of the world should not prevent us from acting against immorality in other parts of the world. Would it have made sense, for example, in World War II for us to have abstained from the fight against fascism because in order to defeat Nazi tyranny we had to align ourselves with Communist totalitarianism in the Soviet Union? Or, to put it in somewhat more contemporaneous terms, take the example of the different policies which we fashioned and formulated with respect to Chile on the one hand and Korea on the other.

Mr. Speaker, these are both repressive

regimes. They are both countries which violate our most cherished ideals and yet it seems to me that it would be a fundamental mistake for us to treat them both in precisely the same manner, because the fact is that the security of one of those countries is essential to the international balance of power, while the security of the other is in no way significantly endangered; or to put it somewhat differently, I submit that just because we provide military assistance to Korea it would be a mistake for us to feel obligated to provide military assistance to Chile in the same sense that our refusal to provide arms to Chile should not require us to refrain from providing essential assistance to Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that an embargo against Rhodesia can make a difference while an embargo against the Soviet Union or against some of these other countries would not.

I had an opportunity last July to travel to several of the countries of southern Africa. I was in South Africa, Rhodesia, Zambia, Mozambique, and Tanzania. I can tell this House that our willingness to repeal the Byrd amendment is viewed throughout Africa as the litmus test of our commitment to majority rule. I think our relations with Africa have improved significantly since Secretary Kissinger's speech at Lusaka and the reaffirmation of the American commitment to majority rule by President Carter and his administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, if the Congress of the United States refuses to repeal the Byrd amendment, this change in our foreign policy from benign neglect to active diplomatic support for majority rule will be viewed throughout Africa as an exercise in national hypocrisy.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a significant commitment to the peaceful establishment of majority rule in Rhodesia. Our ability to achieve such a transition without the kind of bloodshed, and without the possibility of international intervention which might otherwise take place, depends to a very significant extent on a perception on the part of Ian Smith and the Rhodesian front that they can no longer count in the crunch on the support of the United States for the protection of minority rule in their country.

If we fail to repeal the Byrd amendment today, it will be possible for Mr. Smith to continue to delude himself into the profoundly mistaken belief that, in the final analysis, if he holds out long enough, we may come rushing to his assistance. That, my friends would be a formula not only for disaster within Rhodesia itself, but for international chaos and confrontation as well.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for these very

excellent remarks and I hope all Members were listening closely.

I want to say further that the issue of inconsistency and hypocrisy is not at all the case, that one does not use the same weapons against a rat and a rhinoceros.

We have taken positions, and ought to take positions, to attempt to obtain human rights in the Soviet Union also, but this can work in Rhodesia, as the gentleman has said.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman may be more familiar with rats and rhinoceroses than I am; but it seems to me the general thrust of the gentleman's remarks are well taken. What is appropriate in one set of circumstances may be inappropriate in another. I think it would be disastrous if we were frozen into diplomatic and moral immobility because we are not in a position to instantaneously establish similar policies with respect to every other repressive regime that also exports chrome.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, in other words, there are extenuating circumstances so that we do not want to argue for equality under the laws of the United States; is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. SOLARZ. I am for equal rights for all people everywhere.

Mr. SYMMS. But not in the Soviet Union.

Mr. SOLARZ. I am very much committed to freedom and equality, not only in the West but in the East; not only in the United States, but in the Soviet Union. But what is appropriate to the achievement of those objectives in one country may not, because of prevailing international realities, be appropriate elsewhere.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the chairman of the International Organization Subcommittee of the Committee on International Relations, if I could.

Did I understand him correctly to say earlier that he found the Ichord amendment acceptable, or that he was inclined to accept it when we get to the amending process?

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield, what I said was that our present intention is to accept the amendment at the time it is offered.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it would appear, listening to some of this discussion, that the best course Rhodesia could take in its own self interest is to become, first of all, much more oppressive than it is now in denying human rights, and to perpetrate the kinds of injustices and violations that the Soviet Union has been doing for so many years, about which we

have heard most recently from Mr. Bukovsky.

Third, it should become an imperial state and, in effect, declare war on the free world and free institutions. Then, the United States would make a hasty turnabout, guarantee them a monopoly in the sale of chrome and pay double the price we paid for it before.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion pertaining to the rule, and the question that keeps popping up, of course, is economic sanctions, economic boycott, and what would happen if possibly the United States were not able to get any more of this specific kind of chrome from Rhodesia.

It has been very interesting to me that very little of the discussion has centered on human rights, the fact that the leaders in many of these African countries have indicated that there could be a lessening of the tensions and the doing away of the benign neglect policy toward the countries of the third world, as contrasted to European nations, if there was a repeal of the Byrd amendment. No one has addressed that. I noticed one of the gentlemen—I believe it was the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI)—said that his main concern was the economic well-being of the United States. I think that most of us in this room are concerned about the economic well-being of the United States, but we are also interested in the fact that this country enunciates constantly the espousal of equalitarian principles, and that this country actually believes in democratic principles. Since it is on the record and it is a known fact that the repeal of this Byrd amendment will give to the nations of the third world, particularly the African countries, the idea and the feeling and the attitude that the United States is no longer going to have contradictory and different foreign policies for nations throughout this world, then we should consider this situation in that particular light.

In conclusion, I would like to read a letter sent to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY).

Mr. Speaker, the letter follows:

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE
TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The President has stated his belief that the urgent repeal of the Byrd Amendment is of major importance to the conduct of foreign policy. Secretary Vance also testified on behalf of the repeal of the Byrd Amendment before the Senate on February 10.

I personally can state the significance the repeal of this legislation will have in Africa and at the United Nations. On my recent trip to Africa, at the President's direction, I met with over 15 Heads of State and other African officials, and most pointed out to me the very positive impact that repeal of the Byrd Amendment would have in bringing about a settlement in Rhodesia. At the United Nations, such repeal will mean that the United States will no longer be in clear

violation of our obligations under the United Nations Charter, and will underscore the impact we attach to fulfilling our international obligations.

I am convinced that repeal is in the best interest of the United States and that there is no longer a need for this legislation for strategic and economic reasons. I believe that the bill to repeal the Byrd Amendment represents an excellent opportunity for the Congress to work closely with the Administration in helping to bring peace to Southern Africa, an important foreign policy goal.

I hope you will give full bipartisan support to this effort.

Sincerely,

ANDREW YOUNG.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentlewoman tell us what they are about and why this permission is needed?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. The reports are on House Resolution 4876, the economic stimulus bill, and House Resolution 4877, the supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, why is unanimous consent needed?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. They are scheduled for this week. One is on the floor tomorrow and the other is on the floor the following day.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Are we doing damage to the 3-day rule, or what is it?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. It can be laid over 1 day before it can be considered.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. So that all we are bypassing here is the 1-day rule; is that correct?

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945 TO HALT IMPORTATION OF RHODESIAN CHROME

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1746) 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. 1746, with Mr. SMITH of Iowa in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER).

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 1746, amends the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 in order to permit—but not require—the President to enforce full United States compliance with United Nations Security Council sanctions against trade with the white minority government of Rhodesia. The effect of this bill is to permit the President to override the Byrd amendment which has been in force since 1971.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, this bill has been debated on the floor of this House several times in recent years. Today there is probably a more compelling reason for enactment of this legislation than ever before; and the reasons that have been cited in opposition to the bill are considerably less than ever before.

In the first place, the dependence of the United States upon Rhodesian chrome is very small. Only 5 percent of the chromium ore which the United States imports comes from Rhodesia; only 14 percent of the ferrochrome comes from Rhodesia.

Second, it is now clear that through technological advancement in the ferrochrome industry lower grade chromium ore can now be utilized in making ferrochrome. Thus, our dependence upon high-grade chrome ore which is found in Rhodesia is no longer a necessity for American industry.

Third, the Smith government will not be in power very long. It is hard to ascertain how long the white minority of 5 percent will retain power, but surely within a matter of a few months or a year or so that government will no longer be in power, and, therefore, at that point there will be no need to enforce sanctions against the successor government.

Finally, I would like to make the point that the political climate in which we consider this measure has changed considerably. Those who have opposed the bill in the past are now prepared to support it. President Carter has made it clear that the adoption of this measure is important to his leadership in the conduct of American foreign policy.

The major stainless steel companies are not opposing the measure at this time. There was some concern expressed by the foundries, but it turns out upon examination that they only use 2 per-

cent of the chromium which is brought into the United States.

So on every count, Mr. Chairman, there is every reason now to adopt this bill. There are very few reasons left to oppose it. President Carter will be going to the United Nations later this week. It will be important for the United States and for President Carter to carry with him a message that the Congress has given him authority to put the United States back into compliance with the United Nations sanctions, thereby restating our commitment to the principle of majority rule.

So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the debate will proceed on the merits, and I think as the Members examine the merits they will conclude that the time has come for the adoption of this measure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1746 and ask my colleagues to vote in favor of repealing the Byrd amendment. I would like to use the time available to me to explain the factors that have convinced me that this legislation is in our national interest. I also want to emphasize some of my continuing concerns about the Rhodesia embargo and the moral duplicity rampant at the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, there are thousands of people in my congressional district—chrome platers, employees of the large automotive firms, small businessmen—whose very livelihood depends on continued access to chrome ore at a reasonable price. The economic well-being of these people, together with my doubts about the effectiveness of the U.N. embargo, led me in the past to oppose repeal of the Byrd amendment.

Recent technological advances have made the American economy far less dependent than in the past on high-grade ferrochrome ore. Congress has also been assured by the administration that, even with repeal of the Byrd amendment, the United States will continue to have access to chrome ore adequate to meet our strategic and industrial requirements. While I believe we must continue to monitor carefully the price and availability of chrome ore in this country, I can no longer see any compelling economic justification for importation of Rhodesian chrome.

In addition, there is a powerful political rationale arguing in favor of repeal of the Byrd amendment. Our acknowledged violation of the U.N. embargo against Rhodesia has acquired a symbolism and generated an emotionalism that damages our position among black African nations at a particularly critical time. It would well hamper our future ability to play a constructive role in helping to resolve the problems of southern Africa. I am convinced that the potential political advantages of repeal outweigh the economic risk involved.

However, I think we should also take care not to delude ourselves about the impact of repeal, particularly as it relates to the issue of human rights. Through some quirk of nature and politics, abundant chrome ore is concentrated in areas

such as Rhodesia, South Africa, and the Soviet Union, where respect for human rights is minimal or nonexistent.

Racism is wrong in Rhodesia; it is also wrong in South Africa. Suppression of individual rights and liberties is wrong in Rhodesia; it is equally wrong in the Soviet Union.

We will probably act today to punish Rhodesia for its policies and its intransigence on human rights issues. Ironically, our action will tend to reward the Soviet Union and South Africa by handing them a greater share of the American chrome market.

I sincerely hope repeal of the Byrd amendment will have the desired political impact because, as a matter of principle, I fail to see how Rhodesian ore is any more tainted than that of South Africa or the U.S.S.R.

The ultimate irony of the U.N. embargo of Rhodesia is not our forced reliance on the product of South Africa and the Soviet Union. It is rather that the Soviet Union and certain of its Eastern European allies have violated this embargo under the table without incurring the wrath, or even—as far as I can determine—the notice of the third world nations so prominent at the United Nations.

Somehow, the United States has managed to monopolize international ill will on this issue for several years. There is hard evidence that the Soviet Union, which brutally suppresses dissidence at home, denies its people the right to emigrate, and makes a mockery of Basket Three of the Helsinki Accords, also engages in covert violations of the Rhodesian embargo. But little is heard about Soviet attitudes.

I think the administration now has an obligation to insure that the rest of the world fully comprehends Soviet policy and actions on Rhodesia. I have spoken with the Secretary of State and written to Ambassador Young on this issue, and I think we will see some action. I hope we will see the United States forcefully and aggressively challenge the moral double standard that prevails in the General Assembly and many of the U.N. specialized agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to point out certain logical inconsistencies in H.R. 1746. On balance, however, I am convinced that repeal of the Byrd amendment will strengthen our hand in southern Africa and will enable the United States to serve the cause of international peace and stability in that important area.

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

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, our President has asked us to give him the authority that is embodied in this bill to bring to an end a situation that has created problems for our country for some years now. He, in recommending this action, joins each of his last two predecessors in urging this action by the Congress. Presidents Nixon, Ford, and now Carter have urged us to take this action.

In addition, the present and immediate past Secretaries of State have asked us to take this action, and all the other principal officials in the executive branch of our Government who have re-

sponsibility that is relevant urge us to take the action of giving the President the discretion to act in a way that would effect repeal of the Byrd amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is in fact a human rights issue, and I make no apology for asking our country to do better than some others may do. I make no apology for taking this position and asking the question, "If gold doth rust, then what will iron do?" I make no apology for expecting our country to do that which is right and just whatever others may do.

It is a human rights issue and it is clearly that. Every nation in Africa looks to us this day, and they understand that we here will take a stand clearly for or against the aspirations of the 95 percent majority of the people in Rhodesia. They understand we will take an action for or against black rights and human rights on the continent of Africa.

I do not think there is any confusion there as to what the nature of this issue is; it is a legitimate human rights issue.

Mr. Chairman, I will not go into detail on this subject, but I would again say that we can use different weapons in fighting for human rights in different cases. In this instance, the taking of this action can be effective toward helping to bring about negotiations. We can take action now which may prove effective in this case.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that we continue to take action in support of human rights in the Soviet Union. We ought to commend our President for the stand he has taken and the others who have taken strong stands on behalf of human rights in that repressive country.

I happen to believe, Mr. Chairman, that by taking this action, we do not render ourselves more reliant on the Soviet Union in the long term, but that, rather, if we do not wish to play into the hands of that totalitarian super power, we will take this action today so that we shall better guarantee our long-term access to the world's richest supply or richest reserves of chrome by pitting our great strength on the side of the aspirations of the majority of that country, who shall control that country from a few short years or months from now until the end of time.

I would further say that it is our last chance to help influence the outcome as to who shall be in charge in the long term of the Rhodesian Government.

Mr. Chairman, if we put our weight, by the passage of this resolution, behind the negotiating process, we may not yet be too late to help bring about an end result of the kind of government that will follow policies of moderation, policies of wisdom, and may be the best end result within Rhodesia; but if we continue to pit our strength behind the minority Government of Rhodesia, to strengthen it psychologically in its intransigence, we cannot help but guarantee a violent and revolutionary end result with a government of most unfortunate nature. Then in the long term, we may find all the chrome on which we would depend for all the years to come in hostile hands.

Mr. Chairman, there is no inconsistency in taking this stand for human rights, but it is one that is mandatory if the people of Africa are to understand

that we are on their side and to support their legitimate aspirations.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from New York has made plain, we are reliant not only in the long-term on the chrome reserves that are there, but there are many other basic raw materials important to us in the hands of governments that oppose our position in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) has expired.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Mr. Chairman, the House today can take a stand on behalf of what our country stands for as a nation. We can here underline our support for human rights and majority rule in Rhodesia and our support for the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Africa. The people of Rhodesia shall win their struggle for majority rule, but they should do so with our support rather than against our opposition. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that not only is that in our national interest, in narrow economic terms, but it is in our national interest in terms of our continuing to be a country that identifies with those things which caused our country to be created in the first place and for which I hope and trust it shall forever stand.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we act today to give the President the discretion to put us in line with our commitments solemnly made and in line with our own principles as a nation.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RYAN).

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

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1746.

I believe we should reimpose the embargo on imports of chrome ore, ferrochrome and nickel from Rhodesia. I also believe we should return the United States to full compliance with United Nations economic sanctions against Rhodesia in accordance with the International Treaty obligations of this country.

After the Unilateral Declaration of Independence by the British Colony of Southern Rhodesia in 1965 and the establishment of a white minority government under Ian Smith, the United Nations Security Council voted to impose mandatory economic sanctions against the Smith regime. The United States, at the time, strongly support the sanctions because the white minority government of Rhodesia had not taken steps to insure the rights of 95 percent of its citizens, the black majority. This same situation persists today.

Since 1966, we have supported United Nations sanctions with a single exception. In 1971, the Congress amended the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to allow the importation of Rhodesian chrome. This 1971 Byrd amendment was designed to protect our

steel industry from strategic reliance on imports of Russian chrome.

Recent events in Africa and changes in the needs of our steel industry, however, have made this exception politically indefensible and strategically unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, three crucial arguments can be made for support of the repeal of the Byrd amendment.

First, the Byrd amendment has allowed us to disregard our obligation to abide by international law and agreements. Its repeal would reestablish important legal and moral commitments. We can hardly argue for the rule of law among nations if we ourselves abide by that law only when it is convenient.

The United States is now the only Nation other than South Africa which openly violates the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia.

Second, the Byrd amendment has aligned us against the principle of majority rule. Its repeal would reaffirm our historic support for the right of self-determination.

We cannot expect other nations to respect our democratic principles if we ourselves do not support those principles abroad. We cannot have a viable or credible African policy if we do not oppose colonial rule. We ignore the 95 percent of Rhodesians who are black at our own risk.

Third, the Byrd amendment, which may have been helpful for a time, is no longer required to safeguard our strategic needs of chrome ore, ferrochrome and nickel. A recent advance in steel technology is making Rhodesian chrome unnecessary.

Even with the Byrd amendment, we have been importing rapidly declining amounts of Rhodesian chrome and we are replacing it with Finnish, South African, and Turkish supplies.

Over the last few years, Rhodesian chrome ore has represented no more than 17 percent of the U.S. market and since March 1976, no Rhodesian chrome ore has been imported. Similarly while Rhodesian high-carbon ferrochrome was imported heavily 5 years ago, in the last year imports fell over 50 percent.

Finally, we have the equivalent of 3.82 million tons of chromium ore in storage in our country. Such a quantity is more than enough for any emergency.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I support H.R. 1746 which repeals the Byrd amendment because I believe it is in the national interest.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Without it, there will be no credibility to any African policy we may seek to implement.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon in New York City a man who until recently was a member of this body sits now, by Presidential appointment, as the American Ambassador to the United Nations.

In his capacity as Ambassador to the United Nations he is now, this month, taking his turn as President of the United Nations Security Council.

I believe it was on the last day of February or perhaps the first day of March of this year that Ambassador Young ad-

ressed the House Committee on International Relations. One remark that he made at that time has rung in my mind ever since. He said—if I may paraphrase—

I am very new at this job. I am a little scared. I cannot think of anything that would help me or help my country more than to be President of the United Nations Security Council and be able to bring the news to the other members of that body, the significant news, that the United States, and the Congress of that country, has changed its mind and now finds itself in accord with the stated principles and intentions of the United Nations on this issue. This is a signal issue, and of far more importance than the current issue of chrome ore.

We have already heard speakers up until now say that the actual amount of chromium ore is low that we get from Rhodesia.

I cannot find anything in looking at current metal trade demands where this would be increased for any particular reason. In fact we have today, so I am told, more than a 4-year supply of this material in our stockpile in case the United States should lose its sources of supply. So that this issue of supply cannot be the primary issue itself.

It cannot be the primary issue because of the objection of the unions and others, because we have the AFL-CIO, the United Steelworkers, the United Automobile Workers, as well as the American Bar Association, the NAACP, the National Council of Churches and various other distinguished and different bodies throughout this country who are in favor of this particular bill.

So I do not think that is the reason as to really why this bill must pass in this body and must pass this year.

Let us look at this subject from a historic perspective. Many Members, if they wanted to, could find reason to argue that we should have the status quo as it was say 40 years ago in Africa when most of these countries were colonial entities owned by some country from outside their own continent, but that does not make much sense today. But the colonial past is gone. The present looks to the future. I do not believe there is anyone here who would not say in this body that we are committed as a nation, and that this House is committed as a body, to majority rule in America.

So what is the problem? To me it seems to be a problem of when and in what way we implement that particular general principle of majority rule for Africa, in general, and Rhodesia in particular. In that respect there can be no more clear statement this year, according to Ambassador Young, than a statement made by this particular body as to this issue. It is not as if we chose this issue to make this statement because I do not think we did. Time itself has forced upon us this particular issue and given it the kind of signal visibility which it might not otherwise have had from a mere commercial or trade standpoint. Its sole importance now rests with the statement that we will make today upon the floor of this House by this bill to repeal the Byrd amendment. I cannot help but com-

pare this situation with the circumstances that arose 2 years ago on another matter upon which Members from both sides argued very vehemently from their own points of view, that matter having to do with the situation in Cyprus, wherein this House injected itself into an emotional battle between warring Greek and Turkish residents of Cyprus. We found ourselves in the middle of the issue. How that came out I am not prepared to assess today, but I can tell the Members that this stand we take today on this issue is not, as has been implied, just an issue which affects the country of Rhodesia alone. Even on that point, I think we have been told that the Ian Smith proposal for broadening majority rule, or for broadening the base of the vote and participation in the government of Rhodesia, consists of allowing exactly 13 hundredth of 1 percent more blacks to vote than voted before, in a nation that is 95 percent black.

If, then, there is reason to presume that this legislation is important, it is important because it is a signal to the other 46 nations in Africa who are not particularly friendly to this country today.

We want a more cordial relationship with those countries in Africa. We need good relationship—if for no other reason than that we need their trade, and their abundant natural resources, as our own dwindle.

Abolition of the Byrd amendment, means more than that. It signals to those African nations that we are interested in their own self-government, and in their own future.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR.).

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

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, the question of whether the United States should renew its boycott of Rhodesian chrome is a tricky one indeed. Contrary to what proponents would like Americans to believe, reimposition of the boycott would not improve the consistency of the American position on human rights nor would it be without certain economic and strategic drawbacks. At best, it would leave us more chrome-dependent on other nations whose record on human rights is suspect; at worst, and far more likely, it would play into the hands of the Soviet Union which has the most to gain, both economically and politically, from such a display of misplaced idealism.

Looking at the situation realistically, cutting off our purchases is not going to aid the cause of majority rule in Rhodesia. Regrettably, the current choices in Rhodesia are: First, between minority black rule and minority white rule unless a compromise can be worked out; and second, between continued bloodshed and peaceful evolution. According to a report in the March 13, 1976, issue of the Economist on civilian governments in Africa, only three of 32 OAU nations have anything resembling

multiparty governments. All the rest, including most of those active in the fight to topple the current Rhodesian regime are dictatorships antithetical to the concept of majority rule. And, at least one, Mozambique, has declared itself to be a Marxist-Leninist state.

If, we are really committed to the concept of majority rule in Rhodesia, perhaps we should rethink the logic behind this bill which says that its passage will show the Ian Smith regime it can expect no support from the United States. The corollary to such a proposition is that enactment of this measure will show that the United States does support the guerrillas in Rhodesia and the anti-democratic nations that are behind them. How that contributes to either a peaceful solution or majority rule is a question that I think must be answered and, frankly, I do not see how it can be answered affirmatively. There is absolutely no indication, for one thing, that the self-appointed guerrilla leaders who claim to represent Rhodesian blacks are indeed the leaders the black majority would choose, or that they would not become increasingly intransigent in light of our "support." For another thing, there is no guarantee that by our actions we will not be bringing another Idi Amin to power.

There are several other aspects of this human rights question. Perhaps the most ironic is that on the heels of President Carter's letter to Andrei Sakharov and his visit with Vladimir Bukovsky, Congress is contemplating the boycott of Rhodesian chrome, but not Soviet chrome. Certainly the treatment of Soviet dissidents and the refusal of the Soviets to permit Jews to emigrate, to say nothing of the fact the Soviets do not hold elections in either their own country or the countries they have taken over, suggests that the Soviets, rather than the Rhodesians, should be the first target of any boycott. After all, they are a far greater threat to human freedom than 278,000 Rhodesian whites and they are not the least bit hesitant to assist in the imposition of minority rule throughout Africa. Their activities in Angola, and those of their satellite Cuba, ought to make that quite clear.

Also ironic is the fact that proponents of this bill would have us become more dependent on South Africa, Turkey, and Brazil—along with the Soviet Union—for chrome. Yet, many of those who would have us take this position have been outspokenly critical of minority rule in South Africa, the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, and the military government of Brazil.

Are we to expect that at some future time the arguments we are hearing today may be resurrected leaving us, ultimately, with no chrome at all, or are we simply going to pick on one country for no real philosophical purpose? Moreover, have we not forgotten how vehemently we protested when the Arabs embargoed oil to this country for political purposes. Yet, here we are talking of boycotting Rhodesian chrome for equally political reasons.

Then, there is the practical side of this question. If we do not opt to cut our-

selves off almost completely from foreign chrome, what assurances are there that either the South Africans or the Turks will continue to sell it to us. The South Africans may well see in this proposed boycott further indication of both U.S. hostility and hypocrisy and do business elsewhere, while the Turks have already demonstrated that they will not hesitate to hurt us strategically if they view it in their interest. In short, we could find ourselves in a critical bind, not only in terms of the price of chrome but also in terms of supply. And it is not as if we can do without chrome; our steel and defense industries are highly dependent upon it, particularly for the production of jet engines.

A few figures put this picture in clearer context. In 1975, we imported 50 percent of our metallurgical grade chromite—chrome ore—from the Soviet Union, 15 percent from Turkey and 12 percent from South Africa; last year, these figures were 44 percent, 24 percent, and 26 percent, respectively—just about our entire supply. Moreover, almost two-thirds of the world's high grade chrome reserves are in Rhodesia meaning that, if we rule them out, we may find ourselves vulnerable to other political pressures at a later date.

If all that were not enough, we cannot overlook the effects of the provisions requiring that all foreign steel imports carry certification that they do not contain Rhodesian chrome. Not only will this section be difficult to enforce, but it will endanger relations with our allies, particularly Japan. The Japanese import roughly 50 percent of the chrome they use for steel and steel is one of Japan's major exports. Any further restriction of their export trade would cause difficulties that, in the end, are likely to drive up prices for the American consumer.

Given all these factors, I see no compelling reason why the United States should repudiate the Byrd amendment and boycott Rhodesian chrome. Such a step is likely to encourage intransigence rather than compromise and, in any event, is not likely to produce majority rule in Rhodesia. Moreover, by singling out one nation, among a number with whom we deal for chrome, for special punishment smacks of a double standard on human rights. If we believe suppression of these rights to be wrong in one place it should be wrong everywhere and the worst culprit should be punished first. At the very least, if we are to cut off purchases of Rhodesian chrome we should do the same thing with Soviet chrome and let the world know that our rhetoric has some meaning and some consistency. Commonsense requires no less.

Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, JR. Mr. Chairman, we should feel shame. Yes, this House should feel shame that we are seriously considering this proposal that we turn our backs on the genuine economic interest of the United States by agreeing to deprive our country of its source of an important natural resource.

Why are we doing this? Well, the main reason being given is that by so doing we shall ingratiate ourselves with the leaders of black African nations. Incidentally, it

has been well established that other African countries pay little attention themselves to this embargo. We hear that principles of "self-determination, democracy, and majority rule" compel us to action against Rhodesia.

Let us consider these leaders to whom it is hoped we shall endear ourselves by this step, and let us consider the condition of civil liberties in their countries.

For one there is President Macias of Equatorial Guinea. It is reported that this great leader has killed 50,000 of his subjects without trial or charge, has caused one-fourth of the nation's original inhabitants to flee into exile and, now hear me well, has instituted a system of slavery.

Then there is Jean Bedel Bokassa, self-proclaimed Emperor of an unfortunate land he now calls the Central African Empire, who has tortured hundreds of minority tribesmen to death according to the signs of the Zodiac.

Perhaps the most vehement organization critical of Rhodesia is the Organization of African Unity. Charter members of this group include Burundi, where over a quarter million innocent civilians have been slaughtered over the past few years, and Chad, where the local dictator reserves a special treatment for Christians: he buries them alive in ant hills for his personal amusement.

We should not overlook "Big Daddy" Amin of Uganda, were it even possible to imagine doing so. In addition to his recent newsworthy antics, Amin has also—

Expelled over 60,000 Ugandans of Asian ancestry;

Executed a number of political opponents estimated to be over 100,000 and perhaps as many as 300,000;

Reportedly placed the severed heads of some of his late opponents in his deep freeze so that he might deliver lectures to them;

Thrown four cabinet members and the chief justice of the supreme court to the crocodiles; and

Criticized Adolph Hitler for not killing more Jews.

If we associate ourselves, through repeal of the Byrd amendment, with the aggression of other African countries against Rhodesia, we shall be participating in a double standard and the greatest hypocrisy. Under this double standard the leaders of black African countries denounce repression by white minority regimes, but close their eyes and remain silent about murders, tortures, abductions, and systematic persecutions carried out in black-ruled African countries. We should face the truth: The truth is that practically every black government, military or civilian, has employed such repressive measures in what they present as necessary efforts to avert revolution, chaos, and dissolution.

This legislation, if passed, would 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.

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 and were put into effect by the President of the United States. They were never submitted to the Congress for ratification.

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 nations whose form of government and way of life are 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.

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

This is a bad bill and it should be rejected.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ).

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I was asked by my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEVITAS), to publicly respond to a question he asked me, during the course of a conversation we had in connection with this legislation, concerning the extent to which our support for the boycott of Rhodesian chrome would obligate us to support a U.N. boycott against Israel, should one ever be imposed on that country, with respect to some other kind of critical commodity.

The long answer as well as the short answer to that question is: No. According to the United Nations Charter, the only way in which the U.N. can impose a boycott on a country is through the action of the Security Council. To the extent that the United States is one of the permanent members of the Security Council, in a position to veto such sanctions, I think it is probably safe to say that it is virtually inconceivable that we would ever acquiesce in a United Nations-approved boycott of our one reliable democratic ally in the Middle East. But even if somehow, as a result of circumstances no one can envision, the United Nations went ahead and tried,

perhaps through a nonbinding vote of the General Assembly, to impose a boycott on Israel, I would submit that we would be under no such obligation to adhere to that boycott. I say this, because those of us who support this bill do so not simply because of our obligations as a member of the United Nations, but also because the boycott against Rhodesian chrome is the right thing to do.

If the United Nations should ever advise us to embark on a course of action which is the wrong thing to do, then I would hope that the Members of this House would stand up and say that is a course of action with which we choose not to associate ourselves.

In foreign policy, Mr. Chairman, one often has to choose between what is strategically sound and what is morally right. This legislation provides us with a very rare opportunity to adopt a course of action which is both principled and pragmatic. If the day should ever come when the establishment of an embargo on Soviet or South African chrome holds forth the prospect of significantly improving the status of human rights in those countries, I will be the first to support it, but until that day arrives let us not be frozen into a stance of diplomatic and moral immobility by refraining from taking the kind of action against Rhodesia which holds forth the prospect of achieving an objective to which every man and woman in this Chamber and virtually every man and woman in this Nation is truly committed: the establishment of majority rule and minority rights for all the people of that unfortunate country.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman how Russia is treating its minorities now and if it permits free emigration from Russia of these minorities? And if this is not true, why should we continue to purchase chrome from Russia?

Mr. SOLARZ. I hold no brief for the Soviet Union. I think they trample on human rights every day of the week and every hour of the day.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, if I may reply, that I would be perfectly prepared to support such a boycott if I thought it could be effective. The problem is that it would not.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we should not purchase Russian chrome; nor be forced to do so.

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEISS).

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Chairman, I am voting in favor of H.R. 1746 which will allow the President to ban the importation of Rhodesian chrome. I am a cosponsor and supporter of this legislation, because I believe it will express America's opposition to the Rhodesian regime which pres-

ently represses and rules illegally over the black majority in that country.

This bill rejuvenates America's commitment against the inhumane and unequal policies in Rhodesia. In 1966, the United States supported the enactment of the U.N. resolution that requires its signers to impose economic sanctions on Rhodesia. In 1967, the United States supported those sanctions under an Executive order of the President. However, in 1971 Congress supported the Byrd amendment which allowed the United States to escape its commitment to economic sanctions and undercut the strength and authority of the U.N. resolution. The Byrd amendment in reality placed the United States in a posture of thumbing its nose at the international community. It also placed us in a terribly hypocritical stance—defenders of freedom at home, but not abroad.

Today, we have the opportunity to adopt a new policy that rejects the Byrd amendment by legislating America's support for the original U.N. sanctions. By doing so we will lend the strength, weight, and force of our country's reputation as a nation of free people to press Rhodesia into reforming its inhumane policies. Refusal by the United States to import chrome will signal our opposition to the following Rhodesian policies: Voter qualification laws which discriminate against blacks and allow, for all practical purposes, only whites to vote; segregationist policies that allow whites to have free mobility, but restrict the black majority to living in so-called protected villages; and the Emergency Act for Law and Order Maintenance which permits the Rhodesian Government to hold prisoners without the right of habeas corpus.

Passage of this bill, however, signals in my mind much more than mere opposition to "policies"; rather this bill indicates our support for majority rule and the right to the majority to have their natural human rights recognized. In addition, I believe this bill, if passed, will inject a breath of fresh air which has long been needed in U.S. foreign policy—consolidating and mobilizing our country's moral indignation over the treatment of all human beings all over the world including those in the U.S.S.R., Uganda, South Africa, and others who are having their natural human rights denied.

I strongly urge my fellow Members of Congress to advance their wholehearted support for this vital and important legislation.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1746. I would like to focus on what I consider to be the most important issue of today's debate; namely, the geopolitical question.

Several years ago in a very perceptive article in Harper's magazine, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., noted the fact that one of the two driving forces in the world today is the quest for self-determination. Certainly the correctness of Mr. Schlesinger's observation is quite obvious, in view of the fact that since the end of World War II countless colonies have

achieved their independence and are now free nations.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have to recognize, however, that on the other side of the coin is the fact that when there exists a group of people who are enjoying a good life, who possess power, despite their minority status, they are not going to give this up very easily. As a consequence, it seems inevitable that when these two forces come into conflict there is going to be bloodshed. Indeed, we are seeing blood being shed in Rhodesia today. I am very fearful that what we may see in the near future is full scale hostilities.

I addressed a group of African leaders several months ago at a conference in Lesotho. I pointed out to the representatives of this conference that the answer to African problems, and specifically those in Rhodesia, must rest with the Africans themselves. I pointed out that if Rhodesia is to look to any other countries for help, they must seek this assistance from their neighbors in Africa.

Mr. Chairman, what can these neighboring African countries do? First, they can provide sanctuary to those who may flee the terror of war.

Second, if they so desire, they may undertake the training of Rhodesian military forces.

Third, these neighboring states may find it necessary either to supply arms or troops to the Rhodesian majority seeking self-determination.

I further pointed out that there is very little that the United States can do in this situation. Quite obviously, it is not in our security interests to send troops either to Rhodesia, Namibia, or South Africa; but I did state there are certain political actions that I think we can take that may be of very much help in this situation, such as positive actions in the World's fora, such as the United Nations as well as in the U.S. Congress itself. I think today offers one such opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt H.R. 1746 for three reasons. First, it is going to reestablish our credibility by reaffirming a commitment which we made a number of years ago in the United Nations Security Council. To my embarrassment, and to the embarrassment of many of our country, we have reneged on this commitment which we made in 1966.

Second, it is going to put us on the right side of a world political issue, and this may be the last chance to do this.

By affirming H.R. 1746 the House of Representatives will say, in effect, that we are in favor of the concept of self-determination.

Mr. Chairman, let me make a third and perhaps the most important observation of all. I expressed the fear a few moments ago that there might be all-out war in Rhodesia if the majority rule issue is not settled. This might be avoided if it becomes very evident to the minority leaders that they have no chance of winning, that they must compromise.

If we fail to pass the bill that is before us, we are saying, in effect, to the Smith regime, "Look, we are with you; we are likely to back you in any future problems you may have".

President Carter has gone on record very forcefully saying to Rhodesia's leaders:

Don't look to the United States for help.

It seems to me that the Congress of the United States can back up the President if it passes this bill. We, too, will send the signal to Ian Smith that he cannot look to the United States for help in perpetuating his minority regime. If we do this it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is the one chance, the one hope, of avoiding all-out warfare in Rhodesia.

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, at President Carter's swearing in a few short weeks ago, I was fortunate enough to be seated on the House side. I was right below a pillar on which the American flag was projected against a brilliant blue sky. While I sat there observing our flag, I had some time to ruminate on what it is that makes this country assume the leadership role of the world. As I sat there and ruminated, it was very, very clear to me that military might alone does not project a nation into world leadership. As I sat there contemplating the flag, it was made very clear to me that economic power alone does not project a nation into world leadership.

So, I thought on those things, and it occurred to me that a nation assumes world leadership in the international scene primarily and almost solely and exclusively because it can see the right and it will do the right. There have been times, as many Members know, when I have questioned what America's role is on the international scene. There have been times when we have been concerned about our involvement in Vietnam and our involvement in some other issues, but generally this Nation has the capacity and the will and, I think, the deep-seated decency to come back and do the right thing.

That is all we are asking for today. All that we are asking for is that America live out its role of moral leadership in the world. Shortly, our President will go before the United Nations, and quite frankly, my colleagues here on the floor, I do not want my President to go before the United Nations saying that my country is still operating outside of the scope of international law. I do not want this to happen, and I do not think other Members should want it to happen.

I believe that my colleague from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN) has made the very salient point here earlier, that time is running out. Had we done this a year ago, maybe we might have diminished the possibility for armed conflict in Rhodesia, because a moderate leadership was available, looking to us for some help, and that moderate leadership might have assumed the chief negotiating role. But, we delayed, and because of this delay we might have moved ourselves closer to some sort of turmoil in Rhodesia.

There are times in this House, and there are times in the country when the issue becomes so very stark and clear. We simply raise the questions that one of the Chief Justices used to raise when is-

sues came before the Supreme Court. The questions that Justices raised were: Is it right? Is it fair? Is it just?

Now, if we lay out what we do here today in terms of those three questions—Is it right? Is it fair? Is it just?—then there is no doubt in my mind but that we will pass this legislation and repeal the Byrd amendment.

Mr. Chairman, today we are here to vote on H.R. 1746, 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.

In addition to cosponsoring this legislation I have also presented testimony on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus before the House Subcommittees on Africa and International Organizations of the International Relations Committee on the Rhodesian chrome issue.

In 1971, the Congress passed the Byrd amendment which permitted the United States to import chrome ore from the racist nation of Rhodesia. By that congressional act, the United States was in violation of its international obligation because under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter enforcement measures against Rhodesia have been invoked. As a matter of international law, the United States was committed under article 25 of the United Nations Charter to abide by the enforcement measures. The United States did not, and therefore, acted in violation of its often stated proclaimed devotion to international law. In short, by importing chrome ore from Rhodesia, the United States acted in a lawless fashion.

Economically, former supporters of the Byrd amendment, such as the specialty steel companies, now acknowledge that for economic and technological reasons, there is no need for this amendment to remain in force. Imports of Rhodesian high-carbon ferrochrome into the United States were 56 percent lower in 1976 than in 1975. Moreover, no Rhodesian chrome ore has entered the United States since March of last year. Contrary to arguments that importing Rhodesian chrome would reduce U.S. dependency on the Soviet Union, our major chrome supplier, 44 percent of all chrome imports in the United States in 1976 came from the Soviet Union, while Rhodesia accounted for only 5 percent.

The crucial objection to the importation of the chrome ore had come from the workers of the International Longshoremen's Association whose responsibility it was to unload the cargo. On August 1, 1972, local 333 in my city of Baltimore, refused to unload chrome ore aboard the *Mormaccove*, an American flag ship owned by Moore-McCormick Lines. This and other incidents of rejection by the longshoremen in Baltimore and in other cities across the Nation, illustrate that I am not the only person indignant about the import of goods that helped to maintain a minority regime in Africa.

If we continue to import Rhodesian chrome the United States is violating international law and ignoring the United Nations sanctions against Rhod-

esia—sanctions which I must stress upon again, were originally approved by the United States. The United States is officially responsible for having broken the United Nations Security Council ban on trade with the minority regime in Rhodesia. That failure to comply with these sanctions undermines the authority of the United Nations, whose overall contribution to world stability and peace the United States values and seeks to enhance.

Repealing of the Byrd amendment would be the strongest signal we could give to the world community that we are seriously committed to achieving majority rule in southern Africa through peaceful means. The success of the recent factfinding mission to Africa by U.N. Ambassador Andrew Young proved the desire of African nations to achieve our mutually avowed goal of peace in Southern Africa. President Carter has already stated his full support for the repeal of the Byrd amendment. Furthermore, the specialty steel companies which have hitherto opposed repeal of the Byrd amendment have also stated that they would no longer oppose such an action.

I am hopeful that the House will rectify a mistake which has caused us severe difficulty in the conduct of foreign policy. A return to the 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 U.N. sanctions may well result in the development of a negative foreign policy between the United States and Africa.

I would think that we would be grateful for the opportunity to rectify such travesty while it is still in our power to do so.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let us understand this Rhodesian chrome bill exactly as it is. The bill does not refer to Rhodesia nor does it refer to chrome. The bill establishes a trade policy that gives free countries the same opportunity to trade with the United States on equal terms that the United States can maintain its strategic critical materials.

Let me quote the exact language of the bill:

To amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to prevent the imposition thereunder of any prohibition on the importation into 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.

Of all the strategic critical materials chrome is one of the most critical. We do not produce any of our Nation's chrome and have mined none since 1961, so we rely on foreign imports. Sixty-seven percent of the world's reserves of metallurgical chrome are in Rhodesia while South Africa has 22 percent. Chrome is what makes stainless steel stainless.

The United Nations contended that

Rhodesia must be under an embargo, because it was a threat to world peace. This little country with 6 million people has only 250,000 whites. So apparently the reference is to this handful of whites. Over in Africa with 401 million people, we discuss Rhodesia when the threat to the world's peace is in Uganda in Africa. This is a technical reason, because the United Nations Charter does not allow it to enter into internal affairs.

What this debate is doing is opening the door for another American Vietnam relationship. We all remember so vividly how the liberal leadership of this country did not approve of the type of government that existed in Vietnam. With firm intentions for establishing a democracy for the people of Vietnam, our liberals pushed us into a confrontation in Asia. The Vietnam conflict was the most unfortunate period our Nation has suffered. In a no-win, undeclared war that was hopelessly administered by the State Department, the Vietnam war dragged through 10 of the most dismal years of America's history. Now we have taken it upon ourselves in our self-righteousness to move from Asia to Africa to solve the human rights for Rhodesia. This continued meddling could well lead us into another Vietnam disaster.

Who ordained the U.S. Congress to determine the governmental systems for the entire world? We are doing a poor job in administering a government in the United States. We should concentrate on ending inflation. We should find solutions for water in California and the other dry States. We should concern ourselves with the gas and energy shortages. We should be finding answers for the perpetual unemployment which hovers in Northern cities. We should be calling for austerity in those cities that are facing bankruptcy. We should eliminate terrorism here in our Nation's Capital. We should be finding solutions for drugs that are becoming entrenched in the lives of our young people.

Through all of these years, our country made progress by building a great country on the private enterprise system. We provided an inspiration for the rest of the world by showing them how to build through our living example. Vietnam did not want our advice. Rhodesia does not need it. Let us allow the world freedom of speech and action. Let us turn to solving this Nation's own problems. America does not have the genius to solve world problems, when we cannot solve our own problems here at home.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BENJAMIN).

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) for yielding in order that I may speak in support of H.R. 1746.

Since the enactment of the Byrd amendment in 1971, the United States has permitted the importation of Rhodesian chrome ore and ferrochrome in contravention of a United Nations sanctions program which was established in 1966 with the support of our Government.

In spite of repeal attempts in the 93d and 94th Congresses, and Secretary Kissinger's request for repeal in April 1976, the 1971 action of the Congress remains inviolate.

At the urging of the present administration and specifically President Carter and U.N. Ambassador Young, we are again considering the repeal of the Byrd amendment, probably with much greater promise than in previous Congresses.

Having the honor and privilege of representing northwest Indiana, the steel-producing capital of the Nation, I admit to my early apprehensions regarding the impact of this bill, not only in terms of employment, but also in terms of national defense.

I know that many of the steel employers in northwest Indiana previously opposed any repeal or the modification of the Byrd amendment. Consequently, our office proceeded to contact such firms as United States Steel, Inland Steel, Youngstown Steel, Armco Steel, Budd Co., Republic Steel, La Salle Steel, Blaw-Knox Foundry, and Calumet Steel. These are some of the major steel producers in northwest Indiana who have a need for chrome or ferrochrome. They employ from 105 persons to over 25,000 persons at their northwest plants.

In anticipation that all or some of them would oppose this bill, we were preparing amendments to be offered today which are found in the Trade Act of 1974 so as to offer assistance to persons who might become unemployed as a result of the passage of this bill.

I was pleasantly surprised as the responses were received. Each one of these industries reported that, first, there would be no adverse impact to their plants, production, or employment rolls resulting from the adoption of this bill, and second, there was either support or at least no opposition to the bill. We did not attempt to ascertain the impact, if any, on businesses and industries outside of northwest Indiana.

Considering the reported supply of chrome and ferrochrome for military needs, and considering the negligible impact of any boycott of these products on northwest Indiana, I am delighted to join in support of H.R. 1746.

Recently, several of us joined in to utter public remarks regarding the independence of several captive nations. Those remarks were inundated with quests for independence, majority rule, and human rights.

It is difficult to explain our philosophical positions on these noble goals when we refuse to act from time to time to support our verbiage. Today, it was reported that the President was criticized for his recent remarks on behalf of human rights. I suggest that we offer appropriate rebuke to those criticisms by supporting him on this measure.

While every geographical region may not be as well off under this legislation as mine, I suspect that any adverse economic impact is negligible and almost unnoticeable in face of the larger question of the world leadership our Nation is assuming in the quest for peace, freedom, and human rights.

Therefore, I am pleased to support this

measure in relating that the economic fears and apprehensions of several years ago have been removed in at least one sector of the country and one segment of the steel industry and that I join with the President in attempting to resolve a tenuous situation by using our economic position to support our foreign policy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

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

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

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my opposition to H.R. 1746, to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome into the United States.

Since 1971, we have been importing chrome from Rhodesia as a result of passage of the Byrd amendment. The language of the amendment states that any strategic material imported from a Communist country cannot be banned from importation from a non-Communist country. One of the major reasons advanced for passage of the Byrd amendment was that chrome was a critical strategic material and the only alternative source of chrome other than Rhodesia was the Soviet Union.

We have been hearing that technological innovations have rendered this argument invalid. Due to a technique known as argon-oxygen decarbonization, the U.S. steel industry can get along with lower grade chrome from other suppliers, particularly South Africa, but also countries such as India, Brazil, Turkey, and the Philippines. The Soviet Union has in the past provided a major source of chrome for U.S. markets and no doubt will continue to do so.

The issue which we are debating today revolves around bringing the United States into compliance with U.N. imposed economic sanctions against Rhodesia, because of that country's attitudes and practices against its black citizens. Yet passage of H.R. 1746 would embody the most blatant sort of hypocrisy. We assail Rhodesia for its record on human rights and use this as a rationale for curtailing all trade with that country. However, what about the nations which would fill in the trade gaps left by withdrawal of Rhodesian chrome? Would anyone care to comment on the Soviet Union's record on human rights? or India's?

If H.R. 1746 were passed, then the United States would be one of very few U.N. members which actually honor the economic embargo against Rhodesia. It is interesting to note that the Soviet Union and many of her Eastern European allies covertly carry on trade with Rhodesia, under cover of Swiss companies acting as middlemen. The United States at least has never tried to hide her actions in this regard.

H.R. 1746 is bad legislation, because it takes a moralistic approach to foreign affairs, but on a highly selective and discriminatory basis and consequently, I shall vote against it.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Chairman, I

rise in opposition to H.R. 1746, to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

Since the adoption of the Byrd amendment in 1971, the United States has imported Rhodesian chrome, an important element for our industrial economy. We considered it to be in our national interest not to join the ban on trading with Rhodesia, and we were not afraid to make our position official by legislating an exception for chromium imports. Other nations hypocritically denounced the United States for its dealings with Rhodesia and at the same time conducted a broad range of import and export activities with that nation. I find it hard to believe that we should now have to yield to pressure to join a common front against trading with Rhodesia when, in fact, a common front does not exist.

There are those who argue that our imports of chrome provide crucial economic support for an oppressive minority government. I do not intend, by my remarks, to support minority rule in Rhodesia. There have been encouraging signs in recent weeks of movement by the Smith government to take steps which will lead to majority rule. I believe that we should serve as a positive instrument to encourage that transition to majority rule. Repeal of the Byrd amendment is an entirely negative action which will most likely not have the effect desired by those supporting repeal. There is no reason for the United States to promote economic instability in that country. That would only increase the problems a new majority government would have to solve when it comes to power. Such action certainly will not have the effect of diminishing the resolve of the Smith government to seek a transition which does not jeopardize its own security. The Rhodesian Information Office has made that very clear in its own statement:

The safeguarding of political and economic stability in Rhodesia under majority rule far outweighs the importance of chrome sales to the United States.

Beyond the futility of such a course of action are the very real negative effects upon the United States. These include higher costs to consumers for chromium steel products, higher costs to taxpayers for defense procurement, and increased unemployment in a variety of industries.

There are only three major suppliers of chrome in the world: Rhodesia, South Africa, and the U.S.S.R. I suggest we are cutting off our ethical noses to spite our diplomatic faces when we single out Rhodesia for a boycott. During the period when we honored the U.N. sanction, we were forced to turn to Russia for our strategic needs. The Soviets, Marxist injunctions against capitalism notwithstanding, promptly doubled the price, whereupon we got smart late and lifted the boycott. There is no reason to expect any different scenario today. The irony is that the Soviets were actually selling us Rhodesian chrome during this period, saving their own supplies.

There has been some talk about the new process for processing low-grade ore which negates all these arguments. Yet close analysis reveals this is just talk.

More than half the foundries in the United States, representing 40 percent of our capacity, will be unable to afford conversion to the new process. And, of course, the process itself will increase prices.

But the most serious domestic impact of this bill will be on the unemployment rolls. Supporters of this bill have said that it will actually aid unemployment, by keeping out competitive chrome products made with Rhodesian ore in third countries. Yet the "certificate of origin" procedure they offer is little more than a legal fiction. Once the refining has gone past a certain point, there is no way of identifying the source of origin of chrome. All this insures is that even more processing work will be done overseas before the finished product is imported into this country.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is a sham. It will not accomplish the diplomatic aims even its proponents hope for. And it will certainly have negative impacts at home. The hypocrisy of boycotting Rhodesia for its racial policies, while relying upon South Africa and the Soviets, is nothing short of economic and ethical hypocrisy. I urge a "no" vote on H.R. 1746.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

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

I would like to have the attention of my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), and also the attention of my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

I am toying around with the idea of introducing an amendment which would suspend the operation of the amendments in this act if the price of chrome unduly rises in the United States.

The gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. COLLINS) has given us some statistics about how much chrome ore is imported from Rhodesia, and how much ferrochrome is imported from Rhodesia; and we certainly have to be acquainted with the difference between ferrochrome and chrome. However, I see nothing in the RECORD about how much the repeal of the Byrd amendment is going to increase the price of chrome, ferrochrome, or chromium products in this country.

Mr. Chairman, could either of the gentlemen enlighten me in that respect?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would say to the gentleman that there is no way to know what the price fluctuations may be. The price, of course, is dependent on a number of things, including the level of industrial activity in the advanced countries of the world.

I, myself, think that there would be a modest price increase in chrome.

Mr. ICHORD. What does the gentleman mean by "modest," I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. FRASER. Modest in the sense that it would go up somewhat. I would not expect it to go up very much, because my own guess is that a lot of this chrome ore is still going to leak into the world market. Therefore, the supply is not going to be changed that much, so there

would not be an economic reason for it to go up very much.

Mr. ICHORD. Could the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) enlighten us in this regard?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, like the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), I do not have any hard-and-fast figures; but my guess is that the chrome ore prices would soon double, as they did in the previous period when we did not have access to Rhodesian chrome.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING).

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

As I approached this whole idea of serving on the committee, someone asked me, "What do you have to offer that committee?"

I said, "Hopefully, an open mind and no preconceived ideas. I want to hear all sides and make judgments after I have heard all sides."

Mr. Chairman, I did not get that opportunity in relationship to this legislation. Do we realize that we are spending more time on the floor of the House today on this very important issue than we did in committee? To the best of my knowledge, we only had one hearing on this particular issue.

Mr. Chairman, I indicated in my dissenting remarks that I opposed this legislation not because of my disregard for human rights and majority rule, but because I believe it is an undesirable policy for the United States to become caught in inconsistencies concerning the issue of morality and security within the context of current American foreign policy.

We have heard the argument that we no longer need Rhodesian chrome, in fact that has been the whole mood, we do not need the Rhodesian chrome, and that is true—that is true—but we do need chromium and the question is: Should we not then come back next week and take the same stand, and I think many people would agree we should, in relationship to Russia, Turkey, and South Africa? Then I think we would hear a tremendous uproar in relationship to the whole issue.

But I think the most important issue is, and the point I would really like to make, that if we are going to write foreign policy around human rights as seen through American eyes, and that is the important thing, as seen through American eyes—and that is what has gotten us into all of the trouble we have gotten ourselves into in international affairs over the past 40 years—but if that is the way we are going to make realistic foreign policy, then we want to make very, very sure we have the American people ready to make the sacrifices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the additional time.

Mr. Chairman, just to finish my statement, let me repeat that if we are going to try to center our foreign policy around human rights as seen through American eyes, then I think we have to make sure that the American public is ready for this. As you know, we get on our soap boxes down here and sometimes we seem to think that the American people are as idealistic as we are. I am certain we are full of idealism but I never have thought that we can attach that same amount of idealism to the American public when things start to get tough because at that time, all of a sudden, they lose that idealism. That sticks in my mind because when we had the oil embargo, had that embargo continued a few more months, the ground swell in this country would have meant that no longer could we continue our policy and therefore like other countries would have to back off our support for Israel. This support would no longer be possible, because the country would have been forced to withdraw the support because of the public swell against it.

So I think we have to make very certain that we have the public geared for that kind of foreign policy based on human rights as seen through American eyes, not just as we here in the Congress see it, but as the majority of the American people see it.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard and will hear learned arguments pro and con about the merits of H.R. 1746. I am convinced that the Byrd amendment is not only constitutionally sound but is in the best interest of our Nation. I will therefore vote against H.R. 1746.

I do want to point out, however, that while the specific issue may be the Byrd amendment and Rhodesian chrome, what we should today be debating is something far more wide ranging and important. We should be debating our Nation's policies in Africa. Indeed, we should be debating a larger argument and that is how our Nation should deal with countries whose internal policies we may deplore.

If we do overturn the Byrd amendment and impose a ban upon importation of Rhodesian chrome, who will be hurt? The white Rhodesians? This is absurd, since they have long since proved that there are ways to get around even the most stringent sanctions. The Rhodesian Government will be strengthened, not hurt, as even those whites who might disagree with certain government policies rally around Ian Smith as a sign of white Rhodesian solidarity.

If anyone is hurt by this sanction, it will be black Rhodesians, at the bottom of the economic ladder. Is this really what we want to do? I think not. I think we want, instead, to help Rhodesians of both races to achieve the kind of government they want.

Ian Smith has agreed to majority rule in 2 years under a plan presented by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. It was not Smith, it was not black Rho-

desians, but the leaders of surrounding black nations who rejected this offer of majority rule. So we have Smith's gesture of good will rebuffed and now we want to follow that with an action that can only be interpreted in Rhodesia as American support of the intransigence of the black leaders who are the only ones holding up majority rule under a plan guaranteeing minority rights. We do not pass legislation in a vacuum, Mr. Chairman. What we do here today concerns more than chrome.

Finally, may I add a fact that everyone knows but no one here seems willing to talk about? As it stands at the moment, we have no certainty that "majority rule" will mean "democratic rule" in Rhodesia. In fact, the historic evidence in Africa suggests very strongly that majority rule without strong guarantees for minority rights will lead to the kind of dictatorships that are endemic in Africa today. From Ethiopia in the north to Mozambique over to Angola and up to Nigeria there are more dictatorships than democracies. What makes anyone think that black or white Rhodesians are going to get anything different if "majority rule" is brought about without protection of civil and human rights?

That is what we are faced with, Mr. Chairman. Not pleasant-sounding words about "majority rights" but the current facts of denial of human rights by whites and blacks all over the African continent. Needless to say, such denial of rights is not unique to Africa. There are denials of human rights in the Soviet Union and China as well as in dozens of African countries.

To make all of this even more grave, Ambassador Andrew Young, acting as President Carter's "point man" has been going around the world using inflammatory and irresponsible rhetoric about the Rhodesian and South African situations. He is being praised in the media for his courage and his willingness to take risks. I am reminded of the grim joke of American soldiers in World War II about Gen. George Patton, nicknamed "Old Blood and Guts." They would say: "Our blood, his guts." I feel the same way about President Carter's African policies as embodied in Ambassador Young: His courage—but who will pay the price? Whose blood will be shed? Will it be the American soldiers Young wants to send to Rhodesia as a "peace-keeping force"?

These are the questions we should be debating. But we choose to debate a question that avoids the real issue. Right now the only real question in Rhodesia is whether the plan agreed to by Ian Smith's government, which would lead to majority rule in 2 years with rights of the minority guaranteed, will be revived. If it is not, there will be a tragedy of unimaginable proportions in Africa. And history will show that while this tragedy was developing, the Congress was debating the right of the United States of America to get strategic materials when and where it wants to.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the

gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI), to close the debate.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this bill, if enacted, would halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. It seeks to reinstitute an embargo on the importation of Rhodesian chrome into the United States in compliance with the U.N. embargo initiated in 1966.

The United States has fully complied with this U.N.-imposed sanction for over 10 years, with the exception of chrome, which is a strategic material.

By Executive Order No. 11322, the President, in 1968, took action to implement economic sanctions against Rhodesia. This action was undertaken without congressional action or congressional review.

Subsequently, Senator BYRD of Virginia introduced the legislation that would prohibit the President from banning the importation of a strategic material from a free-world country if that same material is being imported from a Communist country.

The argument for this legislation was that the United States should not allow itself to become dependent upon the Soviet Union for a strategic material vital to the defense and economic well-being of this country. At the time of the imposition of U.N. sanctions in 1966, Rhodesia was the largest single source of metallurgical grade chrome ore imported into the United States.

In the years after 1966 when the United States observed the embargo, including chrome, the United States became increasingly dependent on its next largest supplier—the Soviet Union. In 1968 and 1969 U.S. imports of metallurgical grade ore from the Soviet Union approached 60 percent of our total imports. In this period of increased dependence on the Soviet Union, the Soviet price for chrome ore rose by 188 percent with prices reaching their peak in 1971, the last year of the embargo on Rhodesian chrome.

After passage of the Byrd amendment, when we again had access to Rhodesian chrome, Soviet prices declined considerably.

Besides Rhodesia, there are only two major sources of metallurgical grade chrome—South Africa and the Soviet Union—and we will clearly be more dependent on the Soviet Union if we do not import chrome from Rhodesia.

I understand that technological innovations may allow the widespread use of lesser quality metallurgical grade chromium and this decreases our need for Rhodesian chrome supplies.

There is another pertinent factor to consider in evaluating the impact of the new technological process and that is—many of the industries in the United States which use chromium are small firms which do not have the new process. Our Nation has hundreds of small foundries which cannot afford the huge capital investment required by the new process and they must continue to depend on the finer chrome which Rhodesia supplies.

The United States has properly observed the U.N. embargo since its incep-

tion in 1966, importing from Rhodesia only strategic materials. But the rest of the world has persistently ignored the embargo. Many of our European friends, Japan, the Soviet Union, Red China, and even many of the black African nations have ignored the embargo. In January 1977, a limited distribution report was issued by the U.N. charging the Soviet Union and four East European countries with "major sanction-breaking" operations.

Another point to note: This bill would require strict monitoring of steel mill product imports into the United States to insure that none of these products contained chromium of Rhodesian origin. This will be a cumbersome operation and will be open to cheating. Many countries now import Rhodesian chrome despite the embargo as is evidenced by the fact that the United States and Rhodesia only consume approximately 35 percent of Rhodesia's yearly chrome production. Therefore, 65 percent is consumed by sanction violators, and it is going to be difficult if not impossible to prevent that chromium from coming into the United States. For countries like Japan, which have no indigenous chrome and import Rhodesian chrome, this bill will force them either to curtail their exports of steel products to the United States or resort to alternations of the so-called certificates of origin. Another problem is the possibility of the Soviet Union's importing Rhodesian chrome for its own consumption and exporting to the United States chromium of Soviet origin. The net effect of this, of course, is that Rhodesian chromium will still be consumed as a result of U.S. demand.

It must be noted that the President presently has the option of halting Rhodesian chrome imports without any legislative action. This is because the Byrd amendment provides that the President may not ban imports of a strategic commodity from a free world country if the same material is being imported from a Communist country.

The failure of the administration to take chrome off the strategic materials list, or to cut off Russian imports, shows the real need for chrome—and dramatizes the validity of the Byrd amendment.

The Byrd amendment was sound legislation in 1971, and it remains sound legislation today. The courts have upheld it despite a challenge to its legality.

The issue simply is one of providing a critical commodity needed for industrial production. The repeal of the Byrd amendment will increase costs to the American consumer. From a human rights standpoint, our increased prices of chrome from the Soviet Union will not advance the cause of individual freedom in that country.

For some years now, I have been trying to get many of my colleagues on the International Relations Committee to see the importance of maintaining some consistency in our foreign policy. To date, they have failed to heed by advice and H.R. 1746 bears witness to that. They are blissfully unconcerned about the illogic of a bill that imposes sanctions against

a nation because of internal policies that are commensurate with most of the other countries from which we get our chrome supplies.

This same inconsistency pervades international politics. While the United States, with the exception of the Byrd amendment, has abided by the U.N. embargo against Rhodesia, many of its fellow U.N. members have not.

Ironically, some of the countries that posture most dramatically and sanctimoniously on this issue at the U.N. are also among those that have maintained regular trade with Rhodesia over a number of years.

Mr. Chairman, just as I am convinced of the correctness of my view, I am aware that mine is a minority viewpoint in the House today, but for the record these points had to be made. The passage of time will demonstrate which side of the argument will ultimately be the most accurate.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to close the debate to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DIGGS), whose subcommittee also reported this measure.

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

Mr. DIGGS. I yield to the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation, and I want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) and the gentleman from Michigan in the well (Mr. DIGGS) for their outstanding leadership on a measure that seems to me to be crucial to the capacity of our country to speak with a clear and telling voice in the conduct of foreign policy, particularly in respect of Africa.

At stake in this legislation is the integrity of our commitment to human rights and majority rule. At stake is the integrity of our international legal obligations. At stake, in part, is the prospect for peaceful settlement of the issues afflicting southern Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I want also to note that both former Secretary of State Kissinger and Secretary Vance have called for repeal of the Byrd amendment and have made clear that the national security of our own country would thereby not be endangered.

We are all aware, finally, Mr. Chairman, that our distinguished former colleague in the House, now our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Andrew Young, has given great leadership on this important matter, as has President Carter. It would, Mr. Chairman, be tragic if our President were to speak at the United Nations later this week and not be able to point to the fact that the Congress of the United States—both Democrats and Republicans acting together—have joined in passing his highly important legislation. I urge approval of the bill.

Mr. DIGGS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his very constructive contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the repeal and to just say a few words of emphasis rather than elucidation, because I think that the issues are quite clear. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not perhaps have the historical perspective of how long we have been dealing with this matter, and the reason that it may have been processed by the International Relations Committee as expeditiously as it has relates to that particular fact, not because a full record has not been laid out time and time again.

I would like to express, first of all, Mr. Chairman, some surprise that the whole question of our international obligations under the U.N. Charter has been treated so cavalierly by some of the people who have spoken here today.

It is a solid obligation, and as long as we are members of the United Nations operating under that charter, I think that our obligations ought to be quite clear.

I think that the references to the clear signal that our action here is going to send to the minority regime in Rhodesia is a point that is well taken because as early as 3 weeks ago on "Issues and Answers" it was quite apparent that Mr. Smith has still not been convinced that there is not some kind of rescue operation standing by when the crunch comes.

I think also it is important to emphasize, Mr. Chairman, that this has been a nonpartisan issue. We have had this matter under consideration now by three administrations, all of whom have approved the repeal which is pending on the floor today. There has not been enough respect in my view for that particular fact is one to gain any influences from what has been said here today by people who would seek to substitute their foreign policy considerations for the foreign policy establishment of three administrations.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to dwell upon the dependency question and the technological innovations that have been made, although I would say that matter has not been stressed enough, that we now really have techniques that make it possible to seek other sources for this very important metal.

That is why Mr. Andrews, who is the vice president of Allegheny Ludlum Corp., testifying for the stainless steel industry committee, a traditional opponent of the repeal, has indicated that he is satisfied that the stainless steel industry no longer needs Rhodesian chrome. That is why our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) among many additional people can now advocate repeal.

Most importantly, failure to restore sanctions will jeopardize our improving relations with the rest of Africa.

During the past 10 years, Africa has become increasingly important in the area of investment and trade to the United States. In 1966, U.S. direct investment in Africa was only \$1.8 billion. By 1970, it has soared to \$3.2 billion and in 1975, amounted to \$4 billion, a figure that would have been higher had it not been for the nationalizations of U.S. investment in Libya and Nigeria. It is im-

portant to note that nearly two-thirds of this investment is in the extractive industry. Many of the minerals involved are officially considered by the U.S. Government as critical and strategic raw materials.

Africa is the last largely unexploited region that enjoys great resource wealth, so we can anticipate increased and sustained interest by U.S. investors.

Similarly, U.S. exports to Africa increased from \$1.3 billion in 1966 to \$4 billion in 1975.

While South Africa traditionally has been the largest recipient of U.S. investment—increasing from \$460 million in 1966 to \$1.6 billion in 1976—the political situation has begun to change this pattern. According to the Journal of Commerce, before the June 16, 1976 student uprising in Soweto, the net inflow of capital into South Africa each was \$184 million. Since that time, there has been a net monthly outflow of \$6.4 million.

The new recipients of large U.S. investment are those very countries who have urged us to adopt more progressive policies in support of majority rule in Southern Africa: Nigeria, Zaire, Zambia, Libya, Gabon. Stopping Rhodesian chrome imports will demonstrate to the nations of Africa that the American people are serious about their support for majority rule.

Mr. Chairman, I do feel constrained to comment upon what appears to be a fairly widespread misunderstanding. Certain Members of this body have objected to restoring sanctions against Rhodesia because it would, according to their observations, leave the United States dependent upon South Africa and the Soviet Union whose human rights records are not better than that of Southern Rhodesia. Sanctions were imposed on Rhodesia to end its rebellion against Britain, the former colonial power, not because of human rights violations which have accompanied UDI. Let us recall that economic sanctions constitute an action short of war, or military sanctions. If this Nation espouses peaceful solutions to conflict, we must support them.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize that it may be difficult for some Americans to adjust to the post colonial world. However, disenchantment with it, will not change the contemporary political configuration of power in the world community. African States account for nearly one third of the membership in the United Nations and represent an important voting group in international fora.

As most of you know, the Secretary of State and President Carter will address the United Nations on Wednesday and Thursday of this week. Our former colleague, Andrew Young, is presiding over the U.S. Security Council this month. A debate on southern Africa questions is anticipated in the Security Council beginning on March 21. A stronger vote in support of Byrd repeal would strengthen the hand of the new administration as it tries to reach an accommodation on the southern Africa problem in the United Nations.

If the economic case for repealing the Byrd amendment is persuasive, the moral

justification for restoring sanctions is overwhelming. Ian Smith's latest rejection of a settlement plan represents the Seventh abortive attempt to end the colony's 12-year-old rebellion against the British Government. Self determination, majority rule and respect for human rights and civil liberties are the pillars of democratic societies. The incumbent regime in Rhodesia makes a mockery of such principals.

Over 3,500 have already died in the protracted struggle in Rhodesia.

According to the New York Times of February 14, 1977, 3,534 people died in the war for independence with majority rule between December 1972 and mid-February 1977. The vast majority of these were Africans: 2,364 insurgents, 874 black civilians including 189 accused of breaking the curfew; 71 white civilians and 252 members of government forces. During the week that the 7 Catholic missionaries were killed, 52 other civilians died—most of them black and 30 of these killed by Rhodesian Government forces.

By restoring sanctions, we enhance the chances for peaceful settlement. We have an opportunity to usher in a new era with Africa and the rest of the developing world.

We must repeal the Byrd amendment not just because it is our duty under international law, not just because it is right, but because it is in our best interests.

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 1746. Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1746, a bill to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. This legislation does not serve our national interest.

Chrome is an important strategic material. It is vital to our defense needs and our domestic economy. Specialty steels such as stainless steel, for example, require chrome ore for their production.

Unfortunately the United States has virtually no chrome deposits. A report issued in the 94th Congress by the House Committee on Armed Services states the following:

The United States has no indigenous chromite ores of economic significance. . . . Since 1961 there has been no domestic mining of chromite.

Simply put, we have no chrome. We are dependent on foreign countries for this important material.

The world's supply of chrome is concentrated in a very few areas, in particular Rhodesia, South Africa, and the Soviet Union. About 67 percent of the known reserves of metallurgical grade chrome is found in Rhodesia. Another 22 percent is located in South Africa. Approximately nine-tenths of all the known chromium reserves is in Rhodesia and South Africa.

A large share of the rest is in the Soviet Union. In fact, about 40 percent of our chrome ore is imported from the Soviet Union.

If we cut ourselves off from Rhodesian chrome by adopting H.R. 1746, we only make ourselves more dependent on chrome from South Africa and the Soviet Union. Can anyone seriously argue that the Soviet Union—a land dotted like a

"Gulag Archipelago" with concentration camps for those who disagree with the Communist regime—is less repressive than Rhodesia? Is South Africa with its official policy of apartheid a morally superior nation to Rhodesia?

To halt purchases of chrome from Rhodesia but continue to buy it from the Soviet Union and South Africa seems somewhat hypocritical. We would be embracing a double standard of morality.

The hard truth is that the chrome exporting nations do not come up to our own moral standards. Consequently for the United States to pick out Rhodesia for penalty is little more than selective morality.

Nor is this the only case of selective morality. Black Africa is run largely by military juntas, one-party dictatorships and, in the case of Idi Amin, an absolute madman. Why are not the advocates of this bill out demanding majority rule in these other countries?

Let us be honest. Chrome is essential to our national security and our economy. It should be foolhardy to deprive ourselves of such a major source as Rhodesia, especially when the primary alternative sources are the Soviet Union and South Africa.

In addition, if we halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome we will place American steel companies at a competitive disadvantage. The price of chrome ore for American firms will almost certainly go up. During the period of the last Rhodesian embargo, the Soviet Union took advantage of the situation by doubling the price and lowering the quality of the ore. Only after removal sanctions did Soviet prices drop.

Consequently other countries that use the cheaper high-grade Rhodesian chrome will be able to sell their products at a lower price. We should not be naive in this regard. Our foreign competitors may give lip service to boycotting Rhodesia but in actuality they have continued to import chrome from that nation.

Japan is an excellent example of what I am talking about. It supposedly was scrupulously abiding by the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia. In mid-1974, however, it was conclusively shown that Japan had been importing over 25 percent of its chrome requirements from Rhodesia over the previous 5 years. Japanese chrome buyers used forged South African certificates to evade the embargo, a policy apparently winked at by the Japanese Government.

So we should not kid ourselves on this point. Passage of H.R. 1746 would put us in a position of being the only major steel producer prohibiting imports of Rhodesian chrome. Foreign countries will continue to use the cheaper Rhodesian chrome, either openly or covertly, and then sell these products in the U.S. markets in competition with American firms. The end result will be a loss of business for American firms and a loss of jobs for Americans.

The Committee on International Relations recognizes this problem and attempts to solve it by requiring foreign steel mill products to have a certificate of origin stating that these products do not contain Rhodesian chrome. This may

sound good on the surface but it is no real solution to the problem.

It is virtually impossible to detect the origin of chromium once it has been made into processed steel. This fact has been well established in previous congressional testimony. Consequently the certificate of origin provision is little more than window dressing to help a serious problem. It is ineffective, unenforceable and a sheer waste of time.

I urge my colleagues to place American interests first on this important issue. I urge the defeat of H.R. 1746.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am shocked that the arguments for or against the Byrd amendment regarding Rhodesian chrome have so easily skirted the real issue, which is the matter of our economic and military security, and degenerated to an unproductive argument on civil rights. Rhodesia has limited civil rights but is not an enemy of the United States. The Soviet Union, which is the other major source of chrome has even more limited civil rights, is an economic adversary and an avowed ideological and military enemy. Any action which would make the United States largely or solely dependent on the Soviet Union seems not only blatantly unwise, but even treasonous.

And as for civil rights, I am shocked at the civil rights tunnel-vision which seems to exist on Capitol Hill. The oppression of certain ethnic groups is not necessarily the worst example of civil rights violations in the world. Man's inhumanity to man is not limited along lines of racial, religious, and sexual bigotry. Oppressive government knows no such limitations and the best, or worst, examples are nations like the Soviet Union and the Peoples' Republic of China.

It is in both the context of national security and civil rights that I must ask each of my colleagues for a strong search of conscience regarding forthcoming action on the Byrd amendment. Civil rights are improving in Rhodesia under the pressure of political reality and I feel that an extension of the Byrd amendment for at least an additional probationary period is in order.

In the meantime, out of a sense of fairness, I feel that any pressure being exerted on Rhodesia should also be applied in like manner to nations such as the Soviet Union so that they also will have strong inducement to get their human rights houses in order. If civil rights is to be the deciding factor then we should ban South African chrome because of the internal policies of that Government, Turkish chrome because of that country's occupation of Cyprus, and the Brazilian chrome because of that country's internal policies. This would leave us at the mercy of the Soviet Union ore and their internal oppression is the flagrant of all. Our priorities should not be arbitrary in this regard—the worst offenders against civil rights should not be exempted just because they are larger and more difficult to impress.

Economically, the United States is totally dependent upon imports for chrome ore, both for production purposes and for our national stockpile. Without the Byrd

amendment we are at the mercy of the Soviet Union for chrome supplies.

During the period when sanctions against Rhodesian chrome ore were in effect, the Soviet Union was our principal source of high chromite. The U.S.S.R. took advantage of our dependence upon it in two respects. First, the quality of the ore exported to the United States steadily deteriorated, and second, Soviet prices dramatically increased. From \$35.78 per short ton in 1965 the price steadily increased to \$68.45 in 1972 and then fell back to \$51.73 per ton in 1973 when sanctions were lifted. However, in anticipation of congressional action restoring the U.S. embargo on importation of Rhodesian chrome, Russian metallurgical grade ore prices in 1975 were being quoted as \$160 per ton.

There is also another strong reason for not abandoning the Byrd amendment at this point just because the large steel and other multinational corporations say it is OK. I am sure that there are many Members of this body who are tired of having the big money groups set the foreign policy of this Nation particularly when it can have damaging impact upon the Nation's small and family businessmen and their employees.

There is every reason to believe that the announced technological breakthrough which has prompted the big steel industries to switch positions on this need for Rhodesian chrome is not all that great and immediate a blessing to the smaller and sometimes marginal businesses not so able to pass on increased costs of production to the consumer. I have learned that 75 percent of our domestic cast metal firms, those who employ 100 or fewer workers, may end up as little more than brokers for foreign cast metal industries leaving the United States even more dependent upon other nations.

Economically, there is so much to explore in terms of the full impact on this Nation of killing the Byrd amendment that I feel such action is extremely risky and premature. For the sake of our military and economic security, for true international progress in civil rights, and for the benefit and well-being of small businessmen, the laborers, and the consumers of this Nation, I implore you to once again vote to retain the Byrd amendment.

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Chairman, last year, a similar bill to H.R. 1746 came before this body, and I supported it. And the reasons for my doing so again this session are just as compelling.

What has changed this year is the administration of this country. We have a new President, who has boldly made international human rights one of the cornerstones of his foreign policy, who has not shrunk from the controversial and difficult actions that are necessary to "put our money where our mouth is."

It would be ironic if we, in this Democratic Congress, feeling for the first time in so many years that we can establish a cooperative and mutually beneficial relationship with the occupant of the White House and with his agencies, were to vote against a measure which he has directly declared that he supports: "I

want to see the Byrd amendment repealed." President Carter has stated, "and I will give my backing for the repeal." Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young, has reinforced this thought:

In very tangible terms repeal would show the Smith regime that it could not count on assistance from the U.S. government in its obstinate refusal to accede to majority rule. It would impress on Africans that the United States is serious in its support for majority rule in independent Zimbabwe.

"It would impress on Africans * * * Those are very important words. Our present posture can do nothing but increase hostility to our country among black African nations, nations whose support we need much more than Rhodesia's, and will certainly not sit well with the inevitable black regime of that country.

Finally, the Byrd amendment is offensive to those who believe in the future of the United Nations. We have committed ourselves to the search for world peace through that body. We have excoriated those member states who have not abided by its principles. And yet, for seemingly crass commercial reasons, we are guilty of ignoring U.N. sanctions, and thereby contributing to weakening the effectiveness of the entire organization.

And so, for our commitment to black Africa, for our commitment to world peace, and, primarily, so that we can effectively implement our country's hope for individual rights throughout the world, I shall vote for this bill, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to indicate my support of H.R. 1746, legislation to repeal the Byrd amendment of 1971. I take this position after careful deliberation. My views are based on the overwhelming evidence that imposition of an embargo on Rhodesian chrome and ferrochrome will have no appreciable effect on the U.S. economy or on our national security. Further, I view the passage of this legislation to be an important demonstration of this Nation's new commitment to the establishment of a moral and consistent foreign policy toward third world nations.

I have long been a supporter of the Byrd amendment. From the time it was adopted in 1971 until as recently as the vote in the last Congress, I had opposed the imposition of an embargo on Rhodesia chrome because of this Nation's seeming dependence on the supplies and reserves of chrome and ferrochrome from Rhodesia.

However, based on figures provided in the committee report and by the State Department, the dependence argument is a specious one. In 1976, only 3 percent of our chromium ore and 22 percent of our ferrochrome supply were imported from Rhodesia. This does not constitute undue dependence by anyone's interpretation.

I have also based my opposition to repeal in the past on the impact such an action would have on the American job market. Concerns had been raised by the specialty steel industry. Yet, as the committee report points out, the specialty steel industry has stated emphati-

cally that a reimposition of the embargo on Rhodesia chrome would not threaten steelworker jobs. The comments of my colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) have also played a role in my decision to change my position.

The Rhodesia chrome question must be analyzed from another perspective. The Carter administration has made a strong commitment in support of self-determination and majority rule for Rhodesia. Yet, our efforts to be influential in this area are being sabotaged daily by the continued importation of chrome from Rhodesia. This has the effect of giving the present Rhodesian leadership a sense of security, allowing them to stall in the implementation of the agreement to transfer power in Rhodesia; an agreement ironed out during the previous administration.

It is time that our foreign policy reflected a sense of consistency in its application. We must stop undermining our own image through the perpetuation of outdated positions and philosophies. The right of self-determination has long been a bulwark of our foreign policy. It has been primarily directed at the Soviet satellite nations of Eastern Europe. But the deprivations of human freedoms exist in other nations such as Rhodesia, as well as Northern Ireland and if our policy is to have any credibility, we must support a repeal of the Byrd amendment.

Last, we must view a repeal of the Byrd amendment as a positive step in the development of improved relations with the continent of Africa. Many nations in Africa including some which are economically more important than Rhodesia, have been angered by our continued importation of chrome. Repeal of the Byrd amendment would constitute an important good faith effort on the part of the United States which will place us in a better position with the entire African Continent. This is the real national security issue. The growth of Soviet influence in Africa, especially in southern Africa, should be a source of deep concern to this Nation. It has been allowed to flourish in part because of basic distrust of American policies in Africa, best exemplified by our policy with respect to Rhodesia chrome. A change in position on this matter may improve the course of American-African foreign policy.

Finally, of somewhat lesser importance, is the fact that a repeal of the Byrd amendment will put us in full compliance with the United Nations Charter. This could have important benefits to our position in the United Nations, especially if Ambassador Young is able to assume the Presidency of the Security Council.

As I indicated earlier, my vote today does represent a change in my position. Yet, weighing all the facts and arguments as I have, I see no real justification for continuing to support the Byrd amendment. Our economy is capable of detaching its limited dependence on Rhodesia chrome both from the standpoint of our available supplies, as well as our reserves of the metal. I do add the thought that if we are successful in repealing the Byrd amendment today, we

should accompany it with a strong new commitment to increasing our own domestic capabilities to develop sources of chrome and ferrochrome. Extreme reliance on imports of any necessary commodity presets problems, as we have seen with respect to the Arab oil cartel.

Good economic sense as well as the establishment of a foundation for improved third world relations are what a vote for repeal of the Byrd amendment represents. I urge my colleagues to join me in support today.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, American importation of Rhodesian chrome belies our pious criticism of white supremacist rule in southern Africa.

The efforts of this administration to secure a peaceful transition to majority rule in Rhodesia, a transition without bloodshed and retaliation, will fail unless we can restore the confidence and trust of black Africa.

Our influence with the governments of Africa will be negligible, however, if we continue to grant Ian Smith's regime the implicit recognition of economic relations.

There are two events, Mr. Chairman, that will be influenced by our vote today.

The first is President Carter's address before the United Nations on Thursday. He can go there with a foreign policy that proves that America, the first nation to throw off the chains of colonial rule, is still the defender of national self-determination everywhere.

This will be possible only if the Byrd amendment is repealed.

The second event is the Helsinki followup meeting, which convenes in Belgrade on June 15. We are going to Belgrade with the demand that the Soviet Union live up to the treaty they signed at Helsinki, especially to that treaty's provisions on the right to emigrate.

Our demand will be compromised, however, if the Soviet representatives at Belgrade can take our own arguments and throw them back into our teeth. Why did the United States vote for the economic sanctions against Rhodesia, the Soviets can ask, if we were not prepared to observe them ourselves? Do we consider ourselves exempt from our international agreements?

Mr. Chairman, much has already been said about the irrelevance of Rhodesian chrome to our economy. The Government says we have enough chrome stockpiles to meet our strategic needs for several decades of war. The United Steelworkers of America have testified that a ban on Rhodesian ferrochrome will not affect employment in the stainless steel industry. The steel industry itself has conceded that the loss of Rhodesian chrome will not significantly affect production.

But whether or not we repeal the Byrd amendment, events will soon overtake our ability to ship any chrome from Rhodesia. To state the facts simply: American imports of Rhodesian chrome are declining year after year.

We have not purchased any raw chrome from Rhodesia since March 1976. Imports of refined high-carbon ferrochrome, used in the manufacture of stainless steel, have declined from 41 percent of the import market to 21.9 percent last year.

Those imports will continue to decline, Mr. Chairman, because the Rhodesian Government is unable to protect either its internal stability or its external trade. Mozambique has closed its ports to Rhodesian business and guerrilla activity is rapidly escalating into civil war.

The white minority regime is losing its grip on Rhodesia, Mr. Chairman. A thousand Byrd amendments will not guarantee continued shipments of Rhodesian chrome.

But the main issue before us today has nothing to do with the steel industry. The black nations of Africa are beginning to believe that our support for majority rule in Southern Africa is not a pious fraud. There is a word for their growing confidence in our policies: It is called "credibility." And credibility is indispensable to our efforts to avert racial war in Rhodesia. The future welfare of both blacks and whites in that country may very well turn upon our ability to influence the black governments of Africa. That issue alone would justify our support for H.R. 1746.

Mr. Chairman, I voted in 1975 for the last attempt in this House to repeal the Byrd amendment, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the resolution we are considering today. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1746 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

So far 1977 has been an important year for all who cherish the basic rights that belong to all people. We are beginning to end the inconsistencies between our philosophy of human rights and our foreign policy. I applaud the administration for all it has done in this cause. It is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we in Congress will now take this opportunity to continue.

Since the passage of the Byrd amendment in 1971, we have supported a racist minority government which restricts the rights of the majority of its citizens. Our economic support of this government runs contrary to our historical preference for majority rule.

If the United States means what it says about human rights we must prove it by the policies we pursue abroad.

These policies cannot include the support of minority rule against the will of the majority, nor can they include the abrogation of our international commitments. The passage of the Byrd amendment in 1971 created such an abrogation.

Since 1971, we have stood against a United Nations sanction prohibiting trade with Rhodesia. The sanctions were invoked in 1966 and 1968 under chapter VII of the U.N. Charter. We are committed, by the Charter to abide by those sanctions.

How can this country be an advocate of human rights when we stand opposed to the one international body capable of forwarding the cause to which we attach so much importance? Our standing in the world depends on our expression of faith in the ability of the United Nations to effect the outcome of the struggle for freedom for all people. This must include the black majority in Rhodesia.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that those

of my colleagues who supported the Byrd amendment did not do so out of any desire to limit the human rights of the people of Rhodesia. They perhaps felt at that time the economic realities of the situation demanded we import chrome from Rhodesia. Dependence upon the Soviet Union for high quality chrome was viewed as disadvantageous, and still is. However the economic conditions that may have required our reliance on Rhodesian chrome no longer exist. According to the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior our dependence on Rhodesian chrome dropped by almost 50 percent between 1975 and 1976. This is due to advances in technology in our steel industry which have limited the need for high quality chrome ore as well as our ability to purchase chrome from other sources, such as the Philippines and Brazil.

Mr. Chairman, it may be an unfortunate reality that economic necessity can stand in the way of philosophically consistent policy. However, when the economic realities change we must do what is right.

Mr. Chairman, for over 200 years struggling people all over the world have looked to America for inspiration. Many times we have provided it. Now the people of Rhodesia look to us. The majority is setting forth its rightful demand to rule that embattled country.

I urge my colleagues to stand against minority rule, to stand against abrogation of international agreements, and to vote for H.R. 1746.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of H.R. 1746 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

The repeal of the Byrd amendment will be a sign to the world community that the United States is serious about its commitments to human rights. This action is essential to the development of good relationships with the African nations. If we continue to import Rhodesian chrome, we will make it impossible for the citizens of these countries to believe that we are sincere in our support of self-determination and majority rule in Rhodesia.

When the Byrd amendment passed in 1971, forceful arguments were made that we must import chrome from Rhodesia; that we should not be dependent on the Soviet Union for chrome; that this was a matter of national security. Presently we have enough chrome stockpiled to last for several decades of war.

Another argument was the loss of American jobs. The proponents of the Byrd amendment stated that many workers in the stainless steel industry would be laid off. This has been a fallacious argument according to the United Steelworkers. In fact, they have been resentful that the job security of their workers has been the scapegoat for not complying with the embargo. And now the stainless steel industry, who in the past lobbied for the need of the Byrd amendment, has testified that new technologies no longer make this necessary.

It is our hope to effect a peaceful solution to the problems in Rhodesia. President Carter's administration is behind the repeal. There are no reasons to

continue to import chrome from Rhodesia and every reason to comply with the terms of the embargo.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the repeal of the Byrd amendment and in doing, they will be voting for human rights and our commitment toward self-determination in Rhodesia.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, today this body is considering H.R. 1746, a measure to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome. I believe that passage of this legislation would be economically unwise and if enacted, it will establish glaring incongruities in our foreign policy regarding human rights.

The proponents of this legislation point to the fact that the steel industry has developed new and improved technology thereby eliminating the need for high-grade Rhodesian chrome. These supporters say that the need for continued use of this product can be eliminated by switching to the lower grade chrome.

What they fail to realize is the expense of initiating a new technology. Companies such as Republic Steel, United States Steel, and others may be able to absorb the capital expenditures necessary to bring on line a new process but other smaller factories will find it prohibitive. The cast iron metal industries are primarily comprised of small facilities utilizing the manpower of less than 100 workers. These plants do not have the capital on hand to rapidly switch from the present process to the newer more expensive process known as AOD. We would be cutting off the livelihood of many of the companies, increasing unemployment, and requiring additional importation of foreign processed metal products.

Furthermore, the elimination of Rhodesian chrome would, in all likelihood, have an adverse inflationary effect on our economy. By limiting the supply of any product, our economic laws tell us the competition for a restricted market item will increase its price. The increased cost of the new product made without Rhodesian chrome would be passed along to the consumer stymieing our potential for growth.

But this is only the economic aspect of this legislation, what of the political ramifications? The thrust behind this bill is due to the repressive attitudes of the Rhodesian Government. Their apartheid policies are as caustic to me as they are to the supporters of this bill but so are the tyrannical and dictatorial policies employed by the Soviet Union, our other major source for chrome. Are we to overlook the questionable police tactics of this Communist country and in the meantime place restrictive trade sanctions on a smaller government? To selectively impose such economic sanctions is dangerous, confusing, and capricious.

Mr. Chairman, we need to face facts. We need Rhodesian chrome whether we like their internal policies or not. If we impose this economic sanction against Rhodesia it would be totally inconsistent to turn around and look toward the other principle exporter of chrome, the Soviet Union, for the product. I hope we utilize rationality over passion on this issue and defeat the proposal before us, H.R. 1746.

Mr. MARKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1746, a bill to halt the

importation into the United States of Rhodesian chrome and restore the United States to full compliance with United Nations economic sanctions in accordance with international treaty obligations.

On December 16, 1966, the Security Council of the United Nations adopted a resolution invoking mandatory selective economic sanctions against Rhodesia. The United States voted in favor of this resolution, and the sanctions were implemented in this country by Executive Order No. 11322. Further sanctions, also supported by the United States, were adopted by the Security Council in May 1968. The impact of this action was to make the embargo on Commerce with Rhodesia virtually total.

The United States supported the economic embargo against Rhodesia until 1971, when the Byrd amendment to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act was adopted. This allowed the importation from Rhodesia of chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel in violation of the U.N. sanctions. Attempts to repeal the Byrd amendment in the 93d and 94th Congresses were unsuccessful.

We must not allow this present effort to repeal the Byrd amendment to fail. I say this for two reasons.

First, the economic arguments in support of the Byrd amendment no longer are persuasive. In a specialty steel update to the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, Mr. Howard O. Beaver, Jr., president of Carpenter Technology Corp., stated:

Today, because of major technological advances in specialty steelmaking and tremendous investments in the Republic of South Africa in mining, ore beneficiation, and new smelting technology, the chromium from Rhodesia is no longer absolutely essential to the continued operation of our industry.

Similarly, Mr. E. F. Andrews, vice president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries, testified before the Senate Africa Subcommittee on behalf of the Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee that "we cannot stand before you and make the arguments" made in 1971 and 1974 against previous repeal efforts. In addition, Mr. John Sheehan, legislative director of the United Steelworkers of America, pointed out in a letter to Members of the House:

Our union has always opposed the embargo-breaking Byrd amendment, and we have always denied the argument that reinstatement of the embargo would jeopardize the jobs of our members in the specialty steel industry. . . . We are pleased that the specialty steel industry has now also publicly stated that Rhodesian chrome is not vital to domestic needs. It should be emphasized that less than 10 percent of the chrome consumed by the U.S. last year came from Rhodesia. That small amount can easily be replaced by other sources.

Some in the specialty steel industry have expressed concern that repeal of the Byrd amendment would allow unfair competition from foreign specialty steel producers who ship steel to the United States which contains Rhodesian chrome. The bill before us addresses this problem by requiring that imports of chromium-bearing specialty steel mill products be accompanied by a certificate of origin

specifying that the chromium in them did not originate in Rhodesia.

There is another point which should be kept in mind as far as the economic impact of repeal of the Byrd amendment is concerned. It is the question of short term policies versus long term policies. Whatever economic benefits are derived from dealing with the present minority government in Rhodesia in violation of the U.N. sanctions, those benefits inevitably are short term in duration. The tide of history is against that government, and its days clearly are numbered. We must consider that a future majority government of Zimbabwe will recall those who propped up the predecessor regime through illegal trade when it decides with whom it will share the world's largest natural reserves of chrome ore.

Second, retention of the Byrd amendment is injurious to the international interests of the United States. The Byrd amendment has severely damaged our credibility with black Africa. How can we claim to be concerned about human rights, self-determination, and majority rule when we violate U.N. sanctions by trading with an illegal, racist government to which no nation has extended diplomatic recognition? Our words in support of majority rule will not be taken seriously in Africa until they are matched by action. By making a small, short term commercial sacrifice, we can recapture the respect of black Africa and dispel the mistrust our actions have engendered.

Hopefully, by asserting our moral leadership to bring about universal compliance with the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia we can create a climate that will permit the peaceful implementation of majority rule in that country. With this in mind, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of H.R. 1746.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, once again Congress is confronted with the critical issue of U.S. participation in the 10-year-old U.N. embargo of Rhodesian chrome. Since 1971, with the passage of the Byrd amendment, we have directly violated the United Nations economic sanctions against that nation, and have alined ourselves with a government which represents only 4 percent of its population. I hope that today we will end this practice, and will put the United States back into compliance with international law, permitting the U.S. Government to take a constructive role in a peaceful transition to majority government.

The arguments against this action have been persuasive in the past, but have recently lost their strength. For instance, the specter of U.S. dependence on the Soviet Union for this critical material has always been a powerful argument against our participation in any United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia's self-proclaimed minority government. Given the current technological advances in the processing of lesser-grade chrome ore, however, U.S. dependence on the Soviet Union for this critical material has lessened. While we currently import from the Soviet Union approximately 50 percent of our chrome ore, we have consistently increased our ferrochrome im-

ports, which are processed from a lower quality ore made available from non-Soviet sources.

Also, the impact which this embargo would have upon industries dependent on chrome supplies would be minimal. Last year Rhodesian chrome accounted for only 5 percent of the total imported, and the steel industry has acknowledged that ending Rhodesian imports is no longer a subject of serious contention. We also must not forget that the United States has a 4-year supply of high-grade chrome ore in reserve. Even if there are repercussions as a result of this embargo, losing 5 percent of our imports now is better than losing future, and hopefully a greater percentage, of imports after the inevitable advent of majority-ruled government.

With the weakening of these economic arguments, it becomes all the more important for the United States to take its proper place among those nations pressing for an orderly transition to majority rule in Rhodesia. The emerging nations of Africa and the entire Third World will surely condition their future trade agreements on how we support their allies today. Remember, beside huge chrome deposits, Africa houses some of the world's richest supplies of tin, bauxite, copper, and other materials we need to exist as an industrial nation.

The change to majority rule in Rhodesia is close at hand. Let us hope it will be a peaceful transition, and that we can play a beneficial role in it. With adequate stockpiles to meet our defense needs for years to come, we should not hesitate today to help the oppressed Rhodesians through our support of H.R. 1746. As recent developments have shown, continued ambivalence on the part of the major industrialized nations will only prolong the senseless bloodshed and violence which has marred the road to majority rule.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to those of my colleagues who are urging support of H.R. 1746, a bill which reimposes an embargo on imports of chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel from Rhodesia. Since Congress passed the Byrd amendment to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpile Act in 1971, this Nation has been in open violation of the sanctions imposed by the United Nations against Rhodesia. The Byrd amendment was adopted in spite of the fact that the United States in 1968 supported the U.N. Security Council finding that the actions of the white minority regime in Rhodesia constituted a threat to world peace. At that time the United States joined the Security Council's mandatory, comprehensive sanctions program against the Ian Smith government.

Adoption of the Byrd amendment has meant economic support by the United States for an African regime which represents only whites—less than 4 percent of Rhodesia's population. Voting qualifications for blacks are extremely restrictive and continuing white control has denied them a fair share of education, income, and land. Furthermore, it is entirely inconsistent for this Nation, which seeks to serve as a beacon for hu-

man rights, to continue economic support for such a repressive and racist regime.

For these reasons, the bill before us today has the support of a wide range of groups including the American Bar Association, AFL-CIO, United Auto Workers, Americans for Democratic Action, U.S. Catholic Conference, National Council of Churches, Ford Motor Co., United Steel Workers of America, and the NAACP.

I strongly urge each of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation.

Mr. DAN DANIEL. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to question any group's motives for action or inaction, but the complicity of big steel in the repeal of the Byrd amendment, is too obvious to be ignored. By supporting imposition of the ban on chrome from Rhodesia, the industry has further imperiled this Nation's sources of a vital mineral for its own narrow interests. Having supported the Byrd amendment in the past, the industry has done an about-face, declaring there will be no damage to it by imposing the ban. I am disturbed that any industry in this country would put its own interests ahead of national security and economic health.

The excuse in the Congress for this action was human rights. Now we find our purchases of chrome ore and ferrochrome must be made from such countries as the Soviet Union, Albania, and India, none of which has shown any concern for human rights. How hypocritical can we be?

I intend to monitor closely not only the effect on prices—which may be considerable—but also the availability of supply.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, the legislation now under debate by the House would restore the embargo by the United States on Rhodesian goods, particularly chrome, that was imposed in 1966 in compliance with the United Nations sanction but then lifted in 1971 by the so-called Byrd amendment.

Although it appears from all accounts that the Congress, with the strong backing of the Carter administration, will vote to pass the legislation repealing the Byrd amendment. I intend to vote against it, although somewhat reluctantly. My reasons for doing so are grounded in my belief that while the expressed aims are noteworthy, repealing the Byrd amendment would not be in the best practical interests of the United States. Nor is it clear that this legislation will help attain our objective of obtaining majority rule in Rhodesia by peaceful means.

In the questionnaire that I sent my constituents in 1967, I asked whether they approved of the economic sanctions imposed by the U.N. on Rhodesia, which only 2 years previously had unilaterally declared its independence from Great Britain. Britain had requested the sanctions, and I told my constituents, in answering my own questionnaire, that out of deference to our oldest ally I "reluctantly supported" the sanctions.

However, Mr. Chairman, events since 1967 have convinced me that our embargo of Rhodesian chrome was not a wise course of action. The Soviet Union

became our principal source of chrome, and quickly took advantage of our dependence by reducing the quality of the ore exported to the United States while at the same time increasing its price by nearly 100 percent. Moreover, the Soviet Union has reportedly been one of the most flagrant violators of the U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia. Consequently, Congress in 1971 passed the Byrd amendment to the military procurement bill, lifting the embargo on Rhodesian chrome. I supported the Byrd amendment at that time, and have voted against legislative attempts since then to repeal it, in 1972 and 1975. I remain convinced that Rhodesian chrome, which accounts for a very substantial portion of our imported ore, is vital to our security interests, and my position on the Byrd amendment has not changed.

Chrome ore, a resource conceded by all as critical to American interests, is coincidentally found mainly in countries also guilty in varying degrees of repressing human rights—Rhodesia, South Africa, the Soviet Union, Brazil, and Turkey. If we are to follow the arguments of those favoring repeal of the Byrd amendment, that the United States ought not to trade with a country whose government is morally repugnant, then the logical conclusion is that we should be consistent and cease importing chrome from those other countries as well, a conclusion whose absurdity is self-evident. The irony—indeed hypocrisy—of thus singling out Rhodesia for embargo, Mr. Chairman, is compounded by the result, which will be to increase our dependence for chrome on countries whose internal policies are also offensive. This is what disturbs me most about this legislation and is why I cannot support it.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of all my colleagues to an editorial appearing in the Miami Herald on February 25, 1977, entitled "Boycott on Chrome Is Unrealistic." The editor rightly states that economic sanctions such as those imposed on Rhodesia do not prevent the flow of subject goods in world commerce. Their main economic impact is to increase the costs to American businesses and in turn to the American consumer.

It is further noted that Rhodesian chrome is vital to U.S. security. In repealing the Byrd amendment, the United States will be forced to rely more heavily on the Soviet Union for its supply of high chromite—a move the Soviets have already anticipated by raising metallurgical grade ore prices from \$51.73 per ton in 1973 to the present price of \$160 per ton.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to defeat H.R. 1746 which would reimpose the U.N. embargo on Rhodesian chrome ore. This is a course of action consistent with both practical economics and the interests of our national security.

The article is as follows:

BOYCOTT ON CHROME IS UNREALISTIC

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee at the behest of the State Department has voted 15 to 1 to restore the embargo on imports of Rhodesian chrome which was cancelled in 1972 by the so-called Byrd amendment.

The amendment ran counter to the United Nations embargo on 72 strategic materials produced by Rhodesia. The U.N. effort was aimed at the racial policies of Rhodesia as well as its rebellion against British rule. Sen. Harry Byrd of Virginia argued successfully that cutting off Rhodesian chrome would deprive this country of a vital ore needed to manufacture steel and make us dependent on the Soviet Union, the second largest chrome producer after South Africa.

The facts of the matter are clouded not only by emotion but also by contradictory statistics and a recent invention which provides a larger yield of chromium from lower grade of chrome ore available outside Rhodesia. Too, while Sen. Dick Clark of Iowa argues that "only 5 per cent of our chrome last year came from Rhodesia," imports of ferrochrome from all sources have increased six times in seven years.

Chrome from Rhodesia is important to U.S. security. The U.N. embargo which we appear to support is a sieve through which chrome ores pour at much higher prices. Boycotts are a form of economic war with dangerous implications. The full Senate ought to defeat the Byrd repealer in the name of common sense.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1746 of which I am a cosponsor. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the purpose of H.R. 1746 is to allow the reimposition of embargo on imports of chrome ore, ferrochrome and nickel from apartheid-ridden Rhodesia. Mechanically, H.R. 1746 would amend the United Nations Participation Act and thus repeal the Byrd amendment by allowing the President of the United States to issue an executive order requiring the United States to comply with U.S. economic sanctions against Rhodesia. Mr. Chairman, since the Byrd amendment was first proposed in 1971 it has been opposed by every U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, every U.S. Secretary of State, the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the International Relations Committee of the House. Despite this opposition the U.S. Congress, has seen fit to support the odious Byrd amendment.

Mr. Chairman, by repeatedly upholding the Byrd amendment the United States has gone on record as supporting apartheid and the myriad of human suffering and misery which accompanies this condition. Mr. Chairman, the time is long overdue for the Congress to serve notice on the world that America is unequivocally opposed to racism and resolutely on the side of majority rule in Rhodesia. Mr. Chairman, apologists for the racist conditions within Rhodesia have made three major arguments in support of the retention of the Byrd amendment. According to these apologists, opposition to the Byrd amendment is inconsistent with the U.S. approach to human rights, will result in a loss of jobs and a major supply of chrome, and will be ineffective in altering Rhodesia's racist policy.

Mr. Chairman, I reject these three arguments as specious for several reasons. First, to imply that America's opposition to apartheid in Rhodesia is "inconsistent" begs the issue. The stark fact of the matter is that 95 percent of Rhodesia is black African yet it is subjected to domination by a minority of European whites. The sole basis for this domination is racism. Opposing these circum-

stances does not imply that the United States condones human rights violations in the Soviet Union or racism in the ghettos of America, for America recognizes that human rights must be supported in all nations. The problem with Rhodesia is that it represents not only a blatant affront to the international community and a clear threat to international peace, but one of the last vestiges of the European colonialism of Africa.

Second, to suggest that Americans would lose jobs and a major source of chrome by repealing the Byrd amendment is simply not true. According to a spokesman for the United Steelworkers of America:

Steelworker jobs are not threatened by a reimposition of the full embargo on Rhodesian trade, and they never have been.

Concerning American dependence on Rhodesian chrome the United States has not only stockpiled chrome in excess of its need but the domestic ferrochrome industry has developed a procedure which makes it possible for the United States to utilize low-grade chrome ore which need not be imported from Rhodesia. And finally to suggest that it would be difficult to enforce sanctions against Rhodesia thus we should not even try is a position which is clearly without merit. It ignores the tremendous and far-reaching symbolic impact of the repeal of the Byrd amendment. Mr. Chairman, the repeal of the Byrd amendment tells the world that America no longer supports racism and apartheid in Africa and no longer upholds minority rule. Mr. Chairman, the repeal of the Byrd amendment tells the world that America will no longer violate its own obligations under the United Nations Charter.

Mr. Chairman, I urge you to vote today to repeal the Byrd amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Chair announces that 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 clause 2, rule XXIII, further proceedings under the call shall be considered as vacated.

The Committee will resume its business.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it amended by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 (22 U.S.C. 287c) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "Any Executive order which is issued under this subsection and which applies measures against Southern Rhodesia pursuant to any United Nations

Security Council Resolution may be enforced, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law; and

(2) 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 any United Nations Security Council Resolution, 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 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. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "sentence" and insert in lieu thereof "sentences"; and in line 10, immediately before the closing quotation mark insert the following new sentence: "The President may exempt from such Executive order any shipment of chromium in any

form which is in transit to the United States on the date of enactment of this sentence."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAUMAN TO THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAUMAN to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 4, after the word "sentence," strike the period and quotation marks and insert the following: ", Provided however, That no imports into the United States of chrome ore, ferrochrome or nickel shall be allowed unless the President first certifies in writing to the Congress that the country or origin of such imports is in compliance with the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter."

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply an effort to apply evenly the principle which the backers of this bill say they support, and that is true concern for the condition of the human rights of the people in any country from which chrome is imported into the United States.

Of course, the bill before us, in fact, limits itself specifically to Rhodesia. But as I indicated in my previous remarks, the state of civil and human rights in other nations, which also produce a significant amount of chrome, including the Soviet Union, to which we will have to turn for these imports, also certainly should be a matter of serious concern.

If we are to have a consistent application of the Carter principle of foreign policy, that is, concern with human rights, it should be applied evenly across the board to each and every country.

For that reason, I have offered an amendment which simply says that the President, who has certain other duties under the existing United Nations Participation Act, must certify to the Congress that every one of these countries seeking to import chrome, ferrochrome or nickel to the United States shall have to be the subject of a statement to the Congress, in writing, demonstrating that such nation is, in fact, in compliance with the human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter.

This amendment is not in any sense frivolous, unless its opponents consider human rights to be frivolous; unless its opponents consider the plight of Soviet Jews and dissidents to be frivolous. No; this is deadly serious and if one is truly for human rights for everyone, this amendment should be supported.

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

Mr. BAUMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman offering his amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. BAUMAN. I am, indeed.

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman realizes, of course, that the country of South Africa, has, I believe, around 23 percent of the world's reserve of chrome. Southern Rhodesia, or Rhodesia, has about 67 percent. The country of South Africa practices apartheid, while the country of

South Rhodesia, or Rhodesia, or Zimbabwe, whatever they want to call it, does not practice apartheid, and this means that we would have no chrome that we could import from South Africa. Is that right?

Mr. BAUMAN. The gentleman is a very astute Member of the Congress. I am sure he understands the meaning of this amendment. The United States would not be able to import chrome from any country which continues to act in violation of the United Nations Charter and its guarantees of human rights.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland seeks to do nothing more than to apply that charter and those human rights provisions to all countries.

Mr. ICHORD. Certainly that would be true of Russia because the former Secretary of State has testified that Russia is less democratic than Rhodesia.

Mr. BAUMAN. Exactly.

Mr. ICHORD. Would it also apply to Turkey? Turkey has considerable chrome.

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Missouri knows, we agreed here to the Harkin amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act last year which directed the State Department to produce an assessment of human rights in every country that receives our assistance. We now have a catalog of those rights violations. These reports have been coming down to us in the form of reports to the Committee on International Relations, and we need only to look at them.

Under my amendment, the President can simply make a determination, and if he thinks that human rights in Russia, which has produced and exported chrome ore to the United States, are in such good order that we ought to import chrome from them in preference to Rhodesia, then he can simply say that to us in writing. He can state that Russia is in compliance with the U.N. Charter, which I think he would be reluctant to do.

Mr. ICHORD. There is another country, one in South America, from which we import some chrome, and that is Brazil. Would these provisions apply also to Brazil?

Mr. BAUMAN. I think that Brazil, in deference to the statements which have been made about human rights, would also be prohibited. This probably would apply to Brazil.

Mr. ICHORD. The nation of the Philippines mines a little chromium. I suppose we could import chrome from the Philippines; could we not?

Mr. BAUMAN. Once that country or any country, as Rhodesia, is shown to have complied with the U.N. Charter's human rights provisions, that Nation could be brought back into the sisterhood of nations.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all those Members who are sincere in what they say about human rights, to accept the principle of human rights in every nation and not to engage in the crass hypocrisy the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) has referred to previously.

I would hope that we can obtain enough Members to stand and get a roll-

call vote on this amendment so that we can renew our commitment to human rights in every country all across the world. To do otherwise would indeed show the hypocrisy of this legislation.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the debate this afternoon there perhaps has been a misunderstanding with respect to the origin and nature of the embargo against Southern Rhodesia. The Harkin amendment was referred to just a few moments ago. The Harkin amendment deals with governmental policy in terms of foreign assistance, and it was decided by this body that we would deny aid to those countries which are determined to be engaged in gross denial of basic human rights. But today we are talking about private contracts and private enterprise.

The history of the Rhodesian sanctions began in 1965 when a handful of whites in Southern Rhodesia, representing less than 10 percent of the population, declared themselves independent of Great Britain. Great Britain went to the Security Council of the U.N. and indicated that it was opposed to this unilateral declaration of independence, particularly on the grounds that the human and individual rights were not protected by this declaration of independence. The Security Council took this case under consideration and in 1966 agreed unanimously, the United States concurring, that indeed, the unilateral declaration of independence, UDI, should not be recognized. In other words, the Security Council of the United Nations unanimously ruled that Southern Rhodesia should be denied the right of nationhood.

Furthermore, in this decision of the U.N., it was determined and agreed by all parties in the Security Council that certain items would be embargoed.

So we are not talking here about a unilateral decision by the United States; we are not talking here about consistency of United States foreign policy. The Rhodesian policy is a world policy.

Certainly there are many private concerns in the United States that deal with countries which have a record of human rights that are as poor as that of Rhodesia's. We have not cut those countries off from commercial relations with private firms. What we are talking about here is a resolution passed in 1966 by the Security Council of the United Nations which does two things: It denies the right of nationhood to this group of people that declared itself independent, and, second, it imposes an embargo.

This was unanimously agreed to by the members of the Security Council, including the United States. Therefore, we are not talking—I repeat—about consistency or inconsistency in U.S. foreign policy.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I certainly urge that we defeat this amendment because it has no relevance to the issue before us.

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

Mr. WHALEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN) has made a very important point in regard to human rights.

He said that the U.N. sanction that was imposed in 1966 was based upon the denial of human rights in Rhodesia.

Does the gentleman feel that the U.N. has that power? It was my understanding that the U.N. Charter specifically states that the only time it shall have the right to impose economic sanctions against any nation is when they think that nation is a threat to world peace.

Mr. WHALEN. To answer the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly this was done under those circumstances because the unilateral declaration of independence, not recognized by the mother country—in this case, Great Britain—was unanimously determined by the members of the Security Council that this would not be recognized as an independent nation or state, and that, furthermore, embargoes should be applied on certain key commodities.

Mr. ICHORD. Then the gentleman disagrees with former Secretary Kissinger when he stated that he did not think that Rhodesia was a threat to world peace; is that correct?

Mr. WHALEN. This was a decision of the United Nations taken, as the gentleman suggests, in 1966, which at the time was undoubtedly the view of the members of the Security Council.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the argument immediately preceding as to whether the United Nations recognized the validity of the Government of Rhodesia.

I would submit that had a United Nations existed 200 years ago, the mother country, of course, would not have recognized the independence of the United States. That, however, has no great bearing on this particular argument before us.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened today to some very high-flown arguments on human rights. We seem to say to this small country that where human rights are concerned in Rhodesia, we can embargo a particular product and maybe bring that country to the bargaining table for majority rule.

At the same time, the argument is made that in relation to other nations such as the Soviet Union, in which human rights do not exist, we must deal with them a different way.

I would submit that the apparent different way is that we embargo Rhodesia because it is a little country and they cannot do much about it, but in the case of the Soviet Union, I suppose the only argument there is to drop the bomb and then maybe they will understand that.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think that that is a very good way of doing things, and I think the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) does the body a real service by addressing what we claim to be addressing in this bill, and that is human rights.

If we feel as strongly about human rights as we claim to feel, certainly there is no reason not to pass the amendment of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN). He simply says, in relation to chrome, that we will not import it from South Africa; we will not import it from the Soviet Union; obviously, not from Brazil; obviously, not from Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, I would submit that if we went a little further and dealt with all of our foreign trade relations in this manner, we would probably not deal with anybody, including the United States.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bad bill at a bad time and for all of the wrong reasons. I would submit that if we want to make the bill a little bit more palatable, we ought to be honest about human rights and pass the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said here today that we only import 5 percent of our chromium needs from Rhodesia and only 14 percent of our ferrochrome needs from Rhodesia.

It has also been said that all of a sudden labor and management now say that we really do not need Rhodesian chrome.

Mr. Chairman, this is surely a swell time to get moral when we do not need any more of what it is that we say we should not have from this immoral nation of Rhodesia.

That question and that action, if taken, is really hypocrisy at its best—if the Members will pardon my use of the word "best."

What, on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues of this body, would be the case if we really needed Rhodesian chrome?

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

Mr. BADHAM. I will be glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Idaho.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point in relation to the gentleman's point that I believe he is making so well, and that is about the argon oxidation process which is such an expensive process that some of the big steel companies have said that they would try to get by without chrome because it is so expensive that no one can use it but the big huge companies. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that 80 percent of the foundries in America employ less than 50 people and they are not going to be able to afford this argon oxidation process because it is too expensive.

So there again we are only for the biggies and letting the little ones all fall by the wayside without chrome, not to mention the \$100 million per year the consumers of steel will pay in the United States thanks to this action.

Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Idaho for the comments he has made, and to thank him for pointing out the difference between "big" and "little."

That is exactly as my distinguished colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM) has said, that we could not do it if it were Russia but we can do it with poor little Rhodesia. And we are again, in some small sense, being hypocritical, because we can do it to the little man in the United States but not to the big steel companies who can afford, as my colleague the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS) says, the argon oxidation process.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would again ask what would happen if we really needed Rhodesian chrome in this country? You can bet your bottom buck that all of the sanctionious statements concerning human rights in Rhodesia would fall on deaf ears for those who would want the chromium to come from somewhere else.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish up simply by saying that the United Nations—and we have heard nothing but the United Nations and its great concern for human rights today when it comes to chromium and Rhodesia. But does the United Nations govern the United States of America? Not yet, by golly, and there are a lot of us around here who do not think that day is going to come, hopefully. But the United Nations has called Israel "racist." It is the U.N. who fights the "peacekeeping operations" against our friends. It is the U.N. who tell us that we cannot judge between big or little in the United States so far as organized labor, and the like, by putting sanctions upon us—that are meaningless in the first place—and on our relationships with foreign friends in the community of nations. We find now that about 20 percent of the world's population, global land mass, or whatever, remains in the free camp, 20 percent. But if these kinds of proposals are passed then we are telling the rest of the 20 percent that we are going to go it alone, and, as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. KETCHUM) said we probably could not even abide by our own rules if we really had to.

I agree with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN), the author of the amendment, the gentleman is correct: if we are going to use chromium on this planet as a vehicle for human rights, then let us use chromium as the essence of human rights; let us not get it from anyone who does not have the same kind, whatever that is, of human rights that we enjoy in this country.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the major point has been omitted from much of the discussion of this issue. Yes, we are talking about human rights. Yes we are talking about the United Nations. But, in this particular case, we are talking about much more. We are talking about the Security Council of the United Nations, of which we were a member, at the time when President Johnson was the Chief Executive of this country, and pursuant to his instructions and the Secretary of State at that time, this

country joined other members of the Security Council in making a firm commitment.

We have since reneged on a commitment which this country made. It is well enough to talk about why do we not cut out Russia, and why do we not cut out other nations, which do not respect human rights. This is really an evasion of the point. The question is whether or not we shall measure up to our responsibilities, our firm commitment, which we joined with other nations of the Security Council in making. They were not imposed on us by other members of the United Nations. These are commitments in which we participated, and in which we, indeed, were one of the leaders in bringing about this projected embargo of chrome and other imports from Rhodesia.

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

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

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman brought into this discussion the previous President, President Johnson, and his intent to improve human rights around the world. We have heard from President Carter recently about his intention to apply the concept of human rights everywhere. That is all that my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) was trying to encourage, as my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, knows. The gentleman from Tennessee is not opposed to human rights everywhere, is he?

Mr. ALLEN. I am not opposed if the gentleman will yield back my time to human rights anywhere. I am in favor of human rights.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. That is all the Bauman amendment suggests.

Mr. ALLEN. We cannot unilaterally boycott Russia and unilaterally boycott other nations with whose domestic policies we do not agree. But in this case we voted. We made the commitment ourselves as a member of the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. The gentleman is for human rights; then he can support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland, because that is all it seeks.

Mr. ALLEN. No. The thrust of this amendment is to deny this country any access at all.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Oh, no, no, that is not the intent of the amendment. Only if human rights are abridged in the other countries that export chrome to the United States—the same mandate we give to Rhodesia.

Mr. ALLEN. The distinguished gentleman from Maryland said that if his amendment is adopted, it would effectively preclude our buying chrome from any nation.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Oh, no, only if those countries denied human rights.

Mr. ALLEN. But in effect he said they all deny human rights.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. What is the difference?

Mr. ALLEN. There is a great difference.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Will the gentleman from Tennessee explain the difference to me? That is what I want to understand. What is the difference between Russia and Rhodesia for instance?

Mr. ALLEN. The difference is that we committed in the United Nations Security Council ourselves to this course of action. We participated in the decision.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. No. The gentleman is not speaking to the issue of human rights. Tell me the difference in the denial of human rights—which many of my colleagues from New York and other places address themselves all of the time, and I agree with them—between Russia and Rhodesia? Does the gentleman want to speak to that issue?

Mr. ALLEN. This is not just a matter of human rights.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. I see. We are not in agreement on that point.

Mr. ALLEN. It also has to do with whether or not our President, when he goes before the United Nations later this week, can say that our Congress has now authorized him to carry out our firm commitment which we made as a member of the Security Council, some 5 or 6 years ago. That is the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ALLEN) has expired.

Mr. KETCHUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ALLEN) be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to get back and talk about some of the real issues, the issue of economics and what is in the best interests of the United States. The gentleman's amendment neither makes economic sense, nor is it in the best strategic interests of the United States.

It is true that we are now able to free ourselves from being tied to Rhodesian chrome. That is absolutely true—so long as other chromes supplies are available. It is the one product that we do not produce in the United States of America and it is the one product that is most essential to this country in peace and in war. We have been assured by our Government that at no time would this Nation get into a position of being subjected to what we were subjected to during the time of the embargo.

The Byrd amendment was enacted by the Congress of the United States, knowing exactly what it meant to the rest of the world and what it meant to us. It was meant that we would survive as a specialty steel producing nation. We cannot produce anything we can see, we cannot produce anything we can play with and we cannot produce anything for our Defense without ferrochrome. Every tool man has made since he learned to

harden tools has been made from mixtures of chrome and ferrochrome which has enabled us to produce the age in which we live. We would have never been able to build a plane or produce a plow for our fields without chrome.

We have done that because we had access to supplies of chrome. The secret of the matter is if we are pushed either by Russia or by anybody else, we can use the lower grade chrome ore we have in this country.

But we should want to get away from this business of being dependent every time somebody gets an exclusive throttle on our economic throats. Other countries are squeezing us on coffee and tea and on oil. Next winter we will probably be squeezed on meat and the American people will have to pay a tremendous price for their foods.

In helping other nations become independent, we ourselves are becoming more dependent.

To me it is a simple thing we have to do for this country. We have to use the inventiveness and the ingenuity of the American people to be independent of all nations in all things.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman in the well who is speaking knows ferrochrome and he knows chrome and he knows the stainless steel industry.

There is one thing that bothers me about this new process that we developed, the AOD process, where we can use low-grade chrome in the making of stainless steel. Our good friend Andy Andrews from Allegheny Ludlum talked about this.

Mr. DENT. He is from my district. Go ahead.

Mr. ICHORD. He is from the gentleman's district. He has advised me we can tell when Rhodesian chrome ore is coming into the United States. We can even tell when ferrochrome is coming into the United States. But no one can tell the ferrochrome or the chrome that is in a stainless steel product. The thing that bothers me is that if we go ahead and pass this amendment, we know Japan buys a lot of ferrochrome and chrome ore from the nation of Turkey. It will be all Turkish ore and the gentleman knows as well as I do that every major country in the world has been buying ferrochrome from Rhodesia, and they have been trading many other items from Rhodesia.

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. Those of us who went through the certificate of fraud during the days when we embargoed Red China know what happened then, but certification can be done if we are serious.

Let me tell the gentleman what we have to do. We have to pass this bill and pass it today, and if we do it right we will pass it overwhelmingly, with the understanding that no country who buys

1 pound of Rhodesian chrome or ferrochrome will be permitted to ship into the United States one product made with Rhodesian ferrochrome or chrome.

Let me just say how it can be done.

Mr. ICHORD. That is my question, how to enforce it.

Mr. DENT. I will do it, if the gentleman will give me an open hand to do it. There will not be a pound of Rhodesian chrome sold, not 1 pound of it. Let me explain why, because we can tell the productivity and the use of Rhodesian chrome in every country that makes specialty steel and stainless steel. Japan cannot send us stainless steel. Japan cannot send us specialty steel, unless they have Rhodesian chrome. I know where they are getting it. Everybody in the field knows where they are getting it. They get it from Rhodesia. They are beating us over the head in this regard.

The only thing I am asking here now is that any chrome or ferrochrome already purchased before the passage of this act by American companies be delivered to them. Do not do what they did during the embargo when ships were two-thirds of the way home and they turned them back. These were shipments that had been bought and paid for. What they did last time, they turned them back, and we know where the shipments ended up. They ended up in the hands of Soviet Russia and they sold it to the United States.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1746 and urge its rejection by the House. The bill, as reported by the Committee on International Relations, has no other purpose than to interfere in the internal affairs of Rhodesia.

Every Member of this body is aware that the dispute involves the United Nations embargo placed on Rhodesia. Ostensibly, the embargo and sanctions were adopted because of the threat to world peace resulting from the decision of the Government of Rhodesia to declare its independence from the United Kingdom. However, as we are all aware, there has been no threat to world peace and the sanctions imposed by the United Nations are motivated by the desire of those who disagree with the internal policies of the Government of Rhodesia.

I, too, find myself in disagreement with many of the policies of that Government. But I find myself similarly opposed to the policies of dozens of other nations throughout the world. However, my disagreement with those internal policies cannot and should not justify economic sanctions by this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I stood on this floor approximately 18 months ago arguing against a bill almost identical to the one we are debating today. The Congress, in its wisdom, rejected that bill. There has been no new evidence brought to my attention, in the past 18 months, which would cause me to change my mind. The basic fault with the embargo sought to be imposed here is that there is no power in the U.N. to impose such an embargo ab-

sent a threat to world peace, as distinguished from internal civil war.

The Byrd amendment is sound even if it were predicated on this fact alone. Moreover, the Byrd amendment is in the interest of the defense of our own country. The Byrd amendment seems to me to be right, fair and just, because it is in our own defense interests and merely exerts the option not to intervene in the internal affairs of other nations.

Chrome, is of course, a critical defense material, the first such item to be entered in the list when the Congress passed the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of 1939. The Byrd amendment said, in substance, that if we can import any strategic or critical material from a Communist country, we can import it from a non-Communist country. What is so reprehensible about this? There must be some substance to the language since the Congress has rejected, on several occasions in the past, efforts to repeal the Byrd amendment.

Keep in mind four salient facts:

First. Chrome is essential in the making of stainless steel. Despite what you hear, there is no substitute for chrome, and stainless steel is the backbone of defense production.

Second. There is no domestic source of supply for chrome. The United States is completely dependent on foreign countries for metallurgical grade chrome.

Third. Rhodesia has 67 percent of the world's known reserves of metallurgical grade chrome. Rhodesia and South Africa, together, have 89 percent of the world's known reserves.

Fourth. Soviet Russia, presently our major supplier of chrome ores, has only about 6 percent of the world's known resources of metallurgical grade chrome.

Reinstating the embargo on chrome will increase our dependence on Soviet Russia as a source of supply. Common-sense and simple arithmetic should tell us that it is not wise for the United States to shut off the greatest single source of chrome in the world. It is foolish, from the standpoint of our national defense, to increase our dependence on Soviet Russia for supply of this vital material.

Need I add that the Soviet Union is not the most reliable supplier in the world. During the Korean war, chrome shipments to the United States were cut off and the U.S.S.R. did not resume their shipments until 1959. And during the period 1967-71, when the U.S. embargo on Rhodesian chrome was in effect, there was a marked increase in the price of Russian chrome.

Statements have been made in the past that we should "forget about Rhodesia since we have a cushion in our national stockpile—a supply sufficient for several decades of war." Let me put that assertion to rest. It is based on confusion, on misunderstanding of the facts, and on dubious assumptions.

On October 1, 1976, the Federal Preparedness Agency established new Government stockpile goals for strategic and critical materials. The new goal for metallurgical grade chromite was set at

2,550,000 tons. This is an increase of more than 2 million tons since the last objective of 444,000 tons was established in 1973. Had the Congress accepted that objective, where would we be today? In fact, the stockpile policy guidance, under which the requirement for metallurgical grade chrome was reduced, concerned me so much that I insisted that the entire stockpile policy be reviewed. That study has now been completed and as a result, many of the objectives were increased by the Ford administration, including metallurgical grade chrome ore; and just this morning I have been advised by the Carter administration that it "has imposed a moratorium on all stockpile disposals requiring new legislation until a new stockpile policy review can be completed."

In summary, the enactment of this bill would be very harmful to the national security of this country, and it is not required by international law. We cannot afford to reduce our sources of supply and become even more dependent upon the Soviet Union for one of the most vital minerals required in our national defense. I urge the House to reject this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in emphatic ambivalence about the proposed ban on the importation of Rhodesian chrome.

The principal sponsor of the resolution has occupied the forefront of human rights advocacy during his years of dedicated service in this body. But as we catapult ourselves into the adoption of this resolution, I believe there are two fundamental considerations that bear on the legislative precedent that we are setting on this date.

We are leaping to this courageous and momentous denunciation in a total vacuum of overall direction and policy. We pursue this legislative course in the sincere commitment, or the guise, of making a substantive advancement in the cause of human rights. Should we rush to legislative particulars when we, as a Nation and legislative body, are doing so upon the tangential impulse of righteous indignation rather than as part of a national policy and determination?

There is a substantive deficiency in our legislation foundation. First, the piecemeal mollifier is not part of an in-place national policy. We have no policy or consistent philosophy in the international arena of human rights. It is at best hit and miss and at worst expedient hypocrisy. How in the name of "human rights" and "basic democratic principles" can we legislate against importation of Rhodesian chrome while we accelerate our importation of OPEC oil? There is a logical impairment in this approach. And to what ultimate end? We will increase our present 31 percent reliance—1972-75—upon importation of chrome from Communist Russia. Now there is a nation that reveres "human rights" and embodies the "democratic principles" that underline the resolution. Yet, will this body ever be asked to impose a similar legislative sanction upon the U.S.S.R.?

Even with our expanded lung capacities none of us would be well advised to hold our breath in anticipation of this legislative sanction against U.S.S.R.

There is a second foundational deficiency with this kind of legislative approach. An important legislative decision is being requested about a vital mineral resource without any in-place mineral policy to gauge the long- and short-term consequences to this Nation. Do we know where we are going as a nation with our significant dependence upon Russian's importation of chrome? Emphatically, we do not. We are in a state of national oblivion about our future dependence on chrome and 23 other minerals that support the industrial base of this Nation. This indifference to import dependency cost us dearly in 1973 with oil. We are walking down the same dead-end street with nonfuel minerals. A national mineral policy could direct a way out and provide some logical context in which to legislate this Nation's mineral future. We do not have that rational framework at this time.

There are blatant democratic deficiencies in Rhodesia. A similar condemnation could be laid at the doorstep of many rightest or leftest totalitarian regimes in our world. This Nation desperately needs some coherent and consistent and national policy. We have none on either foreign policy front or the mineral dependence front.

Any legislature foray in such a vacuum is subject to inherent infirmities.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTINI. I yield.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I want to say to the gentleman, my distinguished colleague, that I think he has hit on the key to this whole debate here. I, for one, am fully willing to cast my vote for H.R. 1746 if this House consistently—which is the point the gentleman is making—adopts also the Bauman amendment.

The reason I say that is that I think it is essential that we have a consistent policy in defense of human rights everywhere. I have been active in trying to help secure the rights of Soviet Jews who have had their rights denied them, and I am concerned that what the House is saying if the House votes against the Bauman amendment is that the rights of the black majority in Rhodesia are more important to us than the rights of the Jewish people in Russia, who are having their rights denied also. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. SANTINI. I thank the gentleman for his support, and would only invite the author of the amendment to respond to one additional query.

Do we not compound our lack of foundational basis for this legislative judgment with this amendment, rather than enhance it, having no national policy either in the arena of human rights or mineral policy?

Mr. BAUMAN. I would say to the gentleman, who has been in the forefront of the fight for a consistent national policy on minerals—in fact, I was pleased to join him in his letter to President Carter on that subject—that the amend-

ment certainly is not inconsistent with the concerns he has expressed. If this amendment is adopted, as indeed it should be, we may put an end to violations of human rights, and then we will be able to rationally address the issues the gentleman has raised. But, there is nothing inconsistent with bringing about the rational mineral policies the gentleman seeks.

Mr. SANTINI. But we do foreclose the import of chrome, realistically, from the principal supplier.

Mr. BAUMAN. No, we do not necessarily do that. I would say, if the gentleman will read the amendment again, that it makes clear that if these countries will follow the pattern of concern for human rights we have laid down for Rhodesia, they can change their form of repressive government and adopt a policy on human rights consistent with the United Nations Charter, we will be glad to import anything and everything they have to sell.

Mr. SANTINI. I can see Russia adopting that.

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

(On request of Mr. SYMMS and by unanimous consent, Mr. SANTINI was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. SANTINI. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to compliment the gentleman on his letter to President Carter, which I also signed, with respect to the national minerals policy. I think the gentleman, who is gaining a reputation in this Congress of being one who is very aware of what we are doing in the United States of America with respect to withdrawals of lands in relation to minerals, has brought up a very important point.

I would like to point out to the Members of this body that last year we voted away another potential substitute for chrome in Glacier National Bay in Alaska. Am I not correct?

Mr. SANTINI. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SYMMS. The gentleman and I did not vote it away, but the wisdom of the House did.

Mr. SANTINI. I think all 19 of us stood firm.

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

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

Mr. ASHBROOK. I was very interested in the question the gentleman proposed to the sponsor of the amendment, the gentleman from Maryland. Turning it around, would not it be a little bit better for us to have some American, say the President of the United States, determining these human rights, as against the United Nations? If we do not, it is going to be the United Nations determining, whereas in this case the President of the United States is a little bit closer to home and, I suggest, a much better person, a much better instrument, for determining these situations.

I would rather have the President of

the United States passing judgment than the United Nations, because they have already indicated that they are going to be one-sided on this issue, and certainly will not be as objective as our own President.

Mr. SANTINI. The gentleman poses a fair question. I would like to see it ultimately resolved, not by spontaneous response of our distinguished aggregation with all our assembled enlightenment but rather as a process of national policy and determination. I feel we aggravate, perhaps, the situation rather than enhance it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Except that the President would come closer to expressing national policy than the United Nations, I would think.

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

Mr. SANTINI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BUCHANAN).

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is aware that the last three Presidents of the United States have specifically asked us to take this action, and the President is now asking us to do so.

Mr. SANTINI. I am aware of that. I am also aware that the last three administrations failed to develop a fundamental policy of mineral resources to guide our Nation on these issues.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have had extensive debate on this amendment. I think it is quite clear that the adoption of this amendment would frustrate the purpose of the bill totally. This amendment could never become law because the bill with that amendment obviously could not be signed by the President. It would deprive the United States of important access to chrome ore and ferrochrome which our industries need. It makes no sense. It is clearly one of those frivolous amendments designed to defeat the entire legislation. I would hope we can have a vote on this amendment and then move on.

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

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

Mr. KETCHUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made the statement that if this amendment is adopted, the President would not sign the bill.

I know the President is for human rights. Is the gentleman privy to something which tells us that the President would not sign a bill guaranteeing human rights?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman knows, as well as I do, that while the President has spoken out, as I think the gentleman welcomes, on human rights issues, to make clear where we stand as a nation, this question of how we bring to bear our economic or military power remains quite a separate question. And to arbitrarily deprive the United States of important access to chrome ore and ferrochrome would not

make economic sense, nor do I believe that it would help the question of human rights, which I know the gentleman is interested in.

Here we are dealing with a specific problem. There is now going on in Rhodesia a major conflict which does involve other nations. It does threaten to become an ever wider war. President Carter is going up to the U.N. this week. Both President Ford and Secretary Kissinger, and also Secretary Vance, have gone on record in support of these sanctions. That is the issue. This amendment would totally frustrate the bill.

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mrs. FENWICK).

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I feel a sense of sorrow, as well as impatience. We are making a mockery here. Frivolous amendments have been entered purportedly in the cause of human rights. We know we are not discussing human rights. We do not question the motives of those who introduced them. Certainly they feel they are defending the interest of the United States. But we all are here defending the interest of the United States.

I never in my earlier statement made any mention of human rights. We are here involved, it seems to me, with the honor of our country. Our delegate in the U.N. voted not to buy from Rhodesia. We then passed an amendment in Congress to buy. I feel we made a grave mistake when we did so. We now have come to a stage in human affairs where we cannot fool with issues of such importance. And that is what we are doing. We are fooling around in this House. I think the time has come to vote and to stand up against this amendment.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

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

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman agree that the President's concern in the field of human rights has been directed to our U.S. military and economic assistance, whereas here we are talking about commercial relations in the private sector?

Mr. FRASER. The gentleman is quite right.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SYMMS.)

Mr. SYMMS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is sincerely trying to expedite this legislation. In an effort to help him save time, I have an amendment at the desk. I would like to get an opinion from the gentleman, as the floor leader of this bill.

My amendment would halt the importation of chrome and chrome ore from the Soviet Union effective 30 days after this bill becomes effective, as the Soviet Union also has minority government and is guilty of human rights violations.

Would the gentleman give an opinion as to whether he thinks that amendment would be covered in the Bauman amendment?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, clearly the Soviet Union violates human rights, so that this provision would deny access by the United States to chrome ore from the Soviet Union.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I also thank the gentleman for his opinion.

I understand the gentleman is saying that he would agree that the Soviet Union is also in violation of human rights. We will not get into a debate as to whether its violation is worse than Rhodesia's or not, but I think if that is the case, then I will not have to offer an amendment and we can vote on this amendment and settle the issue. I appreciate the gentleman's opinion on that, and I urge support of the Bauman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Soviet Union is the No. 1 enemy of human rights in the world today. Most recently President Carter has spoken out against the denial of human rights in Russia and has offered support for Soviet dissidents. So why should this proposed boycott of chromium apply only to Rhodesia? In 1975 we imported 49 percent of our chromium from the Soviet Union. If we are going to base our chrome import policy on whether or not exporting countries deny their citizens basic human rights, then at least, let us be consistent. If denial of human rights is the driving factor in these import-export decisions, then this embargo of chrome absolutely must extend to the Soviet Union. How can any Member of this Congress vote to embargo chrome from Rhodesia but not the Soviet Union? How can any Member of this Congress not admit that the Soviet Union is a far more oppressive regime than the one in Rhodesia? Mere consistency and intellectual honesty requires that the Soviet Union be included in the provisions in this bill.

As long as the economic embargoes against Rhodesia have been in effect the United States has been the only U.N. member nation to abide by them. Many questions have been raised as to whether or not Soviet chromium products exported to the United States have, in actuality, been Rhodesian in origin. We should make certain that all U.N. member nations abide by the embargo.

Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment that will prevent this body from becoming the world's greatest hypocrite today. If we are so concerned about human rights in Rhodesia, why are we not prohibiting the importation of chrome from the world's greatest alltime violator of human rights—the Soviet Union. The record of the Soviet Union is the longest and most consistent in modern history in this regard. The Soviet Government has suppressed the church, it has prevented free elections, it systematically terrorizes its Jews, Christians and Moslems, its Tartars, its Baltic citizens, and suppresses the identity of its Ukrainians to

name just a few. The means of accomplishing this suppression has ranged from simple incarceration in a psychiatric hospital, to long years and repeated sentences in forced labor camps and including execution. Mass resettlement has been used, quotas on admission to higher educational institutions has also been utilized. Whole areas of the U.S.S.R. have been depopulated in order to stifle resistance or nationalist tendencies on the part of minorities in the Soviet Union.

Now some Members may say that if we reimpose the ban today, and we also ban imports from the Soviet Union, then we have only South Africa left as a major importer and that is true. But these Members should also recall that the Soviet Union cut off imports of their chrome during the Berlin Blockade of 1948-49 as well as during the Korean war, so if we cut off Rhodesian chrome today, we are essentially down to one supplier anyway, except for minuscule quantities available from places such as Turkey, the Philippines, and Brazil.

We have testimony from Soviet refugees that chrome ore in the U.S.S.R. is mined by slave labor. Rejection of this amendment is total hypocrisy.

I move for the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) to the committee amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 153, noes 246, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—153

Abdnor	Edwards, Ala.	Lloyd, Tenn.
Andrews,	Edwards, Okla.	Lott
N. Dak.	English	Lujan
Archer	Evans, Del.	McCory
Armstrong	Evans, Ga.	McCloskey
Ashbrook	Filippo	McCormack
Badham	Flowers	McDonald
Bafalis	Flynt	Madigan
Barnard	Fuqua	Marriott
Bauman	Gammage	Martin
Beard, Tenn.	Gephardt	Mathis
Bevill	Gibbons	Michel
Blaggi	Gilman	Milford
Bowen	Ginn	Miller, Ohio
Breaux	Glickman	Mitchell, N.Y.
Brinkley	Goodling	Mollohan
Brown, Ohio	Gradison	Moore
Broyhill	Grassley	Moorhead,
Burgener	Hagedorn	Calif.
Burke, Fla.	Hall	Mottl
Burke, Mass.	Hammer-	Murtha
Burleson, Tex.	schmidt	Myers, Gary
Butler	Hansen	O'Brien
Byron	Harkin	Pettis
Carter	Harrington	Pickle
Cavanaugh	Heckler	Poage
Clausen,	Holt	Pressler
Don H.	Hubbard	Quayle
Clawson, Del.	Huckaby	Quillen
Cleveland	Hyde	Regula
Cochran	Ichord	Rhodes
Coleman	Jenkins	Rinaldo
Collins, Tex.	Johnson, Colo.	Roberts
Coughlin	Jones, N.C.	Robinson
Crane	Kasten	Rousselot
D'Amours	Kazen	Rudd
Daniel, Dan	Kelly	Runnels
Dan'el, R. W.	Kemp	Sarasin
de la Garza	Ketchum	Satterfield
Derwinski	Kindness	Schulze
Devine	Lagomarsino	Sebelius
Dornan	Latta	Shipley
Duncan, Tenn.	Lent	Shuster
Early	Levitass	Sikes

Skubitz	Thone	White
Smith, Nebr.	Treen	Whitehurst
Snyder	Trible	Wilson, Bob
Spence	Volkmer	Winn
Stangeland	Waggoner	Wydler
Stanton	Walker	Young, Alaska
Stratton	Walsh	Young, Fla.
Symms	Wampler	
Taylor	Watkins	

NOES—246

Addabbo	Foley	Nedzi
Akaka	Ford, Mich.	Nix
Alexander	Ford, Tenn.	Nolan
Allen	Forsythe	Nowak
Ambro	Fountain	Cakar
Ammerman	Fraser	Oberstar
Anderson,	Frenzel	Obey
Calif.	Gaydos	Ottinger
Anderson, Ill.	Glaimo	Panetta
Andrews, N.C.	Gore	Patten
Annunzio	Gudger	Pattison
Ashley	Hamilton	Pease
Aspin	Hanley	Pepper
AuCoin	Hannaford	Perkins
Badillo	Harris	Pike
Baldus	Harsha	Preyer
Baucus	Hawkins	Price
Beard, R.I.	Hefner	Pritchard
Bedel	Heftel	Quie
Bellenson	Hightower	Railsback
Benjamin	Hillis	Rangel
Bennett	Hollenbeck	Risenhoover
Bingham	Holtzman	Rodino
Blanchard	Horton	Roe
Blouin	Howard	Rogers
Boggs	Hughes	Roncalio
Boland	Ireland	Rooney
Bolling	Jacobs	Rosenthal
Bonior	Jeffords	Rostenkowski
Bonker	Jenrette	Roybal
Brademas	Johnson, Calif.	Russo
Breckinridge	Jones, Ok'a.	Ryan
Brodhead	Jones, Tenn.	Santini
Brooks	Jordan	Sawyer
Broomfield	Kastenmeier	Scheuer
Brown, Mich.	Keys	Schroeder
Buchanan	Kildee	Seiberling
Burke, Calif.	Koch	Sharp
Burlison, Mo.	Kostmayer	Sisk
Burton, John	Krebs	Skelton
Burton, Phillip	Krueger	Slack
Caputo	Le Fante	Smith, Iowa
Carney	Leach	Solarz
Carr	Lederer	Spellman
Cederberg	Leggett	St. Germain
Chisholm	Lehman	Staggers
Cohen	Lloyd, Calif.	Stark
Conable	Long, La.	Steed
Conte	Long, Md.	Steers
Conyers	Luken	Steiger
Corcoran	Lundine	Stockman
Corman	McDade	Stokes
Cornell	McFall	Studds
Cornwell	McHugh	Thompson
Cotter	McKay	Thornton
Danielson	McKinney	Traxler
Davis	Maguire	Tsongas
Delaney	Mahon	Tucker
Dellums	Mann	Udall
Dent	Markey	Ullman
Derrick	Marks	Van Deerlin
Dicks	Marlenee	Vento
Diggs	Mattox	Walgren
Dingell	Mazzoli	Waxman
Dodd	Meeds	Weaver
Downey	Metcalfe	Weiss
Drinan	Meyner	Whalen
Duncan, Oreg.	Mikulski	Whitley
Eckhardt	Mikva	Whitten
Edgar	Miller, Calif.	Wiggins
Edwards, Calif.	Mineta	Wilson, Tex.
Eilberg	Minish	Wirth
Emery	Mitchell, Md.	Wolf
Erlenborn	Moakley	Wright
Ertel	Moffett	Wylie
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead, Pa.	Yates
Fary	Moss	Yatron
Fascell	Murphy, Ill.	Young, Mo.
Fenwick	Murphy, N.Y.	Young, Tex.
Fish	Murphy, Pa.	Zablocki
Fisher	Myers, Ind.	Zerferetti
Fithian	Myers, Michael	
Flood	Natcher	

NOT VOTING—33

Applegate	Florio	Montgomery
Brown, Calif.	Frey	Neal
Chappell	Goldwater	Nichols
Clay	Gonzalez	Patterson
Collins, Ill.	Guyser	Pursell
Dickinson	Holland	Rahall
Evans, Ind.	LaFalce	Reuss
Findley	McEwen	Richmond

Rose	Stump	Vander Jagt
Ruppe	Teague	Vanik
Simon	Tonry	Wilson, C. H.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Florio against.
 Mr. Montgomery for, with Mr. Simon against.
 Mr. Chappell for, with Mr. Reuss against.
 Mr. Nichols for, with Mr. Patterson of California against.
 Mr. Rahall for, with Mr. Clay against.
 Mr. Stump for, with Mr. Holland against.

Mr. MILFORD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. JONES of Tennessee changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations. I refer to a letter of March 7, 1977, from the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI), chairman, to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. ULLMAN), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. In this letter Chairman ZABLOCKI notes that paragraph 2 of H.R. 1746, the bill under consideration, establishes procedures for the Department of the Treasury with respect to certificates of origin as the means to determine that steel mill product shipments do not contain Southern Rhodesian chromium. Further the chairman concedes that such matters are technically within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and, therefore, H.R. 1746 is subject to sequential referral to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Although we on the Committee on Ways and Means did not request sequential referral, I should like to confirm for the record that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations recognizes the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means in this matter.

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

Mr. MIKVA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the International Relations Committee.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is absolutely correct. Paragraph 2 of the bill establishes procedures for the Treasury Department with respect to certificates of origin. As such the provision is a matter which is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and therefore, is subject to sequential referral. But I want to assure the gentleman that the Committee on International Relations recognizes the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means in this matter and it does not intend nor is there any desire to establish a precedent in this regard. We fully recognize that this particular matter is within their

jurisdiction, but for the purpose of expediting consideration of the bill we thank the chairman and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means for permitting the Committee on International Relations to act on H.R. 1746 even though the chairman of Ways and Means could have requested sequential referral.

Mr. MIKVA. I thank the gentleman for his references.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to offer a further observation regarding administration of H.R. 1746 by the Customs Service and possible effects on importers of steel mill products containing chromium. To my knowledge, there exists no physical test that can determine the origin of chromium in a steel mill product. Therefore, the importer must accept at face value the exporter's certificate of origin regarding chromium content. Should the Secretary of the Treasury subsequently determine that the certificate is false or does not adequately establish that the imported product does not contain chromium of Southern Rhodesian origin, the importer of record would be subject to the very stringent fraud and penalty provisions of the customs law.

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

Mr. Chairman, it should not be necessary but because of the halo of the U.N. that is placed upon this issue let me first remind the Members of the House that I stand before them as a strong advocate and supporter of the United Nations. Also in self-defense I must emphasize that I am not a supporter of the Government of Rhodesia.

Now having stated those points for the record, let me point out I think this bill before us is ill-advised and ill-timed, and I would like to address myself to one or two points that are still fuzzy after these hours of debate. At the risk of sounding overly partisan and at the risk of interjecting humor into a serious situation, the argument of passing this bill so that the President could wave it at the U.N. General Assembly when he addresses that body Thursday, amuses me. It reminds me of the evening—and some of the older Members will remember it—when we were held here until past midnight to pass the Highway Beautification bill as a tribute to Lady Bird Johnson, and our wives, all dressed in evening wear were in the gallery waiting for us to pass that bill and proceed to the White House for a victory party. We were delayed so long that it ruined the social evening for the Johnson family. I hope the President will make a suitable impression on the U.N. members with or without this bill.

I saw our former colleague and dear friend Andy Young on the floor earlier. Andy was not lobbying, he was just visiting old friends. I would like to make that clear. But one of the reasons we are given to pass this bill is because Andy is presiding over the Security Council in the month of March, and by the passage of this bill we give Andy tremendous evidence of congressional support and the ability to wave this bill

at the Security Council members and say: "Look, I have achieved this passage."

They generally move in alphabetical order in presiding over the U.N. Security Council, so that means in the month of April the ambassador from the U.S.S.R. will preside. What do we do to give him a gift to wave at his fellow diplomats? Do we repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment? That would be the thing to do if consistency is the order of the day.

I will be very serious about this point. There has been talk about bloodshed and who would be responsible for what lives would be lost if the guerrilla war in Rhodesia elevates into a full scale conflict.

The only official mention, however, of possible U.S. troop activity in Rhodesia came when Ambassador Young suggested that U.S. troops may participate in a U.N. peacekeeping force there. This suggestion was shot down by the Department of State, by the Administration, and as far as I know there is no commitment of any kind for U.S. troops to be involved in any peacekeeping operation in Rhodesia.

The sad fact of the matter is that we will probably find Cuban troops in Rhodesia long before troops from any other country.

Last, but not least, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the point that this Byrd amendment has not been the major reason for Rhodesia staying afloat. The Rhodesians declared their independence in 1965. U.N. sanctions were imposed in 1966. Most of the countries of Western Europe, most of the countries of Eastern Europe and Japan have consistently ignored the sanctions. We violate the sanctions only as a result of the Byrd amendment. We abide by the remainder of the sanctions. I think our record legally, morally and diplomatically, is far superior to that of most of the countries of the U.N.

Mr. Chairman, I would just refer to the recent report to the U.N. of violations of Rhodesian trade. It includes the Soviet Union, East Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, Yugoslavia; it also includes West Germany, Belgium, Italy, Japan, Switzerland, a number of African countries in addition to South Africa. Also Turkey, Iran, and a number of other countries; so I submit that the issue is not the record of the United States. The issue is the economic action that we take in cutting ourselves off from needed chrome.

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

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. SYMMS, Mr. DERWINSKI was allowed to proceed for an additional 2 minutes.)

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

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

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman is saying, in other words that the United States says it will not be enforced by other members of the Security Council of the United Nations?

Mr. DERWINSKI. What I am saying is that other countries have consistently

violated these sanctions for over 11 years. These are countries of all political colorations and in all geographical areas.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would it be in order to amend this bill to say that all these countries obey this also, if the United States is going to do it?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Any way the gentleman could amend the bill to produce more compliance with the United Nations sanctions, I suppose would be greeted with enthusiasm by the proponents; although, I cannot speak for them.

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is the gentleman accepting this for the Committee on International Relations?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I am accepting this for all those who worship at the altar of diplomatic consistency.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1746. In so doing, I would like to make one specific point apropos of the discussion today of human rights. As has been stated on the floor, there is a symbolic issue here. Passage of H.R. 1746 will clearly commit the United States to the support of majority rule in Rhodesia. It will be a signal to the Smith government in Rhodesia. It will be a signal to black African leaders, including the five frontline African presidents who have been seeking American support for black majority rule in Rhodesia; but I hope that today's vote will also be a signal to one and all of what the United States believes about majority rule; that majority rule means they must respect basic human rights and policies.

That conventions of civilized society must be provided for; that this is as true for black majority rule in Africa as it is anywhere else. Accordingly, I think it would be appropriate for the U.S. Government to call upon the frontline presidents and other black leaders of Africa to restrain Idi Amin in his pursuit of genocide policies within Uganda. Accordingly, it would be appropriate for the United States to ask the frontline presidents of Africa, in their support of black majority rule in Rhodesia, to include as part of the policy strong support for basic human rights.

For, as black majority rule comes to Rhodesia, the dangers of violence and repression will be great. In both of these instances, in Uganda and in the coming black rule in Rhodesia, the most effective pressure that can be brought to bear for observance of human rights will come from the black African leaders themselves. The United States must ask African leaders to exercise that influence for human rights, and our ability to do so will be strengthened by the passage of H.R. 1746.

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

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

Mr. McDONALD. How many of the elected, so-called presidents of the five front line nations were elected in open,

free elections in their respective countries?

Mr. PEASE. As the gentleman knows, that is not the only criterion of human rights. It is important, wherever we have a human rights problem, to use the tools that are available to us to bring about greater adherence to human rights. I think that these five presidents and other black African leaders are in a better position than any of us to exercise an influence over Idi Amin and other African leaders to restrain themselves within their nations.

Mr. McDONALD. If the gentleman will yield further for a question, how does he define the area of majority rule? Is that synonymous with black rule, or does that mean in open, free elections of all individuals of that country, or does that mean election guided by revolutionary groups from the five front line countries?

Mr. PEASE. Well, it can mean the first two. I would hope that it would not mean the third. Certainly in Africa, an open definition of majority rule is that the majority of the blacks in a nation such as Rhodesia, where blacks far outnumber the whites, are in effective control of the country. Beyond that, I would hope that it would mean a majority of the people within that country voting for the government. That is my hope for Rhodesia, and I think that our support of this bill will help to bring that about.

Mr. McDONALD. If we are going to use the term "majority rule" as a very necessary earmark of human rights, then are we to say therefore that the various five front line African states are complying with human rights, and indeed their governments represent majority elected representatives or presidents or various other officials?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ICHORD

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD: Page 4, immediately after line 6, insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. (a) Upon the enactment of this act, the President may suspend the operation of the amendments contained in this act if he determines that such suspension would encourage meaningful negotiations and further the peaceful transfer of governing power from minority rule to majority rule in Southern Rhodesia. Such suspension shall remain in effect for such duration as deemed necessary by the President.

(b) If the President suspends the operation of the amendments contained in this act, he shall so report to the Congress. In addition, the President shall report to the Congress when he terminates such suspension.

(c) If the President suspends the operation of the amendments contained in this act, any reference in those amendments to date of enactment shall be deemed to be a reference to the date on which such suspension is terminated by the President.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ICHORD was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I am not so much opposed to the repeal of the Byrd amendment at this time as I am to the timing of the amendment.

I appeared before the committee of the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. DELANEY), and I expressed the hope that the committee in its wisdom could see fit to set this bill over for a couple of weeks, past the Easter recess, and that the committee go to Rhodesia and take a look at the situation existing in Rhodesia, much the same as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. RUNNELS), and I did a year ago last April.

I made the charge, Mr. Chairman, that the American State Department was really not very well informed as to what was going on in Rhodesia. I expressed the thought that in proceeding with this mad rush in the repeal of the Byrd amendment, we might be bringing about in Rhodesia another minority government which even the most ardent supporters of this repealer do not want.

Why do I say so, Mr. Chairman? When we arrived in South Africa we were warned by the State Department that it would be unsafe to take our wives into Salisbury and throughout Rhodesia. To my surprise, we found it more safe in the wee hours of the morning on the streets of Salisbury than two blocks from where I am standing and speaking today in broad daylight. To my utter amazement, Mr. Chairman, I met several black millionaires in Salisbury. I got the impression from the State Department that Rhodesia practices apartheid, or something worse; but I not only met several black millionaires, I attended the University of Salisbury and I found that the student population was about 50 percent black and about 50 percent white. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I found conditions in Rhodesia much better than existed in the United States of America, as far as black and white is concerned, in several sections of this country only about 10 or 12 years ago. To my utter amazement, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) will verify, I saw black crane operators in Rhodesia being taught to replace white crane operators, and at the same salary. I also learned, to my astonishment, Mr. Chairman, that the black man in Rhodesia—and I ask the Members to listen to this, since very few of them have been to Rhodesia—has the highest wage throughout all of Africa, including the nation of Egypt.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I think that the President of the United States, and I charge that this body, is getting erroneous information as to what is going on in Rhodesia.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, I am being very arrogant, but I think I know more about what is going on in Rhodesia than any other Member of this body, including the members of the Committee on International Relations. The reason why I think that is true is that I have taken a long and personal interest in the people of Rhodesia.

It so happens that the great moral force of Rhodesia, Bishop Muzorewa, went to school at Central Methodist College in Missouri, which used to be in

my district. I visited with Bishop Muzorewa when I was in Rhodesia a year ago, and in fact only Friday of this week I talked to Bishop Muzorewa's right-hand man, Dr. Chavunduku, who is a professor of philosophy at the University of Salisbury. He said to me at that time, "For God's sake, give the President some discretion. Don't turn Rhodesia over to the bad guys. Yes, we would have a black government, but it would be a minority black government."

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if the Members would only take the time to go to Rhodesia and see what the situation is, they would come to the conclusion that the only possible party that will be able to rule Rhodesia is the party of Bishop Muzorewa. I have read reports in some newspapers that the front line nation's would like to turn the government over to parties which most certainly will result in civil war between blacks as well as between black and white. As I read the situation, and I hope and pray that I am wrong, this is certain to be the end result if the President does not firmly take charge of the situation.

I read a good bit in the paper concerning what these front-line nations are going to do. My distinguished colleague states that he is going to go along with the front-line nations. Why should we not let the blacks and the whites work things out among themselves in Rhodesia, just as we did in the past when we solved some of our own very serious racial problems here in America?

If we are going to impose an external solution, I charge that the Members of this House and the American Government will have on their hands not only the blood of several thousand whites but the blood of several thousand blacks. If we insist upon imposing an external peace, I hope that I am not in a position to say "I told you so."

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) has stated that he would accept this amendment. Let me explain my purpose in offering it. This is what I would like to see the President do: I would like to see the President send a commission consisting of Members of this body as well as our highly esteemed former colleague, Andy Young, now ambassador to the United Nations, to Rhodesia and learn just what the situation is.

We have no relations with Rhodesia. The only information we have as to what is going on in Rhodesia is from British intelligence.

We are the only nation, I would point out to my friends, the only major nation in the world which has lived up to most of the sanctions of the United Nations. We live up to all the sanctions of the United Nations that have been imposed against Rhodesia except those involving chrome and nickel. But do the Members think that the other major nations have lived up to those sanctions? We all talk about the idea that we have to go along with the United Nations. Do the Members think that other nations are living up to the U.N. sanctions? You should have seen the new Fiats, Volvos, Volkswagens, and

Toyotas lining the streets of Salisbury that I saw in Rhodesia.

Do the Members know how much ferrochrome Rhodesia produced last year? Let me ask that question of my colleagues. How much did they produce? They produced 250,000 tons of ferrochrome. Do we know how much the United States bought from Rhodesia under the Byrd amendment? Only 47,000 tons. Who bought the other 203,000 tons of ferrochrome produced by Rhodesia? Do not tell me the Rhodesians dumped the ferrochrome in the Indian Ocean.

That is why I say that this repeal of the Byrd amendment is nothing but a symbolic maneuver, a symbolic action, a psychological action. It is not going to hurt Rhodesia. Every major country in the world is already trading with Rhodesia.

So why does the President of the United States not send Andy Young to Rhodesia to see what is going on? Why does he not send my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York, SHIRLEY CHRISTOLM, who presented this rule, to Rhodesia and let her take a look for herself?

But for God's sake, let us not bring another Idi Amin into power in Rhodesia. I fear that is what we are going to do if we do not adopt this amendment and permit the President to have leverage over the negotiations and to influence sincere negotiations in Rhodesia.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD). Those of us on the committee have reviewed it carefully, and we have submitted it to the Department for its comments.

My understanding is that this amendment would give the President authority to suspend the operations of the provisions of the act if he determines that such suspension would encourage meaningful negotiations and further the peaceful transfer of governing power from minority rule to majority rule in Southern Rhodesia.

The rest of it goes on to say that he shall report to Congress and so on.

Mr. Chairman, the way in which the act is currently worded causes me to believe—and I think that members of the committee with whom I have consulted agree with me—that there is already discretion on the part of the President to do this. However, since this amendment spells out at least one set of considerations that might influence the President in the exercise of the discretion, I do not have any objection to the amendment and am prepared to accept it. Nevertheless, I want to make clear that we accept it as it is written; and I make that point because I understand that there may be an amendment on it or proposed to it which would defer the effective date and would change the word "may" to "shall" and would change it in other respects which would create uncertainty and confusion.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) goes to a vote unamended, I will support it; but I just wanted to make my position clear.

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

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) for yielding.

We must remember that this bill before us does not repeal the Byrd amendment. Rather, what it does, if it should pass, is to give discretion to the President either to enforce the Byrd amendment or to waive the Byrd amendment.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I really do not feel that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) would add anything because the President does have the authority to enforce the Byrd amendment for the next 30, 60, or 90 days, or ad infinitum.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would certainly agree with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) that putting this language in the bill will certainly do no harm and perhaps will clarify it.

Therefore, I accept this amendment on behalf of the minority, Mr. Chairman, and I would urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the gentleman has heard from the author of this amendment as to whether or not he will support the bill if this amendment prevails?

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan obviously was not on the floor at the time the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) did ask me that question. I did say that I would. However, I would state this, and I want to be sure that I understand the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER): I would like to have it a matter of legislative history that the President of the United States study this amendment carefully and that he use the authority that he has to make certain that we do not inadvertently turn over Rhodesia to the wrong kind of people.

My fear is that, in proceeding as we are, we may well incite extremists on each side of the question; that is, harden some of the ultra-conservatives in Ian Smith's government and also harden the position of some of the black leaders.

Mr. FRASER. I think the gentleman and I would share the view that the President should use his very best judgment in carrying out the authority in this act and the authority that is made explicit by the gentleman's amendment so as to further the interests of the United States. I think we would both agree with that.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ICHORD

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON to the amendment offered by Mr. ICHORD: In section 2 (a), line 1:

Strike out the words "Upon the enactment of this Act"

Strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall"; after line 6;

Insert a new subsection (b) as follows:

(b) To enable the President to examine in full detail the current status of such negotiations and to report to the Congress his findings thereon, this Act shall not become effective until 30 days after the date of its enactment."

Strike out the present subsection (b), and insert the following:

(c) The President shall report promptly to the Congress at the end of the 30-day period provided for in subsection (b). He shall also report to the Congress if he suspends the operation of the amendments contained in this Act, and he shall report further to the Congress if and when he terminates such suspension."

Renumber subsection (c) as subsection (d).

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a perfecting amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD). I believe the gentleman from Missouri is in accord with it.

As has already been indicated, there is a belief on the part of the committee itself that the President has this discretion. But whether he does or does not have it, I think it is no secret that the President wants this legislation. He plans to go to the U.N., as I understand it, on Thursday, to announce that the Byrd amendment is being repealed.

I must say that I share many of the apprehensions of the gentleman from Missouri. It seems to me that we need to pause just a little bit to have this kind of factfinding undertaking that he has referred to. All my amendment does is to delay for 30 days the enactment of these amendments giving this power to repeal the Byrd amendment, so that we can have some consideration, and particularly some report to this House, as to what the policy of our Government really is with respect to Africa.

I have some very serious doubts as to where we are heading in Africa today. I do not think anybody in this Chamber really knows what the policy of the U.S. Government is now with respect to Africa. But I am afraid on the basis of what I have been seeing in the papers and reading about these various commitments that are being made, that what we are doing in this legislation may not be taking us down the road to a peaceful negotiated solution, but may instead be taking us down the road to war in Africa, and even choosing up sides in advance in that war. If what we did in Vietnam was wrong, then I think what we may be doing here in Africa is twice as bad. I think we ought to pause for a few moments to find out exactly where we are going.

In the last administration, the Secretary of State, Dr. Kissinger, went to Rhodesia. He had a formula which he offered to the Rhodesian Government. I am not sure of all that happened in those negotiations, but it seems to me the thrust of it was to try to bring about a peaceful change in Rhodesia and to prevent the Soviet Union and Cuba from

taking over further control in Africa and perhaps even taking control in Rhodesia.

Secretary Kissinger had as part of his proposal that if Rhodesia would cooperate in these negotiations we would not impose any sanctions on the purchase of chrome or anything else from Rhodesia. We would remove the sanctions.

Now I do not know whether Ian Smith is responsible for the breakdown in negotiations or whether the frontline presidents are responsible for it, but it seems to me that it is clear that Rhodesia is at least not entirely at fault. So if we are really interested in a negotiated, peaceful solution in Rhodesia instead of getting into war, we ought not to impose the penalty until we know where we stand.

That is all that this perfecting amendment would do. It would give us a chance here in this House to find out whether we know where we are going, whether there is any clear African policy, and to assure us that that policy is directed toward a peaceable solution.

It seems to me that we make a mistake by trying to alienate one of the participants in the negotiations before we know where the negotiations are going.

I do not see how we lose anything by pausing for 30 days to try to inform the American people and to try to inform the Congress what our policy is so that we do not have to read it in the newspapers.

Here is yesterday's New York Times: Zaire is being invaded by Angola. And on the opposite page: The Russians and the Cubans are cooperating to push the United States and China out of Africa. I do not think the situation over there looks good. Before we take the advice of some of these experts on the Committee on International Relations, we ought to learn the facts, as the gentleman from Missouri suggests.

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

Mr. STRATTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I suppose I am between the so-called devil and the deep blue sea on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Minnesota has stated that he would accept my amendment as I propose it. But I rather gather—and particularly do I gather when the gentleman from Ohio started to move the previous question, against the amendment of the gentleman from New York—that they will not accept my amendment if the amendment of the gentleman from New York is adopted.

Mr. STRATTON. I will say to the gentleman in all candor that I assume the reason the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER) accepted his amendment is he knows perfectly well the President has no intention of exercising this restraint and in fact intends to make the statement in New York on Thursday that the Byrd amendment will be rescinded. I think we in the Congress ought to ask him to pause for 30 days, at least until we find out what the policy is.

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman would yield further, this is the thing that worries me. The gentleman from Minnesota

and the gentleman from Ohio gave their interpretation of my amendment and said that it really does not add anything; the President still has the discretion; but I would like to have the President of the United States, at least, become informed as to what is going on in Rhodesia.

Let me understand the gentleman. All he is saying is we are going to repeal the Byrd amendment, but let us wait for 30 days until the President studies this situation, and if he believes that a suspension of the repeal of the Byrd amendment, would promote successful negotiations, or if it would promote a peaceful transition of power from a minority government to a majority government, he can so suspend.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. All we have now are a lot of offhand opinions that this repeal is going to contribute to something or other, but I think we ought to have the kind of examination the gentleman has referred to and a mission, perhaps, to Rhodesia similar to the one now going to Hanoi.

Mr. ICHORD. With that explanation of the gentleman from New York, I am going to take my chance and accept the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

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

Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Is the gentleman in the well suggesting that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and all of his advisers on foreign policy would have taken the position to repeal the Byrd amendment without having studied what the situation is in Rhodesia? It seems incredible to me to assume that.

Mr. STRATTON. I do not know whether they have studied it or not. I assume that they have. What I am saying is that their conclusions have unfortunately not been expounded to the Congress or to the American people. Nobody has explained how this repeal action is going to contribute to a peaceful solution, and I can see some grave indications from the press reports that it may well contribute to war.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have been in discussion with the gentleman from Missouri for the last 2 days. We have tried to check his amendment out carefully and to ascertain its effect. On the basis of that check and review we agreed to accept his amendment.

The amendment that is being offered by the gentleman from New York does more than delay the effect of the whole bill. In the very key word, it changes "may" to "shall." I am not sure what the consequences of that are, but everything in the bill up until now has been discretionary. It has been discretionary for the President in effect to override the Byrd amendment. It has been discretionary to

permit the continuation of shipments in order to have them completed.

But the gentleman from New York not only seeks to delay the effective date but to change the word "may" to "shall," changing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

I think it would be a mistake to take this amendment. The gentleman from New York apparently does not have much trust in the President's judgment. That is his right. But the people in the Department of State have been involved in this for many years. The present Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs was the gentleman who accompanied Secretary Kissinger on his African trip. One of the reasons he has been retained in office was because of his familiarity with the negotiations and with the British.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has asked about "shall" and "may." Will the gentleman let me respond?

Mr. FRASER. When I am through, I will.

The point is there is nothing in the bill that is before us to compel the President to do anything. If he needs time to study before any Executive order is issued, all the time needed is afforded here.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri lays out some of the considerations the President should have in mind. I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri offers discretion for the President. But this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is something quite different. It changes the word "may" to "shall." We have not had the opportunity to ascertain the legal effect of this amendment. It may be useless. I hope it will be voted down.

I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. STRATTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If the gentleman will look at the wording of the amendment, it says in the Ichord amendment:

... the President may suspend the operation of the amendments contained in this Act if he determines that such suspension would encourage meaningful negotiations and further the peaceful transfer of governing power...

My amendment says:

... the President shall suspend the operation of the amendments contained in this Act if he determines that such suspension would encourage meaningful negotiations and further the peaceful transfer of governing power...

If the President finds out that suspension would contribute to the peaceful negotiations, he would be crazy to do anything except to suspend.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman is saying his amendment is meaningless, I do not know why he has offered it. But I say it changes the meaning of an amendment which we have carefully reviewed and checked. He changes "may" to "shall" and he says it does not mean anything.

Mr. STRATTON. It changes "may" to

"shall" and all it does is it delays it for 30 days.

Mr. FRASER. We agreed to take the Ichord amendment, but now the gentleman from New York proposes to come and change its timing and effect and meaning. My point of view is his is really not a helpful amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. It really makes the Ichord amendment effective and meaningful. Otherwise it would be meaningless.

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

Mr. FRASER. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ).

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I think the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON), for whom I have the greatest respect, does our committee an injustice when he suggests we are not aware of the status of the negotiations. In the course of the last few weeks our committee has heard from Under Secretary Habib, from Ambassador Young, from Ambassador Richards, and from the new Foreign Minister of the United Kingdom. Mr. Owen, about the status of the effort to bring about a peaceful transition to majority rule.

Mr. STRATTON. It has not gotten into the papers, I can say that.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota is correct when he states that I did submit this amendment to him last Thursday, when we appeared before the Rules Committee, and I might state to the members of the Committee that I have talked to the Secretary of State, Cyrus Vance, about this amendment because of my great concern about what we might be doing here—bringing about both black and white genocide in Rhodesia.

The Secretary of State never agreed to accept my amendment and the gentleman from Minnesota never agreed to accept my amendment until about 1:30 this afternoon. After the explanation, I feel that the amendment of the gentleman from New York does add a great deal to my amendment.

My fear, and I will speak with candor to the Members of the House, my fear is that the American State Department has opted for an external settlement of the problem in Rhodesia, rather than an internal settlement. This is what I am trying to get the President to look at, a possible internal settlement between blacks and whites in Rhodesia. I submit to the Members of the Committee that this is the only way, the only possible way, and there may be great bloodshed in Rhodesia, anyway, regardless of the passage of this amendment; but this is the only way that we are going to be able to permanently settle the problems between blacks and whites in Rhodesia.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment of the gentleman from New York, it still gives the President discretion. The gentleman says the President shall suspend the repeal if he determines that such suspension would encourage

meaningful negotiations and further the peaceful transfer of governing power from minority rule to majority rule in Southern Rhodesia. How can we vote against that?

The only difference between the amendment of the gentleman from New York and my amendment is that the gentleman is going to postpone it for 30 days. Why are 30 days so important? At least it will give the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ), who is now standing, a chance to go over to Rhodesia. To CHARLIE DIGGS, they will not run him out of Rhodesia. Why not go and look at the situation?

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. FRASER), why not look at the situation?

The gentleman from Ohio and all of us go over and take a look at it, make up our minds as to what should be done.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, actually, the question of "may" or "shall" is minor. I had no particular purpose in mind changing it from "may" to "shall." I would be very happy to go back to "may" and if that is the only problem affecting the gentleman from Minnesota, I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw that portion of my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment insofar as it relates to the substitution of "shall" for "may."

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

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I would have to say this is an added reason for objection to the change and it will leave the issue at 30 days. I am opposed to that equally.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York for modification of the amendment?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON)?

There was no objection.

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

I rise to propose a question to the author of the amendment to the amendment, the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON).

If the gentleman would respond to my question, I am concerned about the reporting provisions. In the original amendment submitted by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD), section (b) requires a report only if the President suspends the operation of the amendments. Now, am I correct in my understanding that in the gentleman's new section (c) that the President must report to the Congress his findings one way or the other?

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, what I do is add a section which suspends the effective date for 30 days, to enable the President to examine in full detail the current status of such negotiations and to report to the Congress his findings thereon.

Mr. WHALEN. I realize that.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in the following section, which deals with reports, my amendment also provides that the President shall report to the Congress his findings after he has spent 30 days to see where the negotiations are going. And then my amendment simply continues the other reporting requirements that the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD) had in his amendment. I do not think there is anything burdensome here. The idea is just to find out what is going on over there in Africa today. I think it would be reasonable for the President to let us know what he found out.

Mr. WHALEN. I would point out that the distinction between this and the Ichord amendment is that there is no report necessary if the President decides not to suspend the provisions in this act, whereas if the gentleman's amendment to the amendment is adopted, a report is required regardless of the President's decision.

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct, but I think if we are going to go into this morass, we ought to know where we are going. That would seem to me to be a very reasonable requirement.

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

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

Mr. SOLARZ. I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Ohio for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the members of the committee to understand that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted, this legislation cannot take effect until 30 days after its enactment on the—I might add, the mistaken—assumption that the Congress of the United States is not aware of the status of the negotiations with respect to the establishment of majority rule in Rhodesia at the present time. Now, in the course of the last several weeks, the members of the Committee on International Relations have been briefed in public and in private by our Ambassador to the United Nations, Andrew Young, who recently returned from a trip to southern Africa; by Undersecretary Habib; by Ambassador Richards, who is chairman of the Geneva Conference; and by the new British Foreign Minister, Mr. Owens, who has been on top of this situation.

We know what the status is. It is that the negotiations have been suspended. We know that Mr. Smith has said that he will refuse to go back to Geneva if, by going back, he has to negotiate with the patriotic front. We know why the negotiations broke up originally, because of disagreement over the composition of the interim government and of who would control the Ministries of Defense and Law and Order.

There is nothing we can learn in the next 30 days that we do not know already with respect to the status of these negotiations. Consequently, I think it does a disservice to the briefings we have already been given and to our knowledge of the situation to adopt this amend-

ment, which would prevent this law from becoming effective for 30 days while we try to find out information which we are already aware of.

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

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

Mr. STRATTON. The gentleman's committee may have been informed, I will say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) and I am sure that the gentleman is one of the most well informed members of that committee. But the point is that the rest of us have not been informed, and the public has not been informed. I probably read the New York Times more carefully than almost any other Member of this body—I carry it around with me all day. I have not found a single thing in it so far that indicates how this legislation is expected to contribute to a peaceful solution in Rhodesia. I would like to know. I do not think 99 and 44/100 of the American people know how it is going to contribute either.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much time I have left, but I think for the sake of simplicity I will yield the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think this Stratton amendment to the Ichord amendment will make the Ichord amendment absolutely useless. Predicated upon my own feelings, at least, in support of the gentleman's amendment is the fact that we had some time under this legislation, both in the original copy earlier and in the Ichord amendment, which assured us that there would be a transition period, during which time we would be able to ship back to the United States all of the ore and all of the ferrochrome Americans had purchased on previous orders.

To put a 30-day limit of any kind under this amendment means that we have taken from the President the sole right to say whether the embargo shall be lifted, whether it shall not be lifted, depending upon his judgment.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman from Minnesota explained his interpretation of my amendment, as did the gentleman from Ohio. I did not get any promise of any delay in actually putting the repeal into effect.

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman let me answer that, please?

The gentleman told me that is what it would do. He wrote the amendment and he convinced me it would give the President more leverage in what he is attempting to do. And the basic reason for setting the period of time was spelled out in the gentleman's amendment, because it had to be based upon what the President's decision would do to the negotiations. That is what I was voting for, and that is what I am going to vote for now.

Mr. ICHORD. If the gentleman will yield further, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania talked to me, I thought that the President did not have any discretionary power whatsoever. But I have talked to the Secretary of State. I have also talked to many other people. I have not received any promise from anyone as to any delay which the gentleman from

Pennsylvania wants. That is the reason why I am accepting the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. If I cannot get the promise, then if the gentleman from Minnesota wishes to defeat my amendment, so be it.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD). I gave him my word I would support it. But I will not support the Stratton amendment.

Mr. ICHORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is in no way inferring that I have gone back on any of my word? Mr. DENT. Oh, no.

Mr. ICHORD. Very well.

Mr. DENT. I do not speak for the gentleman. I have a heck of a time speaking for myself.

I know the Members are anxious to vote. But, very seriously, this is one of the most serious pieces of legislation we are going to have in this entire term. What we have to do is speak and talk honestly. If there are any misunderstandings, let us get them out of the way.

I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he misunderstood what I talked to him about?

Mr. FRASER. No. If the gentleman will yield further, if the Stratton amendment is rejected, despite any unhappiness of the change of the position of the gentleman from Missouri, I still will support his amendment. But I think we should take the amendment as the gentleman and I first understood it.

Mr. DENT. We are saying, first and foremost, what this means in all categories of need. Defeat the Stratton amendment, accept the Ichord amendment, and pass the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. STRATTON) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STRATTON) there were—ayes 55, noes 59.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 160, noes 236, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—160

Abdnor	Byron	Evans, Ga.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Carter	Flowers
Archer	Cederberg	Flynt
Armstrong	Clausen,	Fountain
Ashbrook	Don H.	Fuqua
Badham	Clawson, Del.	Gammage
Bafalis	Cleveland	Gephardt
Barnard	Cochran	Gilman
Bauman	Coleman	Ginn
Beard, Tenn.	Collins, Tex.	Goodling
Bennett	Corcoran	Gradison
Bevill	Crane	Grassley
Bowen	Daniel, Dan	Gudger
Breaux	Daniel, R. W.	Hagedorn
Breckinridge	Davis	Hall
Brinkley	de la Garza	Hammer-
Brooks	Derrick	schmidt
Brown, Mich.	Derwinski	Hansen
Brown, Ohio	Devine	Harsha
Burgener	Dornan	Hightower
Burke, Fla.	Duncan, Tenn.	Holt
Burke, Mass.	Edwards, Ala.	Huckaby
Burleson, Tex.	Edwards, Okla.	Hyde
Butler	English	Ichord
	Evans, Del.	Jenkins

Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Slack	Van Deerlin	Weiss	Wright
Jones, Okla.	Moorhead,	Smith, Nebr.	Vento	Whalen	Yates
Kasten	Calif.	Snyder	Volkmer	Whitely	Yatron
Kazen	Motti	Spence	Walgren	Wilson, Tex.	Young, Tex.
Kelly	Murphy, Pa.	Stangeland	Waxman	Wirth	Zablocki
Kemp	Murtha	Stanton	Weaver	Wolf	Zeferetti
Ketchum	Myers, Gary	Steiger			
Kindness	Myers, Ind.	Stockman			
Lagomarsino	O'Brien	Stratton			
Latta	Pettis	Symms			
Lent	Poage	Taylor			
Levitas	Pressler	Thone			
Lloyd, Tenn.	Quayle	Treen			
Lott	Quillen	Trible			
Lujan	Regula	Waggonner			
McDonald	Rhodes	Walsh			
Madigan	Roberts	Wampler			
Mahon	Robinson	Watkins			
Mann	Rogers	White			
Marks	Rousselot	Whitehurst			
Marlenee	Rudd	Whitten			
Marrlott	Runnels	Wiggins			
Martin	Sarasin	Wilson, Bob			
Mathis	Satterfield	Winn			
Mazzoli	Schulze	Wylder			
Michel	Sebellus	Wylie			
Millard	Shuster	Young, Alaska			
Miller, Ohio	Stokes	Young, Fla.			
Mitchell, N.Y.	Skelton	Young, Mo.			
Mollohan	Skubitz				

NOES—236

Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	Metcalfe
Akaka	Fary	Meyner
Alexander	Fascell	Mikulski
Allen	Fenwick	Mikva
Ambro	Fish	Miller, Calif.
Ammerman	Fisher	Mineta
Anderson, Calif.	Fithian	Minish
Anderson, Ill.	Fiippo	Mitchell, Md.
Andrews, N.C.	Flood	Moakley
Annuozio	Foley	Moffett
Applegate	Ford, Mich.	Moorhead, Pa.
Ashley	Ford, Tenn.	Moss
Aspin	Forsythe	Murphy, Ill.
AuCoin	Fraser	Murphy, N.Y.
Badillo	Frenzel	Myers, Michael
Baldus	Gaydos	Natcher
Baucus	Glaimo	Nedzi
Beard, R.I.	Gibbons	Nix
Bedell	Glickman	Nolan
Bellenson	Gore	Nowak
Benjamin	Hamilton	Oakar
Biaggi	Hanley	Oberstar
Bingham	Hannaford	Obey
Bianchard	Harkin	Ottiger
Blouin	Harrington	Panetta
Boggs	Harris	Patten
Boland	Hawkins	Pattison
Bolling	Heckler	Pease
Bonior	Hefner	Perkins
Bonker	Heftel	Pickens
Brademas	Hillis	Pike
Brodhead	Hollenbeck	Preyer
Broomfield	Holtzman	Price
Broyhill	Horton	Pritchard
Buchanan	Howard	Quie
Burke, Calif.	Hubbard	Rallsback
Burleson, Mo.	Hughes	Rangel
Burton, John	Ireland	Rinaldo
Burton, Phillip	Jacobs	Risenhoover
Caputo	Jeffords	Rodino
Carney	Jenrette	Roncallo
Carr	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Cavanaugh	Jones, Tenn.	Rose
Chisholm	Jordan	Rosenthal
Cohen	Kastenmeter	Rostenkowski
Conable	Keys	Roybal
Conte	Kildee	Russo
Conyers	Koch	Ryan
Corman	Koestmayer	Santini
Cornell	Krebs	Sawyer
Cornwell	Krueger	Scheuer
Cotter	Le Fante	Schroeder
Coughlin	Leach	Seiberling
D'Amours	Lederer	Sharp
Danielson	Leggett	Shipley
Deaney	Lehman	Sisk
Dellums	Lloyd, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
Dent	Long, La.	Solarz
Dicks	Long, Md.	Spellman
Diggs	Luken	St Germain
Dingell	Lundine	Staggers
Dodd	McClory	Stark
Downey	McCloskey	Steed
Drinan	McCormack	Steers
Duncan, Ore.	McDade	Stokes
Early	McFall	Studds
Eckhardt	McHugh	Thompson
Edgar	McKay	Thornton
Edwards, Calif.	McKinney	Traxler
Ellberg	Maguire	Tsongas
Emery	Markey	Tucker
Erlenborn	Mattox	Udall
	Meeds	Ullman

Van Deerlin	Weiss	Wright
Vento	Whalen	Yates
Volkmer	Whitely	Yatron
Walgren	Wilson, Tex.	Young, Tex.
Waxman	Wirth	Zablocki
Weaver	Wolf	Zeferetti

NOT VOTING—36

Brown, Calif.	Guyar	Reuss
Chappell	Holland	Richmond
Clay	Jones, N.C.	Roe
Collins, Ill.	LaFalce	Ruppe
Dickinson	McEwen	Simon
Ertel	Montgomery	Stump
Evans, Ind.	Neal	Teague
Findley	Nichols	Tony
Florio	Patterson	Vander Jagt
Frey	Pepper	Vanik
Goldwater	Pursell	Walker
Gonzalez	Rahall	Wilson, C. H.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, this bill must be considered as great a farce as the House has had perpetrated upon it in recent history. The arguments for the bill have defied the imagination. Even the term human rights has been so twisted that it applies only to little Rhodesia. By refusing to accept an amendment which would apply human rights criteria to all nations, the House has exempted Russia, which controls a major area of the world and its people and which has trampled human rights in the dust for decades. How blind can we be? Talk about international hypocrisy—this is it.

Mr. Chairman, historians some day may say that the House is on a lost weekend binge, that we are drunk on morality. Earlier in this session, this body chose the moral path of approving a pay raise for themselves without giving the people who pay for Federal pay raises an opportunity to see who was for it and who was against it. Then the House approved a code of new morality which provides that unearned income from inherited wealth is ethical but a dollar earned over an arbitrary morality limit by honest toil is unethical.

This week we are back at the winepress of morality working toward the goal of goodness and mercy squeezing the rule of minority out and majority in. Is that all that is really involved? Have we no concern for what we may be doing to our own country and to the free world?

Let us look ahead a few years. Assuming that world communism will be sufficiently encouraged by the passage of this bill, is it not reasonable to anticipate that Cuban troops will move from Angola to Rhodesia to assist the terrorists to kill off or drive out the white populace of Rhodesia and establish a Communist-type government controlled by Russia? Will we then reverse the embargo and, with our sense of morality satisfied, resume the purchase of Rhodesian chrome?

With this background, placing an embargo on Rhodesian chrome should be easy. Some among us say that the de-

isions of the U.S. Security Council should be binding on all members of the U.N. Presumably it matters not that hardly anyone else lives up to the U.N. sanctions or directives when these run contrary to national interests.

Due to a new technology in the steel industry, we are also told Rhodesian chrome can now be embargoed without placing us in position of almost exclusive reliance on the Soviet Union for chrome, until of course, U.N. sanctions and the wrath of our new morality are turned against South Africa which has limited amounts of inferior chrome but which also buys chrome from Rhodesia. They say, only in the event that South Africa chrome is denied would we be forced into a situation of relying almost exclusively on men of reason and morality in the Soviet Union. How many among us doubt that it will be only a few short years before the Soviet guns of conquest are turned also against South Africa?

But, can we be sure that we would not get any Rhodesian chrome in some processed steel imports? Not unless we can be assured no U.N. member countries would never buy raw chrome from Rhodesia—certainly not mother Russia or any of her children. You say even if they did, the bill today strictly prohibits indirect importation by requiring an ethical declaration on a certificate of origin to be administered by the Customs Bureau, the same good people who handle our illegal alien situation so admirably. How many, yes, how many of the Eastern European Communist bloc would hesitate to provide whatever certificate is needed for their purpose?

Would not the embargo of Rhodesian chrome add to our inflation and unemployment of course it would. Most estimates have it that after embargo is enacted the price of chrome will go up no more than 40 percent in the first year. It is such a small price to pay for morality; surely only immoral United States consumers will have trouble understanding. Besides, it will be disguised in the increased prices of finished products and no one will recognize chrome as the culprit. Unemployment should not pose a problem. We pay for unemployment with public works projects and unemployment compensation. If our small foundries say they lack the capital or floor space to install the new technology to use low grade South African chrome, it just goes to show how our small businesses have become; and if they are small, it's likely they don't employ all that many people anyway. After all, what are the jobs of a few thousand Americans when weighed against the greater good of the new "morality"?

Mr. Chairman, today the American people are caught in a moral winepress and they will be squeezed. Chrome is a key ingredient in stainless and specialty steels having crucial application in power generators, refining, transportation, food production and processing and defense, plus a host of other important items. Hardly items we can afford to gamble

with. There are far too many gambles in turning off a presently reliable source of chrome and potentially placing ourselves at the mercy of the Soviet Union. The only people who will ultimately suffer are the American people; they will get one more straw of inflation and unemployment to carry, courtesy of the U.S. Congress. Rhodesia will find other buyers for its chrome who will process it and sell it to our country at a profit.

And to what end? What purpose will be served? We show our allegiance to the U.N. and we help to require majority rule in Rhodesia but at what cost to the United States? Rhodesia is moving toward majority rule, not rapidly but surely. There are better ways to help move that process forward than by harming U.S. consumers and promoting world communism.

I wish someone would explain to me why the Soviet Union is exempt from the morality we are applying to Rhodesia. Tell me how the Soviet Union can trade with Rhodesia and go unscathed in the U.N.? Tell me how for so many years they can play with the lives of Soviet Jews and their families for political blackmail. Tell me why suppression of the majority and of political dissent in Russia is so different from the suppression in Rhodesia.

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.

We are told the U.N. may enforce measures against a country if the Security Council finds that country poses a threat to international peace and security. I do not know by what possible stretch of the imagination Rhodesia is posing a threat to peace and security. It is the nations around Rhodesia—nations which are more and more Communist-controlled—who are training terrorists to infiltrate Rhodesia and who destroy that country's peace and security and who open the door to threats to world peace and security.

I urge defeat of H.R. 1746 first for the economic prosperity and well being of our people, but I also argue for its defeat because it is unworkable and self-defeating and because it arbitrarily applies an unforgivable double standard of morality which blasts a signal loud and clear to our friends and enemies alike that political expediency has become the standard of the United States.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LEVITAS

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEVITAS: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 5(a) of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2)(A) Subject to the conditions prescribed in subparagraph (B), if the President determines that the government of a foreign country is engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights (including torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, prolonged detention without charges, or other flagrant denial of the right to life, liberty, and the security of person), the President may, through any agency which he may designate and under such orders, rules, and regulations as may be prescribed by him, suspend (in whole or in part) economic relations or rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication between that foreign country or any national thereof or any person therein and the United States or any person subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or involving any property subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.

"(B) A suspension under subparagraph (A) shall become effective only if—

"(i) the President submits to the Congress a report describing the proposed suspension;

"(ii) a period of 60 days has elapsed since such report was submitted to the Congress; and

"(iii) during such 60-day period, neither House of the Congress has adopted a resolution disapproving the proposed suspension."

Mr. LEVITAS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Chairman, I must confess that in the past I have had and continue to have certain doubts about this bill that is now before us. These are not doubts that are in any way based upon my condemnation of and the opprobrium that I hold for the manner in which the Separatist regime of Prime Minister Ian Smith of Rhodesia has denied to a majority of its citizens their basic human rights.

In the past I have had certain economic concerns about the national security interests of the United States, but as a result of intervening developments, some of which have been described by prior speakers, in particular the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) reasons no longer exist to oppose the repeal of the Byrd amendment. Indeed, the national security interests of the United States may very well be furthered by the repeal of the Byrd amendment.

But the purpose of the amendment which I place before the body is simply to recognize that Rhodesia is not alone

in its denial of human rights to its citizens. It is unfortunate that such a state of affairs exists in Rhodesia, but it is also true that there are other nations in the world which deny certain of their citizens basic human rights to a greater or lesser extent: for example, the Soviet Union, the Peoples Republic of China, South Korea, Chile, and India, and not the least of which should be mentioned is Uganda. Who in this body can stand to look at the horrors and atrocities of minority rule in Uganda and the slaughter of innocent persons simply because they are not of the same faith as the ruling party in that country?

However, the United States has not seen fit to prohibit economic relations with nations other than Rhodesia when we disagree with their treatment of their citizens. Why then do we single out Rhodesia? Why do we import copper from Chile? Why do we import coffee from Uganda?

My amendment is very similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BAUMAN) with one exception. His amendment made it mandatory. My amendment gives the flexibility of discretion, discretion such as was suggested by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLARZ) as being necessary.

I also must say if we were voting in favor of the repeal of the Byrd amendment simply because the United Nations has asked us to, I could not agree. I would have to oppose it because, as our former Ambassador to the United Nations and now our colleague in the other body has pointed out, the United Nations has indeed become a theater of the absurd, and we must not let our foreign policy be dictated by the United Nations. We must formulate our own foreign policy consonant with our own national interest.

Accordingly, I offer the amendment which lets us speak up forthrightly on the issue of human rights and lets us make our own foreign policy rather than require us to acquiesce to the demands of the United Nations and lets us stand up for the principles we agree on as being fundamental rather than single out one nation as being the malefactor in the world when we know other nations of the world are equally if not more guilty of depriving their citizens of human rights.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota insist on his point of order?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SMITH of Iowa). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The bill deals only with United Nations sanctions against importation of chrome, while the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia deals with embargoes and other economic sanctions on any material or commercial transaction. Also, the bill deals only with sanctions against Rhodesia, both in the title and in the body of the bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia permits U.S. rather than U.N. sanctions to be imposed on prod-

ucts or communications from any foreign country. It is the opinion of the Chair that the amendment is not germane, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, 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. 1746) to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to halt the importation of Rhodesian chrome, pursuant to House Resolution 397, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

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 Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DERWINSKI moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1746, to the Committee on International Relations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Immediately after section 2, add the following new section:

"SEC. 3. On the first day of the first calendar quarter beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and on the first day of each quarter thereafter, the President shall report to Congress the degree of compliance with the United Nations' sanctions against Southern Rhodesia by all other members of the United Nations."

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that has arisen again and again in the debate this afternoon and a year ago when this bill was on the floor was whether or not the United States being in compliance, except for the Byrd amendment, was in a better or worse moral and legal position than the countries who give lip service to the U.N. sanctions, but are known to violate them. All this motion to recommit provides is that the President shall give a quarterly report to the Congress on the compliance of member nations with the U.N. sanctions.

Now, there are no teeth in it. There is no action other than that requested of the President. There is no action requested of the Congress. All we would do is to place in the RECORD quarterly the compliance or lack of it by other countries with the U.N. sanctions. I would think this consistent with the intention

of Members of this House that the U.N. sanctions be observed. This quarterly report would provide information so that those who consistently violate the sanctions are publicly and properly reported.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a constructive suggestion. It does not in any way interfere with the basic goal of the bill before us. I believe it is worthy of support as a motion to recommit.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit with instructions. The instructions which the gentleman proposes would put on the President the responsibility of getting information which is not, frankly, available to him. There is a United Nations sanctions committee with which the gentleman is familiar which seeks to determine what nations are in compliance and which are not in compliance; but despite their best efforts they have not been able to get the information we ought to have. There is no way that the President, without doubling the budget of the Central Intelligence Agency, is going to be able to get this information, since countries will not openly admit to these violations and we will have to engage in a massive international investigation to try to elicit facts which are not normally available to us from any of the countries involved; so it is not a workable provision. I think it would be misleading to put it in the legislation.

I, therefore, oppose the motion to recommit with instructions.

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

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

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman familiar with any official policy of violation by any other governments than the United States?

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I think only South Africa officially admits it. I am not even sure they officially admit it.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the issue all along has been the official policy of the Government of our country to permit violations of the United Nations Security Council resolution. Now, if this amendment were adopted in the form of a recommittal motion, it would mean we would require the President, as I understand it, to try to ferret out information regarding every illicit private transaction in violations of U.N. sanctions; is that correct?

Mr. FRASER. Yes; not only violations by United States companies, but every single entity around the world.

Mr. WHALEN. That is what I mean, by South Africa or any other country.

Mr. FRASER. I agree with the gentleman. I think it is an unworkable version. It would not function.

Mr. WHALEN. I think it would be imposing an impossible task on the President and I, too, oppose the recommittal motion.

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; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

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 250, nays 146, answered "present" 1, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—250

Addabbo	Ford, Mich.	Murphy, N.Y.
Akaka	Ford, Tenn.	Murphy, Pa.
Alexander	Forsythe	Myers, Michael
Allen	Fraser	Natcher
Ambro	Frenzel	Nedzi
Ammerman	Fuqua	Nix
Anderson,	Gammage	Nolan
Calif.	Gaydos	Nowak
Anderson, III.	Glaimo	Oakar
Andrews, N.C.	Gibbons	Oberstar
Annunzio	Gilman	Obey
Applegate	Glickman	Ottinger
Ashley	Gore	Panetta
Aspin	Gradison	Patten
Badillo	Gudger	Pattison
Baldus	Hamilton	Pease
Baucus	Hanley	Pepper
Beard, R.I.	Hannaford	Perkins
Bedell	Harkin	Pickie
Bellenson	Harrington	Pike
Benjamin	Hawkins	Preyer
Biaggi	Heckler	Price
Bingham	Hefner	Pritchard
Bianchard	Hefel	Quie
Blouin	Hillis	Railsback
Boggs	Hollenbeck	Rangel
Boland	Holtzman	Rinaldo
Bolling	Horton	Risenhoover
Bonior	Howard	Rodino
Bonker	Hughes	Roe
Brademas	Ichord	Roncalio
Breckinridge	Ireland	Rooney
Brodhead	Jacobs	Rose
Broomfield	Jeffords	Rosenthal
Buchanan	Jenrette	Rostenkowski
Burke, Calif.	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Burke, Mass.	Jones, Tenn.	Russo
Burlison, Mo.	Jordan	Ryan
Burton, John	Kastenmeier	Sawyer
Burton, Phillip	Keys	Scheuer
Caputo	Kildee	Schroeder
Carney	Koch	Seiberling
Carr	Kostmayer	Sharp
Cavanaugh	Krebs	Sisk
Chisholm	Krueger	Skelton
Cohen	Le Fante	Smith, Iowa
Conable	Leach	Solarz
Conte	Lederer	Spellman
Conyers	Leggett	St Germain
Corman	Lehman	Staggers
Cornell	Lewitas	Stanton
Cornwell	Lloyd, Calif.	Stark
Cotter	Long, La.	Steers
Coughlin	Lone, Md.	Steiger
D'Amours	Luken	Stockman
Danielson	Lundine	Stokes
Delaney	McClory	Studds
Dellums	McCloskey	Thompson
Dent	McCormack	Traxler
Dicks	McDade	Tsongas
Diggs	McFall	Tucker
Dingell	McHugh	Udall
Dodd	McKay	Ullman
Downey	McKinney	Van Deerlin
Drinan	Maguire	Vento
Duncan, Oreg.	Marky	Volkmer
Early	Marks	Walgren
Eckhardt	Mattox	Waxman
Edgar	Mazzoli	Weaver
Edwards, Calif.	Meeds	Weiss
Ellberg	Metcalfe	Whalen
Emery	Meyner	Whitley
Eriksen	Mikulski	Wilson, Tex.
Ertel	Mikva	Winn
Evans, Colo.	Müller, Calif.	Wirth
Evans, Del.	Mineta	Wolf
Fary	Minish	Wright
Fascell	Mitchell, Md.	Yates
Fenwick	Moakley	Yatron
Fish	Moffett	Young, Mo.
Fisher	Mollohan	Young, Tex.
Fithian	Moorhead, Pa.	Zablocki
Flood	Moss	Zefiretti
Foley	Murphy, Ill.	

NAYS—146

Abdnor	Flynt	Myers, Ind.
Andrews,	Pountain	O'Brien
N. Dak.	Gephardt	Pettis
Archer	Ginn	Foage
Armstrong	Grassley	Pressler
Ashbrook	Hagedorn	Quayle
Badham	Hail	Quillen
Bafalis	Hammer-	Regula
Barnard	schmidt	Rhodes
Bauman	Hansen	Roberts
Bennett	Harris	Robinson
Bevill	Harsha	Rogers
Bowen	Hightower	Rousslot
Breaux	Holt	Rudd
Brinkley	Hubbard	Runnels
Brooks	Huckaby	Sarasin
Brown, Mich.	Hyde	Satterfield
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins	Schulze
Broyhill	Johnson, Colo.	Sebellius
Burgener	Jones, Okla.	Shibley
Burke, Fla.	Kasten	Shuster
Burleson, Tex.	Kazen	Sikes
Butler	Kelly	Skubitz
Byron	Kemp	Sack
Carter	Ketchum	Smith, Nebr.
Cederberg	Kindness	Snyder
Clausen,	Lagomarsino	Spence
Don H.	Latta	Stangeland
Clawson, Del.	Lent	Steed
Cleveland	Lloyd, Tenn.	Stratton
Cochran	Lott	Symms
Coleman	Lujan	Taylor
Collins, Tex.	McDonald	Thone
Corcoran	Madigan	Thornton
Crane	Mahon	Treen
Daniel, Dan	Mann	Trible
Daniel, R. W.	Marlenee	Waggoner
Davis	Marriott	Walker
de la Garza	Martin	Walsh
Derrick	Mathis	Wampler
Derwinski	Michel	Watkins
Devine	Milford	White
Dornan	Miller, Ohio	Whitehurst
Duncan, Tenn.	Mitchell, N.Y.	Whitten
Edwards, Ala.	Moore	Wiggins
Edwards, Okla.	Moorhead,	Wilson, Bob
English	Calif.	Wyder
Evans, Ga.	Mottl	Wylie
Flippo	Murtha	Young, Alaska
Flowers	Myers, Gary	Young, Fla.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Santini

NOT VOTING—35

AuCoin	Gonzalez	Rahall
Beard, Tenn.	Goodling	Reuss
Brown, Calif.	Guy	Richmond
Chappell	Holland	Ruppe
Clay	Jones, N.C.	Simon
Collins, Ill.	LaFalce	Stump
Dickinson	McEwen	Teague
Evans, Ind.	Montgomery	Torrey
Findley	Neal	Vander Jagt
Florio	Nichols	Vanik
Frey	Patterson	Wilson, C. H.
Goldwater	Pursell	

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Florio for, with Mr. Teague against.
 Mr. Simon for, with Mr. Montgomery against.
 Mr. Patterson of California for, with Mr. Rahall against.
 Mr. Brown of California for, with Mr. Nichols against.
 Mr. Vanik for, with Mr. Chappell against.
 Mr. Clay for, with Mr. Stump against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Holland with Mr. AuCoin.
 Mr. Richmond with Mr. Evans of Indiana.
 Mr. Reuss with Mr. Gonzalez.
 Mr. Torrey with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
 Mr. LaFalce with Mr. Neal.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson of California with Mr. Guyer.

Mrs. Collins of Illinois with Mr. Goodling.
 Mr. Findley with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Ruppe with Mr. Beard of Tennessee.
 Mr. Goldwater with Mr. McEwen.

So the bill was 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 just passed.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM SERGEANT AT ARMS—SUBPENA TO TESTIFY BEFORE GRAND JURY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms:

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
 Washington, D.C., March 14, 1977.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,
 The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 31, 1977 I was served with the attached subpoena duces tecum commanding me to appear in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri and to bring with me copies of the records attached thereto. Subsequently, on February 18, 1977, the Court issued an order finding that the documents called for in the subpoena are material and relevant to the grand jury's investigation.

Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 10, I am hereby transmitting said subpoena and order, and the matter is presented for your consideration.

Sincerely,

KENNETH R. HARDING,
 Sergeant-at-Arms, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provision of House Resolution 10, the subpoena and order will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The subpoena and order follow:

[U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Missouri, Eastern District]

SUBPENA TO TESTIFY BEFORE GRAND JURY

TO: KENNETH R. HARDING, Sergeant at Arms,
 U.S. House of Representatives, Wash-
 ington, D.C.

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri at Room 427, U.S. Court and Customs House, 1114 Market Street, in the City of St. Louis on the 3rd day of March, 1977, at 10:00 A.M., to testify before the Grand Jury and bring with you the following records of William L. Clay and/or Carol A. Clay, 633 Whittingham Drive, Silver Spring, Maryland:

(See attached list.)

This subpoena is issued on application of the United States.

Dated this 31st day of January, 1977.

[U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Missouri]

IN RE GRAND JURY SUBPENA
 ORDER

Application having been made to the Court by the United States of America pursuant to House Resolution No. 10, 95th Congress, for a determination of the relevancy and materiality to the Grand Jury's investigation of the relevancy and materiality to the Grand Jury's

investigation of certain documents subpoenaed by the Grand Jury and having considered the facts set forth in the application and having reviewed the Grand Jury subpoena, it is hereby

Determined that the documents called for in the subpoena to Kenneth R. Harding, Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives are material and relevant to the Grand Jury's investigation of possible violations of 26 U.S.C. §§ 7201 and 7206(1) by William L. Clay.

Furthermore, the Court requests the House of Representatives to make certified copies of said documents available at a place under the order and control of the House of Representatives to a duly authorized Special Agent of the Internal Revenue Service who will take custody of said certified copies on behalf of the Grand Jury.

LEGISLATION TO DENY COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, JUDICIARY, AND TOP LEVEL EMPLOYEES OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SARASIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to deny the cost-of-living increase which the Members of Congress, Judiciary, and top level employees of the executive branch would have received this October under the provision of H.R. 2559, which was passed by the House of Representatives in August of 1975 without my support.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is absolutely necessary for the Congress of the United States to improve its image in the eyes of the people we represent. We cannot do this if the public finds us increasing our salary twice in 1 year, with the second raise based on the very inflation that is caused by the huge Federal deficits approved by the majority of this House. As stated in the report of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries:

Among the public's frustrations we know of, none ranks higher than inflation. And we know of no problem which the public is more likely to blame on government spending and therefore the Congress and Executive branch. The idea that Congress would be willing to support the notion that the rest of the country suffers the ravages of inflation, but that its Members have a kind of inflation insurance, protected from the very disease that it is believed to have created is not one whose time has come.

Without discussing the merits or problems caused by the salary increase which went into effect on February 20, 1977, I feel it is critically important that we not allow the comparability salary adjustment—better known as the cost-of-living adjustment—to take place this year. I think that the cost-of-living and other factors that would ordinarily be taken into account in that respect were fully considered in the recommendations of the Commission on Executive, Legislative, and Judicial Salaries which was accepted by the Congress.

The recent pay increases, after 8 years, were reasonable and adequate. The House coupled the increase with a sound and reasonable code of ethics. I see no reason to provide a second pay increase

in the same calendar year. Future cost of living increases can be considered in the context of the economic conditions prevailing at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I have also added my support to legislation which would deny Members of Congress any future increases in salary during their current term. I feel that any and all salary increases should be effective at the inception of the following Congress. In this way, any potential image of the Congress sitting around thinking up new ways to increase their salaries, enhance their perquisites, and generally improve their financial status at the public's expense can be dismissed.

Mr. Speaker, I seek your support for these measures and your assistance in enhancing the potential for early passage. The tarnished image of the Congress cannot be ignored much longer. We must act responsibly if we are to earn the respect of our constituencies.

AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSERVATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, in late January of 1976, the Federal Energy Administration—FEA—formally entered into a cooperative agreement with the States of Kansas and Nebraska for an 18-month, \$300,000 pilot project to develop a model voluntary Statewide energy conservation program for on-farm production agriculture. The technical structure of the program has been jointly designed by the Agricultural Engineering Departments at Kansas State University and the University of Nebraska in coordination with their respective State Cooperative Extension Services and Agricultural Experiment Stations, under the purview of their respective Governors.

FEA has estimated that the equivalent of about 100,000 barrels of oil per day could be saved by 1985 through voluntary energy conservation programs on the more than 2½ million U.S. farms. These savings could be made through the establishment of more efficient energy management practices in many farming operations. Consequently this pilot project was established to determine where energy inefficiencies presently exist, develop a suitable program of corrective measures, and establish a workable delivery system for these practices. The major goal was to design and implement a program that would decrease energy inputs per unit of crop production.

This program is presently more than half way through the original contract period. More than 200 cooperating farmers have been selected to participate in the ongoing pilot program. They are presently keeping detailed records of their fuel usage for agricultural operations. To varying degrees, these farmers have also actually implemented a number of low cost, low risk, energy conservation practices on their farms. Further program implementation has been achieved through utilization of existing institutional networks such as the Coop-

erative Extension Service, 4-H, FFA, farm groups, and FEA Region VII.

While project members have found that there is no panacea for reducing agricultural energy consumption, there are a number of small, technically sound practices available using existing technology that can produce a worthwhile energy reduction while maintaining or increasing current productivity. Most require very little or no capital investment. These include energy efficient practices for both farm and agricultural industry participation in field operations, irrigation, crop drying, transportation, fertilizers and pesticides, and on-farm transportation.

Statewide implementation of the agricultural energy conservation program in Kansas could minimally attain a 10- to 12-percent savings in fuel that would be the equivalent to the income from a 5 to 7 million bushel wheat crop; that is, \$11 to \$15 million to the Kansas agricultural community. A similar program in Nebraska would equate to an additional 7 to 8 million bushels of corn income—\$14 to \$21 million—for the Nebraska agricultural community.

Implementing the Kansas-Nebraska agricultural energy conservation program nationwide would reduce fuel waste in agriculture and still maintain the agricultural production so vital to this Nation's standard of living and international balance of payments.

By 1980, it would result in a realistic savings of almost 441,000 barrels of crude oil per year in a typical agricultural State. The economic value of this 441,000 barrels would be more than \$11 million based on current agricultural fuel costs. Implementing this program in 17 agricultural States would yield a projected savings of 1,627,124 barrels per year.

Estimated cost for Statewide implementation of this type program through the end of 1980, including a 5 percent rate of inflation, would be approximately \$619,000. Calculation of the cost-benefit ratio yields a payoff of almost 20 to 1. In other words, for every 5 cents invested in this type of energy conservation program \$1 in fuel savings will result.

This program is demonstrating that, with a relatively low level of funding, to two agricultural States, an energy conservation program for on-farm production agriculture can be formulated to successfully utilize existing institutional mechanisms and resources to achieve widespread coverage, participation and results. I urge the Appropriations Committee Interior Subcommittee to continue funding this essential project and expand it to additional States as well.

On February 3, a briefing on the progress of the FEA-sponsored Kansas-Nebraska Energy Conservation Program was held here in Washington, D.C. Following are excerpts from the reports:

AGRICULTURAL ENERGY CONSERVATION GOALS

The major goal of this project has been to test and prove (or disprove) four hypotheses: (1) energy conservation on the farm can be both practical and profitable. From the farmer's standpoint, a reduction in fuel consumption can be translated directly into a means of saving money; (2) a model conservation program can be designed and effectively implemented through existing insti-

tutional networks, many of which originate with the office of the Governor. Since this program is entirely directed toward agriculture, it would be extremely counterproductive to by-pass such workable institutions as the Land Grant Universities and the Cooperative Extension Service in favor of an entirely new organization; (3) significant energy savings on State-wide basis will result. Since there are many known energy inefficiencies in modern agriculture, a program which is wholly directed towards correcting these inefficiencies should be able to realize a substantial energy savings if properly designed and implemented. Based on the presently available technology, a savings of approximately 15 to 20 per cent seems quite feasible; (4) based on the previous statements, it follows that a similar program, when implemented on a national basis, could substantially reduce the energy demands of agriculture, without affecting the present levels of production.

BARRIERS

The barriers to establishing an agricultural energy conservation program are similar to those existing in the establishment of any conservation program. There are also a number of barriers which are somewhat unique to a voluntary, agriculturally oriented energy conservation program. These include (1) an overall resistance to any changes. Farmers are often associated with being quite staunch supporters of the status quo. However, when one considers just how much is at stake for the farmer, the reasons behind this position are more apparent. There also tends to be a good deal of resistance on the farmer's part toward any program that is directly associated with the government; (2) in the past, there has been very little economic incentive for energy conservation. We have lived in an age of very cheap energy supplies. For example, as recently as 1975, a Kansas farmer's fuel costs comprised only about 7 percent of his overall expenses. However, this is rapidly changing. Two years ago, the price of natural gas (which is widely used for irrigation) was \$0.18 per 1,000 cubic feet (MCF). This has since risen to \$1.48 per MCF, with further increases expected; (3) there is a general lack of awareness of energy problems. Many farmers as well as a large percentage of the general public do not realize, or fail to believe, that energy supplies are limited. When shortages do occur, the blame is often placed on the oil companies, rather than the lack of understanding of many conservation practices, especially the ones that have only recently been developed. Even if there is a desire to obtain more information relating to a given practice, there is often a lack of awareness of where this information can be obtained.

This last barrier is where the most progress can be made. Much information relating to conservation practices is currently in print and further research is being done. An awareness of this information needs to be developed, but it is only a first step. Once the farmer knows where his energy is consumed and how much it costs him, he must then be provided with the information he needs to apply suitable conservation measures and techniques.

COMPLETE CONSERVATION PROGRAM REQUIRES 3 TO 5 YEARS

The implementation of a voluntary conservation program must stress energy efficiency or energy management rather than conservation; promote only practices that are economically feasible; utilize personnel that are in close contact with agriculture; gain cooperation of production agriculture related industries; and utilize a wide range of educational methods.

Experience indicates that from three to five years will be needed to implement a full

scale conservation program complete with energy savings. As a result of the time needed to develop the program and establish staff credibility within the State, the most significant portion of these savings occurs toward the end of the program.

Behavioral change in production techniques, even in the presence of strong economic incentives, is usually a slow process in the agricultural community, but it can be accelerated.

The more obvious energy conservation practices will be implemented first as farmers become aware of the savings potentials: upgrading of irrigation pump and engine efficiencies; improved water management techniques; the use of dual tires and weights; reduced tillage; more attention to machinery maintenance, cutter sharpness, et cetera; low temperatures grain drying; demands for pickup trucks averaging more than a few miles per gallon; and better interpretation of soil analysis results, and more.

If each farmer persuaded in one year could persuade just one or two of his neighbors the next, the effect of an initial education program in these early years would be considerable by 1985 in terms of both energy savings and dollars retained annually by farmers.

Using figures developed for FEA by the USDA Economic Research Service, these energy savings are possible:

Field machinery, 20 percent of 390 trillion btu = 78 trillion btu.
Transportation, 20 percent of 320 trillion btu = 64 trillion btu.
Irrigation, 25 percent of 260 trillion btu = 65 trillion btu.
Livestock, 15 percent of 160 trillion btu = 23 trillion btu.
Crop drying, 20 percent of 110 trillion btu = 22 trillion btu.
Fertilizer, 15 percent of 620 trillion btu = 93 trillion btu.
Miscellaneous, 10 percent of 150 trillion btu = 15 trillion btu.
Total, 18 percent of 2010 trillion btu = 360 trillion btu.

This equates to about 170,000 barrels per day, a savings at today's energy prices of more than \$1 billion in production costs.

SYNTHETIC FUELS DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. EMERY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will effectively demonstrate the practical application for synthetic fuels in our economy. Entitled "The Synthetic Fuels Demonstration Act of 1977," this bill consists of two separate and distinct programs: The first introduces synthetic fuels into daily use in a controlled fleet environment. The second part encourages extensive experimentation with synthetic fuels in high performance peak turbine electric generators.

PART I—MOTOR VEHICLE DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

This program is administered by ERDA in cooperation with the selected agency in which the program is to be conducted. The ERDA Administrator first selects a synthetic fuel to be used, based on blending qualities with gasoline, compatibility to vehicles, availability, and

cost. Also, the synthetic fuel must be produced domestically.

Concurrent with the selection of the fuel is the selection of a demonstration agency for the program, based on the agency's facilities for testing and evaluating the effectiveness of the synthetic fuel-gasoline blend. The other criteria requires that the agency under consideration be a large purchaser of motor vehicles and also have common fueling and maintenance facilities.

A demonstration plan is also established under the auspices of the ERDA Administrator, which includes consideration of a variety of motor vehicles to be used in the program, the necessity for modifications, and the system for data collection and evaluation.

The demonstration program runs for 3 years with annual interim reports and a final evaluation being submitted to Congress.

The authorization for the entire program is \$15 million.

PART II—ELECTRICAL GENERATION SYNTHETIC FUEL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

This program is basically designed to demonstrate the feasibility of synthetic fuel substitution for fossil fuel distillates in peak-power turbines.

Under this program, interested utilities submit plans for implementation of synthetic fuels in their turbines to the Energy Research and Development Administration. If accepted, the difference between the cost of the synthetic fuel and the cost of the conventional fuel is paid to the utilities.

Authorized for appropriation for the entire 4-year duration of the program is \$6 million. Reports are also annually submitted to Congress with a final evaluation due at the end of fiscal year 1981.

Mr. Speaker, technologies for making and using alcohol fuels are known and solutions to operating problems are solvable by new engineering technologies. Research in modification of engines and fuels, fuel distribution, performance data, and fuel composition is being conducted at universities and research centers around the country.

This bill will provide a fleet test in cars and electric turbines. Users will then have assurance that they can operate as expected without unknown problems and that the fuel is reliable under user conditions.

The natural gas crisis of this winter should be a strong reminder to us that we must proceed with all possible speed in our development of renewable, clean synthetic fuels. A demonstration program, of the nature I am proposing, will hasten the commercialization of gasoline blends and begin to reduce our dependence on high-priced foreign petroleum products.

LEGISLATION MANDATING AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH CONGRESSIONAL INTENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DEL CLAWSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, after Congress approves legislation any boomerang effect on a large segment of the population manifests itself early in the agency implementation of the law. Opposition organizes and calls are mounted for corrective legislation. On the other hand, it has been observed that "Many a boomerang does not return but chooses freedom instead." It is the free-wheeling legislative-regulatory boomerangs which were the target of legislation which I introduced with broad bipartisan cosponsorship in the last Congress. We refer to the increasing tendency of bureaucrats in the executive agencies to issue rules or regulations contrary to congressional intent or which go beyond the original intent of the law and which frequently are, in effect, new legislation. The fact that the regulations are formulated in arcane bureaucratic reaches far from the Halls of Congress and outside the process by which the people hold duly elected Representatives responsible for legislative acts is at the foundation of our concern.

Individuals—and small businesses—adversely affected often cannot afford to take to the courts for recourse, and these same courts are increasingly clogged by litigation. Meanwhile, the distinction between rules and regulations and new law is increasingly in doubt.

In keeping with our pledge at the close of the last Congress, I am again introducing a bill to provide an orderly method for congressional review and disapproval of those rules and regulations which may be contrary to law or inconsistent with congressional intent. The bill builds on the recommendations of the House Judiciary Committee following hearings on our bill in the last Congress. It is intended as an oversight tool; not a replacement for effective committee oversight. It is hoped that both the Rules and Judiciary Committees will take early opportunities to act on this legislation so that Congress may regain those constitutional legislative functions which have been usurped by some members of the bureaucracy.

IN SUPPORT OF THE HAWAIIAN NATIVES AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, with Congressman HEFTL, four bills which seek to amend existing welfare and social laws to include Native Hawaiian people under the heading of native Americans. By correcting the definition of native Americans in key statutes the Native Hawaiians will now have the opportunity to receive vital Federal assistance now available to American Indians and other native groups. I believe you will agree that Native Hawaiians are native Americans. The Hawaiian people face many problems in the land now called Hawaii. They face hardships similar to our brothers and sisters of the Indian nations. As a nation, we were

self-governing prior to our discovery, and we, like the Indian nation and the Eskimos, are now a part of the United States.

The Congress has been kind in passing key legislation which has assisted the Indians and Eskimos in maintaining their identity and self-respect. Sadly, however, the definition of Hawaiians as native Americans was not mandated at the time of the drafting of these important laws.

I am asking you, my distinguished colleagues to right an inequity in current statutes, assuring the Hawaiian Natives the rights and privileges currently enjoyed by other native Americans.

The Native Hawaiian of today faces a great problem in adjusting to a society that is alien to his native beliefs. He faces the trauma of identity in a world not his own; he searches for his home in his own homeland; he asks for assistance from the Federal Government in recognizing him as a native American so that he, too, can be proud of his heritage and be recognized for what he is—a native American.

The measures that I am introducing will rectify some of these inequities. The first of the measures that I am introducing would include Native Hawaiians for eligibility for aid under the manpower programs of section 302 of the 1973 Comprehensive Employment and Training Act—CETA—which was designed to assist the creation of job training educational and employment programs for unemployed and economically disadvantaged native Americans. I am sure you will agree that this is a reasonable request.

The second measure proposed is entitled the Hawaiian Native Educational Assistance Act of 1977. This measure would amend section 810 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to include Native Hawaiians with American Indians now covered by the act.

The third measure would extend provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to Native Hawaiians. The fourth would extend to Native Hawaiians provisions of the Indian Financing Act of 1974.

I hope that these measures will meet with the approval of the appropriate House Committees, the full Houses of Congress, and the President. The Native Hawaiians are looking to you for assistance. I feel that these measures will correct some of the inequities. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the text of each of the four bills that I have introduced this day:

S. 850

A bill to extend the provisions of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 to Native Hawaiians

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(b) of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "and any Native Hawaiian as defined in subsection (h) of this section".

(b) Section 3(c) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and further includes any corporation or

other legal entity organized by Native Hawaiians as defined in subsection (h) of this section".

(c) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and further includes lands held by incorporated Native Hawaiian groups".

(d) Section 3 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consisted of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

S. 859

A bill to extend the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to Native Hawaiians

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4(a) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or any Native Hawaiian as defined in clause (e) of this section".

(b) Section 4(b) of such Act is amended by inserting immediately before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and further includes any corporation or other legal entity organized by Native Hawaiians as defined in clause (e) of this section".

(c) Section 4 of such Act is amended by inserting immediately after clause (d) thereof the following new clause:

"(e) 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consisted of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

S. 858

A bill to amend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 to provide manpower programs for Native Hawaiians

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Native Hawaiian Manpower Act of 1977".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 302(a) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" the second time it appears; in clause (1) of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma, and

(2) by inserting after "native" in such clause (1) the following: "and Hawaiian native".

(b) Section 302(b) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" the fifth time it appears in clause (2) of such section, and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such clause a comma and the following: "and Native Hawaiians in Hawaii".

(c) The first sentence in section 302(c) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "and such public and nonprofit private agencies as he determines will best serve Native Hawaiians".

(d) Section 302(g) of such Act is amended by striking out "4 percent" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 percent".

(e) The heading of such section 302 is amended to read as follows:

"INDIAN AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN MANPOWER PROGRAMS".

Sec. 3. Section 601(a) of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(14) 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consisted of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

S. 857

A bill to amend the Indian Education Act and certain other related education assistance programs to provide Federal financial assistance to Hawaiian Natives, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Hawaiian Native Educational Assistance Act of 1977".

Sec. 2. (a) Section 810 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "Indian children" each time the words appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian children".

(b) Section 810 of such Act is further amended by redesignating subsection (g) of such section, and all references thereto, as subsection (h) and by inserting after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

"(g) As used in this Act 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consisted of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

(c) The heading of such section 810 is amended by striking out "INDIAN" and inserting in lieu thereof: "INDIAN AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN".

Sec. 3. (a) (1) Section 302(a) of the Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act is amended by striking out "Indian students" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian students".

(2) The Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act is amended by striking out "Indian children" wherever it appears in such Act, except in the second sentence of section 303(a) (2) (B), and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian children".

(b) The Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"NATIVE HAWAIIAN DEFINED"

"Sec. 308. As used in this Act, the term 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consisted of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

(c) Section 301 of the Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act is amended to read as follows:

"SHORT TITLE"

"Sec. 301. This title may be cited as the 'Indian and Native Hawaiian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act'."

Sec. 4. (a) (1) Section 422(a) of the Indian Education Act is amended by striking out "Indian organizations" each time the words appear in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian organizations".

(2) Such section 422(a) is further amended by striking out "Indian children" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian children".

(3) Such section 422(a) is further amended by striking out "Indians" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indians and Native Hawaiians".

(b) Section 423(a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Indian students" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian students".

(c) (1) The first sentence of section 412 (a) of such Act is amended by striking out "Indian Education" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian Education", and by inserting after "Indians" a comma and the following: "native Hawaiians".

(2) The second sentence of section 442(a) is amended by inserting after "organizations," the following: "and by Native Hawaiian organizations".

(3) Section 442(b) (1) of such Act is amended by striking out "Indian children" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian children".

(4) Section 442(b) (3) of such Act is amended by striking out "Indian children" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian children".

(5) Section 442(b) (4) is amended by inserting after "organizations" a comma and the following: "and Native Hawaiian organizations", and by striking out "Indian children" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian children".

(6) Section 442(b) (6) of such Act is amended by striking out "Indian" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian".

(7) The heading of such section 442 is amended by striking out "INDIAN" and inserting in lieu thereof "INDIAN AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN".

(d) (1) Section 453 of such Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section designation and by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) For the purpose of this title, the term 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consisted of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

(2) The heading of such section 453 is amended to read as follows: "DEFINITIONS".

Sec. 5. (a) (1) Section 314(a) of the Adult Education Act is amended in the matter preceding clause (1) by inserting after the word "organization" the following: "and to Native Hawaiian organizations".

(2) Such section 314(a) of such Act is further amended by striking out the word "Indians" in the matter preceding clause (1) and in clause (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "Indians and Native Hawaiians".

(3) Section 314(a) (2) of such Act is amended by striking out "Indian" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian".

(4) Section 314(a) (5) of such Act is amended by striking out "Indian" and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian".

(5) Section 314(b) of such Act is amended by inserting in the matter preceding clause (1) after the word "organizations" the following: "and Native Hawaiian organization".

(6) Section 314(b) of such Act is further amended by striking out "Indian" each time it appears in clause (1) and clause (2) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "Indian and Native Hawaiian".

(7) The last sentence of section 314(c) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period a comma and the following: "and Native Hawaiian organizations".

(b) Section 314 of the Adult Education Act is amended by redesignating subsection (d) and all references thereto, as subsection (e) and by inserting immediately after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(4) For the purpose of this section, the term 'Native Hawaiian' means any individual any of whose ancestors were natives of the area which consisted of the Hawaiian Islands prior to 1778."

(c) The heading of section 314 of such Act is amended by striking out "INDIANS" and inserting in lieu thereof "INDIANS AND NATIVE HAWAIIANS".

VETERANS JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, because of interest in H.R. 200, the Veterans Judicial Review Act, I am today reintroducing that bill, along with the following 28 cosponsors: Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PHILLIP BURTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WEISS.

This bill would amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for judicial review of VA decisions, rules, and regulations pursuant to title 5, United States Code to make it conform to the Administrative Procedures Act. It would also repeal section 3404(c), title 38, United States Code, to remove the present limitation of \$10 which veterans are allowed to spend on attorney's fees when appealing a case before the Veterans' Administration.

The VA, the third largest Government agency, is the only agency whose decisions about such matters as benefit levels and eligibility are exempted from review by the Federal courts. Congress has created the Board of Veterans Appeals, a special review process for administrative actions taken by the VA. It is somewhat unique in that other agencies do not have an appellate review board, although most agencies have appeals processes which end with the Administrator or at the Commission level.

However, the VA internal review process, conducted solely by VA employees even at the Board of Veterans Appeals level, is the only check on the fair and proper application of statutory programs enacted by the Congress. Without judicial review, the VA is free to issue regulations and make rulings which may differ significantly from the intent of the laws it is responsible for administering.

I am certain many Members of Congress are familiar with individual veterans' cases in which the veteran's claim for disability or educational benefits was denied by the VA despite what seems to be an excellent case.

The frustration of having no means of appeal beyond the VA itself for such arbitrary or inconsistent rulings is intolerable. I am confident that the Congress did not foresee what a stumbling block in the way of justice this immunity from judicial review would be, and the time has come to remove it.

I would like to commend my colleague, the Honorable TIMOTHY E. WIRTH, on his bill, H.R. 4395, the Veterans' Administration Judicial Review Act of 1977, which is identical to H.R. 200. I

understand that Mr. WIRTH will be re-introducing his bill on March 21 and I hope that those of you who did not co-sponsor H.R. 200 will join Mr. WIRTH in cosponsoring H.R. 4395. We are looking forward to working together to correct the inconsistencies and inequities of the VA review process.

I am including at the end of my remarks an article from the May 20, 1976, edition of the national veterans newspaper, the Stars and Stripes, which makes a persuasive case for enactment of this legislation:

SHOULD THE VA REMAIN FREE FROM JUDICIAL REVIEW?

(By Guest Editor Dean K. Phillips, 101st Airborne Div. Vietnam Veteran, August 1976 Univ. of Denver Law Graduate, Member National Advisory Committee, Senate Veterans Affairs Committee)

An increasing number of Americans have viewed with concern what many have labeled a fourth branch of government, elected by no one, and increasing rapidly in power and responsibility—the federal administrative agencies.

These agencies were given life by the Congress which charges them with specific responsibilities through federal statutes. Some government agencies administer and adjudicate benefits applied for by its citizens such as the Social Security Administration.

When applications for Social Security benefits are denied, applicants then have a right to appeal the decision of that agency within the agency framework—in the later stages via a hearing on the record and the opportunity to cross examine. If the final agency decision is not in their favor, the citizens have the right to appeal it in a court of law—an outside review consistent with the basic "checks and balances" envisioned by the founding fathers.

However, unlike its sister agencies, one agency remains immune from outside judicial review of its adjudicative decisions—the Veterans Administration [VA], third largest government agency. Under Title 38, USC, Section 211[a], the decisions of the VA on any question of law or fact under all laws administered by the VA are "... final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such decision . . ."

Since no judicial review is permitted, the VA writes rules and regulations which may differ significantly from the original statutes. One example is Public Law 93-508 which permits a student veteran who has exhausted his or her 36 months of educational assistance "... an additional number of months, not exceeding nine, as may be utilized in pursuit of a program of education leading to a standard undergraduate college degree".

However, under a subsequent VA regulation:

"The Veteran [who applies for the additional nine months] or in-service student must have been enrolled in a standard undergraduate college or first professional degree program at an institution of higher learning at the time that original [36 month] entitlement was exhausted."

Based upon this untestable [in Court] VA regulation, thousands of Vietnam Era Veterans [who were enrolled in educational programs other than those leading to a standard college degree when their 36 months were exhausted] have been deprived of their additional nine months of G.I. Bill educational assistance which the law on its face clearly does not deny them.

Not only does the VA write its own rules—which may or may not be consistent with Federal statutes but which are not subject

to judicial review—but the VA also adjudicates claims for benefits and these decisions are also not subject to judicial review.

The individual veteran's application for benefits might be rejected at one of the 58 VA regional offices. If his appeal with that office is denied, the ultimate appeal would be with the Board of Veterans Appeals in Washington, D.C. which is comprised of 31 permanent members—all of whom are VA employees and under Title 38 "The Board shall be bound in its decisions by the regulations of the Veterans Administration, instructions of the Administrator, and the precedent opinions of the chief law officer".

Furthermore, under VA rules, "Hearings conducted by and for the Board are ex parte in nature and nonadversary, cross-examination by parties to the hearing will not be permitted". Clearly, Title 38, Section 211[a] appears to be a denial of due process of law under the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, particularly since 73.6% of the VA budget is spent on "Benefit Programs".

Every veteran that has his or her initial claim for benefits denied at the regional office level should not go crashing directly into Federal Court. Veterans should be required to exhaust administrative remedies up through the Board of Veterans Appeals.

If the veteran was then not satisfied with the Board decision, he should have the right to file a civil action in Federal District Court, or file an action with a Court of Veterans Appeals which could be established independent of the VA, much like the Court of Military Appeals is independent of the military.

The VA should be also required to subject its proposed rules and regulations interpreting Federal statutes to outside review under the strict provisions of the Federal Administrative Procedure Act.

Hence, proposed rules inconsistent with Federal statutes could be effectively challenged by interested parties in hearings on the record where the VA would bear the burden of proof and thus resolved before they had the force of law. Presently, VA proposed regulations generally have the force of law 30 days after they are printed in the Federal Register.

VA spokesmen have stated, "The interest of the majority of the veteran population would not best be served by Court review. This is particularly true in the event of an individual decision becoming precedent and then being applied to the veteran population resulting in action not in the best interest of the veteran or claimant concerned". [Official VA response to the National Association of Concerned Veterans, March, 1975.]

Precedent, however, is a double-edged sword and could indeed serve the best interests of many veterans. For example, if the aforementioned nine month extension issue ever got to Court, there is a more than reasonable chance that the questionable VA regulations would be found more restrictive than the original statute and nullified. This would result in thousands of veterans finally becoming eligible for retroactive educational assistance that Congress had originally mandated when it passed Public Law 93-508 in December, 1974.

The knowledge that their decisions might ultimately be subject to outside judicial review would have a definite effect on those VA officials who write rules and regulations that are presently virtually unchallengeable. No less affected would be the adjudicative decisions of VA officials that deal with veterans on a day-to-day basis at the regional office level. No longer would VA adjudication officers be assured that their findings are subject to review only by fellow VA employees.

On the other hand, no longer would the Board of Veterans Appeals decisions, the

overwhelming majority of which are just and legally sound, be vulnerable to the present criticism due a closed and endogamous system like any other in the myriad of Federal bureaucracy and certainly inconsistent with the basic principles of a representative democracy.

FEDERAL TANKER SAFETY ACT OF 1977

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to be known as the Federal Tanker Safety Act of 1977, which addresses the growing national problem of pollution resulting from the unsafe operation of oil tankers off our shores.

During the first 9 months of 1976, over 200,000 tons of oil were spilled by oil tankers around the world. These figures do not include the rash of tankers accidents, including the *Argo Merchant*, which plagued our country during late 1976 and 1977. Clearly, inadequate oil tanker safety is a problem that not only causes the loss of a much-needed energy supply but it also pollutes our waters, destroys our fragile coastal environment, and threatens our already suffering fishing industry.

With this in mind, our goal is not to economically penalize the tanker industry or hinder the transport of this needed energy. Instead, our goal is to provide this energy in the safest possible, most efficient manner, which is what I believe my bill will help to do.

However, before I introduced legislation on this issue, I wanted to see and discuss oil tanker safety with the pilots and captains who guide these giant ships. Today, Mr. Speaker, in New Haven Harbor in Connecticut I took a tour of the tanker the *Gulf Oil* and discussed tanker safety with tanker captains who know the issue.

I found that while many tankers, especially those under American flags already contain most of the safety equipment that my legislation would mandate, there does exist 10 to 15 percent of the world tanker fleet, many times flying under flags of convenience, which have substandard safety equipment and ill-trained crews. For this reason I am today introducing the Federal Tanker Safety Act of 1977. My bill would mandate certain safety requirements and help to insure that all tankers which enter our ports will meet uniform safety guidelines.

The basic components of the bill are as follows:

It would establish an FAA-style traffic control system for our oil tankers operating off our shores;

It would require full disclosure of tanker ownership;

It would establish mandatory navigational equipment requirements and construction requirements.

This bill, known as the Federal Tanker Safety Act of 1977, will provide that all tankers, foreign owned or domestically

owned, which enter our ports will have to meet some of the most stringent anti-pollution and safety guidelines in the world. These new standards will apply to both U.S.- and foreign-owned and registered tankers; thus flags of convenience can no longer be used as loopholes by shippers seeking to escape safety regulations.

Inspection both on an annual basis and unannounced will take place.

And, perhaps more importantly, the bill will address the problem of tanker personnel. Equipment improvements are not the sole answer. The tragedy of the *Argo Merchant* could have been prevented by a more professional and better trained crew.

My bill would establish stricter licensing and training requirements based on National Academy of Sciences reports which will apply to the crews of all vessels who enter our ports.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that through improved legislation and stricter monitoring systems, we can prevent future tanker disasters which spoil our beaches and pollute our water. The Federal Tanker Safety Act of 1977 is legislation whose time has come.

RHODESIAN CHROME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BENJAMIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I had occasion to address myself to the support of the adoption of H.R. 1746 to allow reimposition of the embargo on imports of chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel from Rhodesia and thus return the United States to full compliance with United Nations economic sanctions in accordance with the international treaty obligations of our country.

While my remarks concentrated on the economics of the proposal, I did discuss the overall subject of human rights, majority rule and national independence as I did on the Ukraine on January 26 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page H523) and Lithuania (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1100). It therefore grieves me that many of us were compelled to vote against the Bauman amendment today in order that H.R. 1746 could be adopted to implement our present national policy in regard to human rights.

The Levitas amendment, although ruled to be out of order for lack of germaneness, certainly should be considered for legislative and executive action in the form of a renewal effort to convince our world of nations that we do mean to lend our influence to a new world order of freedom, self-determination and the guarantee of human rights as envisioned in Wilson's Fourteen Points.

On February 20, I appeared before the Lithuanian American Council of Lake County, Ind., on the occasion of its annual dinner which was being held at St. Casimir's Hall in Gary, Ind.

I advised the 350 Lithuanian-Americans and friends gathered at the dinner that I believed that January 20, 1977,

Inaugural Day, would be considered by historians as the hallmark of a new commitment and dedication to "human rights" for all people and that the Carter administration would inspire an unparalleled crusade provided the American people supported their President and that we could avoid all possibilities of global confrontation. I indicated that any use of moral and economic persuasion would certainly invoke criticism of internal meddling as it did by the Senate this past weekend. However, I concluded my reasoning that the pilot light had to be kept burning and that more favorable treatment of repressed nations was in the offing.

My remarks were followed by those of a local personality who indicated that I exuded false hope and that the U.S. foreign policy was an instrument of our economic goals rather than the design and employment of economic pursuits to support our foreign policy. I personally believe that the passage of H.R. 1746 by a decisive 250 to 146 vote should serve to dispel that observation and pessimism.

Frankly, there is hope for proposals as these offered by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland and Georgia. If they are as sincere as I believe they are, I hope that they will take counsel and join with others who have kindred beliefs to promote the new era of international goodwill through the medium of the promotion of human rights for all.

Upon conclusion of the program conducted by the Lithuanian-American Council, I was presented with the following resolution which I hope will provide the inspiration and invocation for new hope and aspiration in our international affairs. I would ask that this resolution be included in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

That February 16, 1977, marks the 59th Anniversary of the restoration of independence to the more than 700 year old Lithuanian States, which was restored by the blood sacrifices of the Lithuanian people during the wars of independence in 1919-1920, and recognized by the international community of States;

That the Republic of Lithuania was forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all the existing treaties and the principles of international law;

That so many countries under foreign colonial domination have been given the opportunity to establish their own independent states; while Lithuania is still exposed to the most brutal Russian oppression and is nothing but a colony of the Soviet empire;

That although the Soviet Union, through programs of resettlement of peoples, intensified russification, suppression of religious freedom and political persecutions, continues in its efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania, the Soviet invaders are unable to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for self-government and the exercise of their human rights.

Now, Therefore, be it resolved

That we demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, administrative apparatus and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves freely;

That we demand immediate release of all Lithuanians who are imprisoned for political

and religious reasons and who for years are lingering in various Soviet jails and concentration camps or kept in psychiatric wards;

That, meanwhile, we protest against the degradation of the Lithuanian people by the Soviet rulers in proclaiming that Lithuanians shall be grateful to the Soviet Union for their "liberation"; and that we further protest against subversion and corruption of the minds of the Lithuanian people by the preaching of lies about all kinds of human rights in occupied Lithuania which in fact do not exist.

That we are deeply grateful to the 94th Congress of the United States for passage of new Resolutions expressing the sense of the Congress relating to the status of the Baltic States.

That in expressing our gratitude to the United States Government for its firm position of non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania, we request an activation of the non-recognition principle by stressing at every opportunity in the United Nations and other international forums the denial of freedom and national independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic States.

That copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the United States Senators and Congressmen from our State, and to the news media.

CONTESTED ELECTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1977, I advised the Members of the House that seven election contests arising out of the 1976 congressional elections had been filed with the Committee on House Administration.

Again, on January 31, 1977, I advised the Members of the House that by unanimous consent of the Committee on House Administration the Elections Subcommittee was abolished; we then appointed seven ad hoc panels, each comprised of three members of the committee, to deal with each of the seven contested elections. At that time, I indicated that I would request the chairman of each ad hoc contested election panel and committee staff to proceed with the resolution of these contested election matters as expeditiously as possible.

Now, some 6 weeks later, I am pleased to advise the Members of the House that 5 of the 7 contested elections cases have been heard by their respective ad hoc election panels. By hearing these matters promptly consonant with fairness and due process, I would hope to save the House substantial sums of money by way of reducing attorneys' fees, which are provided for in the Contested Election Act (2 U.S.C. 381 et seq.).

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Members who served on or chaired the respective election panels. As the Members of the House well know, the U.S. Constitution provides the House of Representatives with plenary authority to "be the judges of elections, returns, and qualifications of its Members * * * ." (article I, section 5). The Committee on House Administration is executing its responsibility under the U.S. Constitution

and the Rules of the House by dealing with the largest number of serious contested election matters ever filed with the House in an expeditious fashion.

SLAUGHTER OF BABY SEALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, this will be very brief.

On March 15, off the coast of Canada this year, there will be, again, the so-called harvest of young harp seals, just being born on the ice floes as they drift south in the springtime. The Canadian Government has licensed the taking of some 70,000 baby seals this year. I believe this so-called taking of seals is witnessed because of television coverage and because of coverage in the newspapers, by millions of people throughout the world, as a result, there is growing shock and horror at this continued practice.

Aside from the fact that this killing I believe endangers the species there is the act of killing itself which is among the most brutal acts which mankind takes during the year against helpless, immature seals.

Mr. Speaker, I have written a letter which has been cosponsored by Members from both sides of the Capitol, to the Prime Minister of Canada asking him if he will use his good offices to intervene in the slaughter of these baby seals off the coast of Canada in behalf of his Government and in behalf of all mankind.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include a copy of this letter to the Prime Minister of Canada.

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

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1977.

His Excellency, Prime Minister of Canada
PIERRE TRUDEAU,
Ottawa, Canada.

DEAR MR. PRIME MINISTER: In your speech to the Joint Session of Congress on February 22, 1977, you stated that, "The friendship between our two countries is so basic that it has long since been regarded by others as the standard for enlightened international relations." We concur wholeheartedly and hope that the door of friendship and international relations will forever remain open.

In that same spirit the undersigned are writing you this letter to express concern about our planet and its present condition. The slaughter of hundreds of thousands of baby seals off the coast of Canada is about to take place.

We view this slaughter with the same concern we have for other such hunted species as the Asian tiger, the African rhinoceros, and the various species of whale. We recognize that there is a certain slight economic advantage to a few people in the continued harvest of such a species.

But the same might have been said for the buffalo that once wandered over our vast plains, and the passenger pigeon that once darkened our skies with its flocks—and is now gone, forever. The same economic struggle now goes on in California to save the giant redwoods that are left from timber harvest.

As we work to save these endangered species of life, we urge you to review your present policy regarding conservation of wildlife as part of our international concern for the preservation of the environment.

Sincerely yours,

Senators Spark M. Matsunaga, Harrison A. Williams, Jr.

Representatives Leo J. Ryan, Jonathan B. Bingham, David E. Bonior, William M. Brodhead, Bob Carr, Mickey Edwards, Henry J. Hyde, Jack F. Kemp, Paul N. McCloskey, George Miller, Daniel K. Akaka, John Breckinridge, Romano L. Mazzoli, Joseph G. Minish, Joe Moakley, Richard L. Ottinger, Claude Pepper, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Harold S. Sawyer, Morris K. Udall, Frank Horton, Edward W. Pattison, Jerry M. Patterson, Parren J. Mitchell, Jim Lloyd, Clair W. Burgener, Charles Wilson, Helen S. Meyner, Bruce F. Caputo, Joseph L. Fisher.

RHODESIAN CHROME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. KRUEGER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted with 249 of my colleagues to repeal the so-called Byrd amendment, which since 1971 has permitted the United States to import Rhodesian chrome ore, ferrochrome, and nickel in spite of United Nations sanctions to the contrary. When a similar measure came before the Congress last year, I voted against repealing the Byrd amendment. I believe, however, that there are some reasons for supporting repeal at this time.

Several reasons are usually given for denying the benefits of our trade to Rhodesia. First of all, the member nations of the United Nations, only the United States and South Africa have chosen officially to disregard the economic sanctions imposed upon Rhodesia by that body. Therefore, our position as a proponent of international law and order is eroded somewhat by our refusal to adhere to the international boycott of Rhodesian goods. Second, our continuing trade with Rhodesia in the face of the U.N. sanctions may be viewed by the lesser developed countries in general, and by African nations in particular, as an indication of our unwillingness to stand up for the principle of majority rule and human rights whenever our economic interests make it impractical to do so. This is a highly undesirable consequence at a time when we may be forced to rely increasingly on certain black African nations for vital commodities, as is possible with oil-rich Nigeria. Third, the United States should fashion its foreign relations posture in such a way as to maximize our long-term, rather than short-term supplies of commodities like chromium ore and ferrochrome; although a white minority government may be presently in control of Rhodesian natural resources, the long-range outlook for its survival is not optimistic, and it would do us well to cut off trade with Rhodesia now in order to curry favor—or at least not to incur disfavor—with Rhodesia's black majority and future rulers.

These are all good arguments for joining the United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia, but, in my mind at

least, the linchpin in the case against the Byrd amendment was only recently brought to my attention, and it eliminated the major reason for my vote against removing that amendment last year. Representatives of the specialty steel industry appeared before both Houses of Congress to testify that their industry was no longer dependent upon Rhodesia as a source of chromium ore, owing to the development of a new industrial process which could make use of lower grade chromium ore. This meant that ore could in the future be imported from several other countries which had better, if not wholly respectable, records on human rights.

I should also point out at this time the reason for singling Rhodesia out among nations as the object of economic sanctions. First, in no other country does such a small minority of the inhabitants deny the basic rights of a vast number of persons to determine their own form of government. Second, Rhodesia is a true bandit among nations in that no other country in the world has officially recognized her existence, and for the purposes of international law Rhodesia is still recognized as a protectorate of Great Britain. I will also point out that it was the protector-country, Great Britain, which requested that economic sanctions against Rhodesia be imposed.

Thus, a danger to American jobs and the welfare of an entire American industry no longer existed as a result of a boycott of Rhodesian chrome, and it made economic sense for the first time for the United States to join in the international sanctions. This may seem overly mercenary reasoning on my part, but, in fact, there are some nations which officially endorse the economic boycott of Rhodesia but which conduct clandestine trade with that nation. Therefore, adherence to the ban made sense only if our industries no longer depended on Rhodesian chrome, and if some effective precautions could be taken whereby American-made steel were not prejudiced in international markets by competition with specialty steel products made with Rhodesian chrome.

I am assured that there is no chance of such discrimination under the terms of H.R. 1746, and thus it makes sense for the United States to join in the international sanctions and to aid in their enforcement against other nations now trading clandestinely with Rhodesia. Although some proponents of the Byrd amendment claimed that passage of H.R. 1746 would make the United States reliant upon the Soviet Union for a strategic defense material, my investigations showed this contention to be false. Actually, the United States has enough chrome ore stockpiled today to last this Nation through several decades of war. In short, the economic and national defense arguments which previously underlay the Byrd amendment simply collapsed under the weight of technological innovation and national defense policy.

Even more important, however, is the fact that this year we have a new administration in the White House, one which is dedicated to the use of interna-

tional trade as a weapon for achieving basic human rights the world over. I highly approve of President Carter's admonitions to the Soviet Government regarding its treatment of dissidents, and hope that the legislation we pass today will serve as another effective instrument in our crusade for human freedom. What better place to concentrate our efforts than in Africa, where the yoke of colonialism and racial segregation are only now yielding to the goals of self-determination and personal rights, for which our own ancestors fought so hard a short 200 years ago? Repeal of the Byrd amendment is one simple, nonviolent step among many which this country can take to assist the African people in their quest for our mutual goals; I hope that all nations will cooperate to insure a nonviolent transition to majority rule in all the African nations not currently enjoying this right.

THE NATION MAGAZINE REPORTS TO THE NATION ON URUGUAY

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, as the author of the Koch amendment to the fiscal 1977 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, which ended U.S. military assistance to Uruguay, I was pleased to see a fine summary of some of the events that surrounded the effort to stop military aid to that country. As my colleagues will remember, Uruguay is the South American country located between Brazil and Argentina, which, until a few years ago, was a model democracy. Then, unhappily, the suppression of disorders in Uruguay led to the assumption of power by the Uruguayan military.

This military dictatorship—like so many others—could not tolerate even the vaguest hint of opposition and began to round up thousands of Uruguayans, ostensibly to restore order, but actually as a form of political intimidation and repression.

All those with political views, even those with moderate views, were forced to flee or be subject to arrest and probable torture by the military. Uruguay, whose population numbers 2.7 million, last year had the highest per capita population of political prisoners with nearly 5,000. Furthermore, 300,000 Uruguayans have left their native country to escape the rampant repression and torture that had been unleashed by the military government. Amnesty International and the International Commission of Jurists both issued reports last year documenting the abuses of human rights that had occurred in Uruguay, including 22 deaths under torture in the military prisons.

The current issue of *Nation* contains a description of the role of the U.S. State Department and our Ambassador in Uruguay. The article accuses the Ambassador of having taken the side of a brutal military regime, rather than objectively carrying out the will of his Government, as expressed in the congressional cutoff of military assistance for

the country to which he was assigned. In this case, I am not sure that the Ambassador can be held accountable for all the recalcitrance and dissimulation practiced by the U.S. State Department, as it attempted unsuccessfully to convince the Congress to reject my amendment cutting military aid. However, the article makes clear that our Ambassador was less than enthusiastic about the course of American policy.

I am appending a copy of the article:

SIRACUSA, OUR MAN IN URUGUAY

(By Max Holland and Kai Bird)

(President Carter's repeated assurance that a concern for human rights will color his relationships with other countries must, if that concern is to bear fruit, be reflected in the embassies the United States maintains abroad. As evidence that this is an urgent matter, the authors of the following piece review the career of Ernest Siracusa, a career foreign service officer, who is now our Ambassador to Uruguay.)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Since ambassadors serve at the pleasure of the President, it is customary, each time a new administration takes office, for all the heads of missions to send in form letters of resignation. That makes it easier for a new President to put his imprint on the foreign service. Ambassadorships are useful for paying political debts, but not all posts are suitable for that purpose: the Soviet Union, for example, is still regarded as no place for a political crony to practice diplomacy, and Afghanistan is simply not thought an ample reward for political favors.

Thus, the majority of ambassadorships remain in the hands of career foreign service officers. Even a career officer who has compiled a controversial record during his ambassadorial tours of duty is in little danger of being retired; the more likely recourse is quietly to transfer him. Such a transfer need not be regarded as a rebuff, because ambassadors rarely serve more than four years in a given country.

A case in point is the American Ambassador to Uruguay, Ernest Siracusa. A career officer for thirty years, Siracusa has been posted to Mexico, Honduras, Guatemala, Peru, Argentina and Italy. In 1969 he was appointed Ambassador to Bolivia, and after four years was transferred to Uruguay.

Siracusa is a classic example of that State Department malady known as "clientism," in which the career officer forgets which country he actually represents. He has served conspicuously as an "apologist" for the present regime in Uruguay. He caters to the sensitivities of Uruguayan officialdom at the expense of human rights. And he is still entrusted with carrying out American foreign policy there—even though that policy is officially changed.

Uruguay, once an island of tolerance and democracy in South America, has gradually become a complete military dictatorship. The situation began to deteriorate well before Siracusa arrived in December 1973, but it has become much worse during his tenure. The parliament remains closed; the constitution ignored. Newspapers and other media are censored, and a once-powerful trade union movement has been destroyed. All political activity is banned. The definition of "subversive" in Uruguay has been expanded to include any person who holds, or is alleged to hold, democratic or leftist opinions. Hundreds of these so-called "subversives" are imprisoned and subjected to psychological and physical torture. Almost 300,000 Uruguayans have voted with their feet against the dictatorship by emigrating during the past three years.

The first public indication of Siracusa's attitude toward human rights came on April 21, 1976 in *The Washington Post*. The story

said that on February 13, the Ambassador had written a confidential complaint to the State Department about a radio program broadcast by the Voice of America. One day earlier, VOA had carried a story out of Geneva about charges of human rights violations in Uruguay that had been made by the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ), an impartial group of about forty respected jurists who promote the rule of law and investigate the status of human rights in countries throughout the world.

The two-minute VOA broadcast was a summary of an ICJ report which found that massive arrests of political suspects had occurred; that many of these suspects had been tortured, some until they died; and that both press and church were censored.

Siracusa's letter, quoted by the *Post*, said the VOA story contained "exaggerations and distortions" of the Uruguayan situation, which "can only be injurious to our friends, to our relations and to our efforts to develop useful influence on the very situation commented upon." Specifically, the Ambassador complained that the word "massive"—used both in the ICJ report and the VOA story—"grossly exaggerated the situation." To say that few of those arrested survived was not true and "can only be considered" by the Uruguayan Government as a "calumny and a provocation." And the question of press freedom was "a relative one," Siracusa said, while the alleged church censorship was "a minor problem . . . worked out between the government and the [church] hierarchy."

At three places in his letter, Siracusa supported VOA's policy of broadcasting such news, but he said the story should have been handled with more discretion so as not to endanger his attempts to improve the human rights situation "to the extent that there are violations."

The director of the U.S. Information Agency—former Nixon speechwriter James Keogh—defended the accuracy of the VOA story in a reply to Siracusa's complaint. But Keogh did concede that the phrasing "showed insufficient appreciation for the sensitivities involved," and he assured Siracusa that future reports would be "subject to closer review and cross-checking prior to use."

This complaint marks the emergence of Siracusa as a public relations agent for a brutal regime. In the future he would excuse the Uruguayan Government's heavy-handedness by repeating the government's own alibi: "the continued threat of subversion" justifies the suppression.

Just one week after Siracusa chastised VOA for its story, Amnesty International embarked on an unprecedented campaign to draw international attention to torture and other violations of human rights in Uruguay. It was the first Amnesty campaign ever directed against a single government. The agency released the names of twenty-two persons who allegedly had died at the hands of torturers, and circulated a petition calling for an international investigation into the repression. Uruguay, Amnesty said, had the highest number of political prisoners per capita in the world—nearly 5,000 in a population of 2.7 million.

This campaign produced another campaign, this one inside the U.S. Congress. In the spring of 1976, Rep. Edward Koch (D.-N.Y.) introduced an amendment to the foreign aid appropriations bill to cut off all military aid (worth \$3 million) to Uruguay. Koch chose Uruguay, from among all the repressive regimes given aid by the United States, for two reasons: it was as repressive as Chile (whose aid had been cut off earlier), and it was of no real strategic importance to the United States. "Uruguay was a natural to illustrate, to make the point with other Latin American countries, that we were no longer going to sit back and support repression," Koch said later.

One month after Koch started his campaign, Rep. Andrew Maguire (D., N.J.) received a letter from Don Guerriero, the political/labor attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Montevideo. Guerriero is also one of the embassy officers who report on human rights to Siracusa. The attaché told his home-town Congressman that "much of what Congressman Koch said is untrue and the AI report is demonstrably false." As an example, Guerriero cited Koch's reference to thousands of political prisoners. "There may be a few political prisoners around here," Guerriero wrote, "but most people in jail here are in for crimes like murder, rape, bank robbery, kidnapping and the like." (But the State Department publicly recognizes there are at least 2,000 political prisoners in Uruguay.) Along with his letter, Guerriero included an article from a journal called *The Review of the River Plate*, explaining that it said what he wanted to say only "much better." The article called Amnesty International a "Communist front organization."

As Koch said when he later inserted Guerriero's letter into the *Congressional Record*: "Certainly the man is entitled to have and speak his opinions. . . . On the other hand, his line of argument is so close to that of the Uruguayan Government and is in such contradiction to the accepted facts that one must wonder how valid his judgments, as reflected in this letter are in his regular reports to the State Department."

The human rights reports sent to Washington by Siracusa and his staff were of the utmost help to Koch's campaign, for they led the State Department to defend the indefensible—the military regime in Montevideo. That effort turned into a fiasco last summer, when the International Organizations Subcommittee of the House International Relations Committee held two days of hearings on the status of human rights in Uruguay. The subcommittee chairman, Rep. Donald Fraser (D., Minn.), is the acknowledged Congressional expert on human rights. His subcommittee has held seventy-six separate hearings on a variety of countries during the past four years.

In contrast to the testimony offered by Amnesty International representatives and a Uruguayan Senator now in political exile, the State Department testimony seemed ludicrous. Fraser questioned Deputy Assistant Secretary of State Hewson Ryan about torture in Uruguay. Ryan replied that there had been "occasional" cases, but that steps had been taken to prevent it. "Do you believe it?" asked Fraser. "It is what the [Uruguayan] Government tells us," said Ryan. "We have no reason to doubt them at this moment. I cannot prove that they have not taken the steps." Ryan found his position so untenable that at one point he claimed U.S. military aid to Uruguay "is seen as a treaty-like obligation." No such treaty or treaty-like obligation exists, as Fraser was quick to point out.

Koch said of the hearings:

"I cannot determine where the fault lies: whether the U.S. Embassy in Uruguay is not providing all the facts to the State Department or whether the State Department is intentionally excluding information which is not supportive of its position. . . . I must say that the State Department is proficient at stopping just short of lying in its statements."

But if Koch did not know then how much fault lay with Siracusa's embassy, he soon found out. After the Koch amendment became law in September, Siracusa paid a visit to Koch in New York. Koch recalls: "When he came to my office, he took the position that much of what was said against Uruguay was false. He said that it was overstated. He didn't have evidence to prove that, but was basing it simply on his own observations."

Mere startling than Siracusa's defense of the Uruguayan regime was that he regarded

the aid cutoff as a personal rebuke. Koch said: "He was very upset. He was personally embarrassed that this had occurred. It made him look bad. . . . He had become so identified with Uruguay that it was a personal affront to him. That's the way he viewed it."

When Siracusa returned to Uruguay, the local press was as eager to find out about his meeting with Koch and Amnesty International officials. Would aid be resumed? Rather than represent the suspension of aid as U.S. Government policy, Siracusa took pains to remind the regime publicly that he had opposed the Koch amendment. He allied himself with the Uruguayan Government against the U.S. Congress. If there was at least a slim possibility that Koch's legislation might have induced the Uruguayan military to mend its ways, Siracusa's remarks only encouraged it to persevere in them.

On October 19, *El Dia* (Montevideo) quoted Siracusa as saying "The U.S. Embassy in Montevideo and the State Department did not support the cutoff of military aid to Uruguay. However, I still believe something can be arranged, but I will not venture an opinion on how long it will take. From here, I will do everything possible to resolve this problem."

The Ambassador's remarks caused him some anguish once they had filtered back to the United States. The Council on Hemispheric Affairs, which monitors U.S.-Latin American relations, issued a press release that characterized Siracusa as a "major apologist for one of the most dreary and brutalizing states in the region," and asked the incoming Carter administration to remove him.

In a series of cables to Washington, Siracusa said his remarks had been "embroidered or distorted" by Uruguayan reporters not present at the news conference. He said the subject of military aid was not even mentioned during the interview, and he implored the State Department to exonerate him by releasing the "true facts." But the department refused. Charles W. Robinson, the Deputy Secretary of State at that time, reportedly told Siracusa that an official response would only earn the accusations a prominence they had failed to get in the American press. All that Siracusa could do was attempt to rebut the charges to his superiors. In a final cable on the subject he wrote:

"As any review of this embassy's reporting would show, the embassy has done everything possible to give the department a fair, factual and unbiased picture of the human rights situation in Uruguay. While we have not agreed with many of the accusations made against Uruguay, especially regarding torture of prisoners and the number of prisoners, we had nonetheless frankly reported those practices which we considered inconsistent with accepted standards for humane treatment of prisoners. . . . We might add that, at the Ambassador's direction, the embassy has adopted a policy of the strictest possible compliance with both the letter and spirit of the Koch amendment."

Siracusa's unqualified defense of the embassy might lead one to wonder whether his position was misinterpreted or obscured by State Department bureaucracy. But a cable he sent on October 26, 1976 indicates that nothing of the sort occurred. In that message he hailed Uruguay's new "Law on the State of Dangerfulness" as demonstrating the military government's "growing consciousness with respect to human rights" and providing "greater due process of law for those only tending toward subversion, thus easing application of the stringent emergency security measures."

According to Amnesty International, however, the law places a facade of legality on the indefinite detention of thousands of citizens. It rescinds certain legal rights and incorporates practices of martial law into

the civilian legal system. Special civilian courts will be empowered to punish those "in or outside the country" who may subvert the efforts of the government to restore "national values." The new law penalizes those with an "inclination to commit crimes"; an individual who has committed no crime may be imprisoned for up to six years at hard labor.

The right of a convicted political prisoner to exile—previously a constitutional right—is revoked under the new law. Judges now have the power to refuse any request for exile. Political dissidents may have to live in a particular town, report regularly to the authorities and submit to official surveillance of their homes. Ambassador Siracusa did not mention these facts in his cable.

Siracusa's clientism and attitude toward human rights are all too common among American envoys. It poses a problem for a new President whose spoken commitment to human rights far exceeds campaign rhetoric. Because Siracusa is a visible symbol of a discredited policy, it will be relatively easy to pick up his resignation, especially since his tour of duty is nearly complete. The problem may only be where to post him next. Carter's difficult problem is how to find ambassadors who believe that an active concern for human rights is part of their job.

A THOUGHTFUL LETTER ON THE NATURAL GAS SITUATION

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH, Mr. Speaker, one of the most pressing tasks facing this Congress is the formulation, in cooperation with the new administration, of a comprehensive national energy policy.

With the thought that it will be of interest to my colleagues, I am inserting into the RECORD a letter I received concerning the recent natural gas shortage from Irwin M. Stelzer, president of National Economics Research Associates, Inc. It is a thoughtful discussion of the economics of natural gas by a person whom I consider to be very knowledgeable about the energy choices facing this country; and I believe it is worthy of every Member's consideration, regardless of one's conclusions to date on the subject.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL ECONOMIC RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 26, 1977
Congressman EDWARD I. KOCH,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR ED: With things getting active on the natural gas scene, I thought I might take the liberty of passing along a few thoughts.

With the near-record cold winter we are experiencing, and with horror tales of natural gas shortages dominating the headlines, I am sure you will be pressed to pass sundry emergency measures. These appear to be of two types—those aiming at short-term allocation of existing supplies, from "have" to "have not" regions, and those aimed at longer-term solutions. While efforts will undoubtedly be made to have deregulation of field prices passed as an emergency measure, it should be clear that—even if the premises of its sponsors are correct—such a move should be considered only in the context of long-term incentives to supply.

Let me attempt to sort out the various relevant topics.

The Shortage. This is principally a phenomenon stemming from two forces: an upward surge in gas value, and therefore de-

mand, vis-a-vis other fuels, contrasted with a running down of available gas supply. A combination of the greater concern for the environment, calling for more clean fuel, and the OPEC cartel raised the competitive value of gas many-fold, so that its regulated price, at the consumer level, was far below the new, three times higher price of other fuels. At the same time, the gas resource base, both proven reserves and potential, was being pulled down at a rapid rate. As other areas of the world became relatively much more promising for oil (and gas) exploration, oil company interest in U.S. exploration (and it is of course the oil companies which are the prime movers in the discovery field) turned down; it is reviving now, with current higher prices, but results of the stepped-up effort are disappointing. (Laggardly FPC field price regulation did not help during the dulling downturn.) It seems clear that a demand-supply balance can only be achieved by pricing gas so as to limit demand to those willing to pay current costs; and by encouraging supply from both the traditional sources of U.S. natural gas supply and the various supplemental sources which will be required to meet a demand even restricted to high value uses.

You will be interested in some findings reached in a study recently made on the New York outlook to illustrate the force of these conclusions.

First, even at the likely much higher prices, gas demand in the state will continue to grow, though very modestly.

Second, this growth can be met, even with the expected continued gradual slide in gas supply from traditional sources, by a vigorous program to attach supplemental supplies such as LNG, synthetic gas from petroleum products, gas from the Arctic, and, most important for the 1980s, gas from the Atlantic offshore.

Third, this demand is there (though of course somewhat lower) even though all gas were priced at the level of high-priced supplements—which the economist would say is the direction to go.

Fourth, if the demand is not met because governmental policy makes these supplements unavailable, the cost to the consumers of being forced to use higher-priced substitutes (even with likely higher gas prices) and the cost of conversion will be in the order of several hundred million dollars a year for New York consumers.

There seem to be a number of policy lessons in all this. First, to existing federal agencies (or their successors): stop impeding, as they do now, the bringing on of LNG and SNG supplies. The FPC has made an LNG application a practically "unwinnable" obstacle race, and you have to go to court, essentially, to have the FEA look with favor on new SNG plants (existing plants have saved New York's consumers this winter).

Second, to Interior: abandon the costly bonus bidding for federal leases and open up the competition to others than the few giants—and most important, for the near term, the next five years say, use their already substantial powers to expedite the development of Gulf Coast leases already granted. This is where the gas is.

A word as to these leases. During the 1960s, it took seven to ten years to bring a lease up to full production (in contrast to three for oil), often because of the complications of bringing the gas ashore. Now a network of mains is laid in the Gulf—but it still takes seven to eight years, apparently. Leases of the late 1960s and the 1970-1972 period where gas is already discovered are still awaiting development work, and their gas is not being used to ease the current pinch. The Gulf is dotted with "producibile shut-in" leases, to use Interior's jargon.

Sometimes the gas has not yet even been committed.

Please note: We do not say that these resources would cure the shortage in any permanent sense—they would not, for the fundamental problem I alluded to at the outset still remains. But it would enormously improve the shortrun outlook, and ameliorate the current crisis if development work were speeded. We cannot criticize the lease owners (who were forced to put up many millions for a lease by the bonus bidding system) for waiting for the best gas prices, as they leap upward; but the lease form requires expeditious development, and it is this requirement which Interior appears to have chosen to ignore.

So far I have addressed only supply problems. The FPC tackles demand by a complex series of curtailment (rationing) orders. How much more efficient if it and the state commissions made the same advances on the gas front that are being made in the electric rate area, toward marginal cost pricing—the only durable solution on the demand side.

What to conclude from this already overly long analysis. First, "crisis" bills, covering emergency gas-shifting powers for the FPC, should be approached cautiously. The pressure is to take from the "have" pipelines (in middle America) and give (or loan) to the "have-nots," generally east of the Mississippi (including New York). This may have an attractive sound, but beware of the effect on the long-term solution. What distributor (or pipeline) is going to make expensive investments in supplemental supplies if, as the FPC is already planning, they can be taken away because someone in Washington thinks someone else "needs it more"? The least to watch out for here is the need to restrict the powers to the current crisis and to provide that the compensation is on a full marginal cost basis. This will minimize the negative impact on incentives of such progressive companies as Brooklyn Union to invest in their own supplies.

Second, the cost to New York consumers of "new" gas deregulation bills which will be pressed on you will importantly depend on their definition of "new gas." If the definition of "new gas" is strict (as it was not in most of the 1976 bills) and we do not wake up and find ourselves paying new gas prices for already-discovered gas, the cost of improved gas supply in the state will be more tolerable. But if the definition is loose, consumers will pay unnecessary sums for already-discovered supplies. Furthermore, a careful distinction between offshore and onshore should be kept in mind: cost circumstances are different and gas from offshore must be committed to interstate sale, regardless of intrastate prices.

Sincerely,

IRWIN M. STELZER,
President.

THE PIPEDREAM OF ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I want to invite the attention of my colleagues to some statements made by an engineer concerning our energy dilemma. For that purpose, I am asking that his statements which were printed on the front page of February 24 Washington Star be printed following my remarks.

The engineer, Dr. John McKetta, specializes in the energy field and has served as an advisor to the Government many

times in dealing with energy problems. You will see his points are very clear: We cannot for the foreseeable future gain energy independence and we must develop every practical source to stave off catastrophic consequences. I cannot help but comment that it appears our official actions all seem to ignore his advice—for example, conservation is being touted as the complete solution, utilities are cutting back on plans to build more coal and nuclear plants, drilling for additional oil is being held up, and so forth. We must start taking actions which will add to our energy supplies from our own domestic sources.

In my statement of February 23, 1977, printed on page H1386 of the February 23 RECORD, I point out the confusion which is being injected in the planning of electrical utilities by the many statements being made by Government officials that we can take care of all of our problems by conservation. I certainly hope that this misconception is removed in the energy plan the administration has scheduled to release in April.

The interview of Dr. John McKetta from the February 24, 1977, Star follows:

HE ENDORSES USING EVERY ENERGY FORM

Dr. John J. McKetta, a University of Texas professor of chemical engineering, has served as chairman of the Interior Department's Advisory Committee on Energy and on a variety of other energy panels. He was interviewed by Washington Star Staff Writer Stephen M. Aug.

Question: Where would you say we are today in terms of energy independence?

McKetta: We are at the point of no return. There's no way in our lifetime and our children's lifetime that there's anything we could do in the United States to have energy self-sufficiency.

Q: So the old idea of energy independence by 1980 . . .

A: It's out. It's a pipe dream. It's a shuck.

Q: Why couldn't we be energy independent by, say, the turn of the century?

A: First of all, in order to continue a positive gross national product would mean that you are going to have to have an increase of energy of approximately 2 or 3 percent a year. And this will continue between now and the year 2000. From the supply standpoint there is nothing you can do today that would bring you more energy by the next seven or eight years. You can't open enough coal mines or increase the transportation and so forth in the next five or seven or eight years. In the United States it takes about 10 or 11 years to build a nuclear plant. You've got to find four more Alaskas. You've got to triple the amount of coal, you've got to build a new reactor each week—a new nuclear reactor—starting today. You've got to get approximately a million to 2 million barrels of oil from shale by the year 2000. All these things together you've got to do in order to have self-sufficiency by the year 2000 or 2010.

Q: Would you put more emphasis on developing coal miners or building nuclear plants or perhaps solar energy which takes no fuel to run?

A: Right now I'd put effort in every direction. First of all I would start a very strong program into tripling the amount of coal in the next 15 years. This evening I would start opening up trying to have as many nuclear plants started as we could get. I would try to encourage people to find more oil and gas opening up the outer continental shelf and free the people from the shackles.

Right now as you know the new outer continental shelf bill is going to hold back the producing companies up until 1987 before you really develop the fields. This is really senseless. It sounds like Soviet Russia is making the rules for us rather than our own people. I would remove those shackles and go out in the outer continental shelf and start bringing in oil next year. It can be done. The reason I say oil and gas is because the present dependence is about 80 percent on oil and gas. If you and I increase this only 10 percent that helps us as much as doubling the amount of coal. But we've got to do all this at one time.

Q: The coal industry advertises that there's enough coal to last 500 years. If more of our energy demand was to come from coal how long would the coal last?

A: If coal were to supply all the energy that oil and gas is supplying today it would only last 100 years. But on the other hand you have vast amounts of shale as well as shale oil and coal and lignite. What we're looking for is by the year 2010 we will be receiving possibly 8 to 10 percent of our energy from solar and maybe by 2020 this may increase to 25 percent. By the year 2030 we will be in the fusion energy era where we will be making energy from deuterium in the sea water. These are inexhaustible sources. You and I want to do something over the next 30 years. In the meantime we've got to be frugal. We're going to have to make many sacrifices and we ought to have voluntary sacrifices right now to try not only to conserve but to do without the luxurious use of energies.

Q: Would you just go ahead and build nuclear plants and not worry about how to dispose of the waste products?

A: Well, there are two things we want to look at. First, the nuclear reactive waste is dangerous. Radiation is dangerous. But remember gasoline is extremely dangerous. You and I keep it in our cars every night; 10, 15 or 20 gallons in our car each night of this highly dangerous gasoline. Automobile driving is dangerous. So there are dangers in every area. But reasonable people will take moderate risks if the benefits are great, or they'll take small risks if the benefits are moderate or they won't take any risks if the benefits are small. Fortunately there have been no accidents in the nuclear field. There have been no deaths in any nuclear reactor, power reactor facility, no over-radiation cases, and remember we've been in business for over 20 years. So from the standpoint of accidents I think that we've learned how to handle plants and so forth.

Q: Is one way to encourage frugality to simply make energy so expensive that people can no longer afford to use it?

A: I don't think that you should intentionally make energy more expensive. I think that what happens is that you have to encourage people to go out and look for energies. And one way that you are going to encourage them is by making sure that they get a good return on their investment. And if they don't, then they aren't going to look. You understand that in 1954 we had as high as 38,000 independent drillers for oil and gas. In 1974 we had less than 3,800. The people left the business because the risks were too great for the return of their money. Now we're back up to about 10,000 people in the business. And the risks are still great. But the return is a little better. And a lot of it on the basis that we do have intrastate gas whose price is maybe as high as \$1.75 or \$2.

CHRISTOPHER BACUS, WINNER OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS "VOICE OF DEMOCRACY" CONTEST

(Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure today for me to tell my colleagues about the achievements of Christopher Bacus, winner of the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy" contest in the State of Illinois.

Chris is from East Alton, Ill., and he lives in my congressional district. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Jack Bacus, and is one of the student leaders of Roxana, Ill., Community High School, having held such offices as President of his National Honor Society chapter and parliamentarian of the student council.

For his effort as 1 of 50 State first-place winners out of more than 500,000 entrants from throughout the country, Chris has won an all-expense-paid trip here to Washington. It is a well-deserved reward.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD the text of Chris' winning speech, on the topic of "What America Means to Me":

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

"Breathes there the man with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said
This is my own, my native land!
... The wretch ... will go down
to vile dust from which he sprang,
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung."

In this excerpt from a poem by Sir Walter Scott, the man without a soul is described as the man without love for his country. Unfortunately, this man seems to abound today in our selfish society, but still there are those who are not afraid to stand up for our country. As for me, I am proud to say that I am an American, and that this is my native land. You ask me, "What America means to me?" This question is very difficult to answer. Not because America means nothing to me, but because the emotion this land of ours arouses in me escapes description. Why ask me? Ask the land itself.

First, ask the mighty Mississippi River. Ask it of the Force with which it moves thousands upon thousands of tons of water without effort. Ask it of the Power which allows nothing to stand in its way. Ask the River, and it will tell you that this is the Force of America. This Force causes Americans to defeat obstacles with ease. This Force moves our country forward, without hesitation, but with cautious confidence. It is this Power which will not allow our country to be second best, but which makes it the leader of the world. And it is this Force which made this nation grow from a settlement, to several colonies, to a few states, and, finally, to the great nation it is today. Ask the mighty Mississippi of the Force of America.

Then, ask the great Redwood tree. Ask it of the Spirit which caused it to strain from its seed through the firm soil and force itself upward to the sky. Ask it of the Spirit with which it stretches its limbs outward to God. Ask the Redwood, and it will tell you that this is the Spirit of America. It is this Spirit which urged the pioneers to set out toward the West in covered wagons, against all odds, and it is this Spirit which urged us to send the first man to the Moon; an American. It is this Spirit which drives men to the battlefield to give their lives if necessary. And it is this Spirit which encourages a poor farm boy to become the President of the United States. Ask the great Redwood of the Spirit of America.

Finally, ask the wide, spacious sky. Ask it of the Freedom with which an eagle soars through the clouds. Ask it of the Freedom it gives to a man at the sight of a golden sun-

set or the silvery stars. Ask the sky, and it will tell you that this is the Freedom of America, the Freedom for which men have died. It is this Freedom which allows us to say what we feel, to act as we see fit, and to worship as we wish. This Freedom causes excitement at election time because we know the People will speak through their Freedom. It is this Freedom which makes us proud to see the Star-Spangled Banner fly freely. And it is this Freedom which makes the United States the envy of the world. Ask the sky of the Freedom of America.

What does America mean to me? America means a Force, a Spirit, and a Freedom. In other words, America is life, for what is life without a force to give us strength? What is life without a spirit to encourage us? And what is life without a freedom to make us independent? Yes, to me, America is life. I now challenge you to move this Force along, to keep this Spirit alive, and to forward this Freedom, because our lives without America's attributes would not be life, but only existence. I agree with one of our early patriots, Daniel Webster, who said, "Thank God! I—I also—an American!"

ACTION TAKEN TO IMPROVE EDUCATION OF U.S. CONSULAR OFFICIALS

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today there are approximately 2.3 million Americans traveling or residing abroad for commercial, educational and official reasons; a vast increase over the number 10 years ago. There are an ever-increasing number of foreigners requesting visas to travel in the U.S. and a seemingly endless number of foreigners desiring to immigrate to the United States. In addition, our citizens living abroad find themselves facing changing and often complex legal and political situations which affect their well being. All of these factors have created increasing demands upon our embassies and consulates abroad. These increased demands fall on the Department of State and its consular officers.

The depth of consular officers' knowledge and experience is a matter of considerable concern to the Department of State, as is the question of better service. Recently the Department inaugurated a new training program for consular officers under the rubric of "The Consulate General Rosslyn" at the Foreign Service Institute.

This novel facility, patterned after an overseas post in its layout and operation, is being used to provide beginning consular officers with as much practical experience in consular work as possible under realistic conditions. Role-play interviews, actual case work, and critiques from experienced officers provide an opportunity for trainees to utilize basic knowledge gained through self-study throughout the program. In this simulated American consulate, officers actually issue passports, visit prisoners, and refuse visas, as they will once they are abroad. Unlike earlier programs primarily based on lecture formats, Consulate General Rosslyn promises to graduate better qualified and capable consular officers for the Department of State.

At this time when we are all concerned about the welfare of our citizens abroad, I believe it important to point out this initiative of the Department of State to give, through improved training, the best, most efficient service to our citizens and support to American interests.

SECRETARY OF STATE REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON U.S. PRISONERS IN MEXICO

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on March 4, 1977, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance submitted to Congress a periodic report on progress toward achieving full respect for the human and legal rights of U.S. citizens detained in Mexico. The report makes note of some progress, including a treaty to allow an exchange of prisoners between our two countries, but details continuing problems relating to the physical abuse of our citizens at the time of arrest, failure to promptly notify our Government of an arrest, and failure to respond to our diplomatic notes protesting certain cases.

Because of the great concern in Congress about this issue, I wish to bring the full text of the Secretary's report to the attention of the House:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1977.

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL,
Speaker House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In accordance with Section 408(b)(2) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976 (P. L. 94-329), I am writing to report on the progress which has been made toward achieving full respect for the human and legal rights of United States citizens detained in Mexico.

In the last report, submitted to you by my predecessor on November 10, 1976, it was reported that the problem of obtaining full respect for the human and legal rights, under Mexican law, of all United States citizens detained in that country had not been solved and that the Department was not fully satisfied with the progress that had been made at that time toward its solution.

During hearings before the House International Relations Committee from July, 1975 through January, 1976, the Department reported on its findings in some 475 cases of United States citizens who were detained in Mexico as of July 1, 1975. The Department indicated during those hearings that prisoners' allegations of physical abuse and denial of human and legal rights were substantiated in a disturbing number of cases in which U.S. citizens are not receiving the full rights guaranteed to them under Mexican law.

During the period from July 1, 1975 through January 15, 1977, over 1500 Americans were arrested in Mexico. A vast majority of that number were involved in minor offenses and the arrestees were released after only one or two days in jail and/or the payment of a fine. During this period, there were 58 cases of substantiated physical abuse at the time of arrest. In another 47 cases the evidence was not sufficient to reach a clear conclusion. There were also 17 cases wherein Americans were subjected to unscrupulous financial practices by attorneys who extracted large fees from the prisoner and/or his family for services which they then failed

to provide and another 61 cases where the evidence of malpractice was not sufficient to reach a conclusion. In cases of substantiated abuse the Embassy at Mexico City and our consular posts throughout Mexico have made and continue to make protests to the Mexican authorities at both the local and federal levels. I should point out, however, that protests have not been made in those cases where the arrested American citizens specifically requested that no protest be made. The protests are normally made both orally and in writing to the appropriate local officials. In many instances, the cases are documented by constituent posts and forwarded to the Embassy at Mexico City so that protests can be lodged with the Mexican Foreign Ministry. In such cases, the Embassy sends a formal note of protest to the Ministry with a copy to the Mexican Attorney General. These notes include a description of the case, a sworn statement by both the prisoner and the consular officer where appropriate, and a request that a full investigation be made into the allegation of abuse. To date, the Embassy has not received satisfactory replies to the vast majority of such notes.

While it is true that the total number of cases of substantiated abuse represents a small percentage of the total number of arrests, we cannot be complacent. As was noted in our previous report, as long as one American citizen is not being accorded his human and legal rights under Mexican law, we will not be satisfied.

Timely notification to our consular officers of the arrest of an American in Mexico and subsequent early access to the arrestee continue to be major problems, which we have discussed repeatedly with officials of the Mexican Government at the highest levels. We have stressed in these discussions the importance the United States Government places on obtaining early notification of an arrest and subsequent prompt access to the detainee in accordance with the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations to which both of our countries are signatories. While we have succeeded in convincing the Mexican Federal Government of our position, practical results on the local level remain spotty and uneven. During the last eighteen months, there were some 269 cases where we did not consider notification of an arrest by police authorities as adequate.

In many cases the initial information on the arrest case came from outside sources such as friends or relatives rather than from local authorities. Once notification has been received, however, the gaining of consular access to the arrested American is usually no longer a problem. Conditions of communication and/or transportation, however, can be an obstacle, particularly in the many cases where the arrest takes place several hundred miles from the nearest consular office. In these instances initial contact with the arrested citizen is made by telephone and a consular officer visits as soon thereafter as practical.

In our last report, the Department also noted that the Mexican Government was understood to be in the process of revising its law to extend parole to drug offenders on the same basis as other convicts. The parole bill, however, was not reported out of committee prior to the adjournment of the Mexican Congress on December 31. We understand that the parole legislation may be reconsidered when the Mexican Congress reconvenes in September.

On the more positive side, the United States and Mexico have concluded successful negotiations on a treaty which will permit a national of the United States or Mexico convicted of a crime in the other country to serve his sentence in a penal facility located in his own country. The Treaty on the Execution of Penal Sentences was formally signed

in Mexico City on November 25, 1976 and ratified by the Mexican Senate on December 31, 1976. The Treaty was transmitted to the United States Senate for its advice and consent to ratification on February 15. Implementing legislation which is currently being drafted by the Department of Justice must also be enacted before the Treaty can go into force. We are hopeful that, when ratified, the Treaty will help to alleviate the long range problem of large numbers of Americans serving extended sentences in Mexico.

During the period covered by this report a new Mexican administration has assumed office and we have discussed the problem with newly installed officials. President Lopez Portillo is, of course, aware of the problem and, as you know, alluded to it in his address to the House of Representatives during his recent State Visit to Washington. We are hopeful that our continuing discussion of the plight of U.S. citizens arrested in Mexico with the new Mexican Government officials will lead to rapid improvement.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE.

THE DOUBLE STANDARD OF ENERGY PRODUCTION

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Washington Post attracted my attention, and, I might add, my agreement. I would like to recommend it as sound reading material to my colleagues who exhibit what the Post editors refer to as "the Atlantic state of mind."

The editorial characterizes "the Atlantic state of mind," which we often see in this area and points North and East, as:

... an attitude that vehemently opposes offshore drilling, or the construction of new refineries, or the development of oil ports. It is also an attitude that bitterly resents rising fuel costs and utility bills. This attitude concedes that the disruptive and sometimes dirty process of producing and refining oil is necessary, but it wants it to take place somewhere else. At the same time, it does not see why the northeastern states should pay more for their fuel than, say the Southwest.

Mr. Speaker, we have all seen this double standard attitude expressed. As a representative of an oil and natural gas producing State, I can assure our colleagues, the people of Louisiana resent this hypocrisy. While the environmental "guerrilla warfare," which has dragged out opportunities for exploration and development of oil and gas deposits along the Atlantic coast continues, our consumers are subsidizing the importation of oil into the Northeast.

Our people are as concerned about the environment of our coastline as the people of the Atlantic seaboard are about theirs. We have not deliberately plundered and ruined our beautiful bayous and rich marshlands in the wild pursuit of oil and natural gas. We have been careful to conserve and protect our abundant natural inheritance. We have learned that producing the energy our country needs and protecting the environment are compatible. We can have both, if we are willing to try. But the un-

realistic and selfish attitude of "give us your oil, but keep your refineries" can only lead to more shortages and national divisiveness.

I hope that this editorial will signal a new awakening of reasonable attitudes about offshore drilling and refining in the Northeast. I am only sorry it has taken so long.

I include the full text of "Oil Wells and Beaches," from the Washington Post following my remarks:

OIL WELLS AND BEACHES

The guerrilla warfare over energy and the environment goes on and on—expensively, wastefully and, worst of all, inconclusively. It's being fought mostly through the tangled jungles of the regulatory agencies and various court systems. Now a federal judge in New York has delivered an opinion that holds up indefinitely any oil and gas drilling operations off the East Coast. The environmental planning was, in the judge's view, inadequate under the standards of the Natural Environmental Policy Act.

By itself, this delay in offshore drilling will probably turn out to be less than crucial. Mother Nature has lately been offering broad hints that the Atlantic Coast is not going to be sufficiently rich in oil and gas to change significantly the dimensions of the national shortage. For one thing, the Canadians have been doing a lot of drilling in their segment of the continental shelf, to the north, and the results have been disappointing so far. The more distressing thing about the court's decision is this further demonstration that the country still isn't coming to terms with the limits on its oil and gas resources.

A certain set of attitudes has emerged that can be called the Atlantic state of mind. It is characteristically American, and widespread, but it is most explicit in the region that runs from Washington to the north and east. It is an attitude that vehemently opposes offshore drilling, or the construction of new refineries, or the development of oil ports. But it is also an attitude that bitterly resents rising fuel costs and utility bills. This attitude concedes that the disruptive and sometimes dirty process of producing and refining oil is necessary, but wants it to take place somewhere else. At the same time, it does not see why the northeastern states should pay any more for their fuel than, say, the Southwest.

The rest of the country is now, in fact, subsidizing the imports of home heating oil into this country—most of it into the Atlantic states. It isn't a government subsidy; it's paid by one consumer to another through the refiners and distributors, to equalize fuel costs nationwide. It's permissible as a temporary measure in a very cold winter. But the sections of the country that produce and refine oil have a right to ask how much they are to pay, and for how long, while the fight over environmental standards goes on in the Atlantic states.

The offshore leasing decision was "a stinging victory for our 1,000 miles of shoreline," declared John V. N. Klein, Suffolk County (N.Y.) Executive. ". . . It is obvious that the 'inevitability' of offshore drilling may not be as 'inevitable' as some have suggested." Quite true. But there are choices to be made here. Somewhere, some time, this country is going to have to work out a reliable and rational way of reconciling the benefits of stable fuel prices with the different but even more important benefits of environmental protection. Perhaps it is reasonable for the Atlantic states to demand a higher standard of protection for their coasts and beaches than those now in effect for the Gulf Coast and California, where drilling has been go-

ing on for years. But is it fair for the Atlantic states, at the same time, to ask the rest of the country to help pay the high costs of its imported heating oil?

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO EXEMPT CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL AIRCRAFT FROM THE AIRCRAFT USE TAX

(Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain agricultural aircraft from the aircraft use tax and to provide for the refund of the gasoline tax to the agricultural aircraft operator.

The law recognized an exemption for gasoline used on a farm for farming purposes, but the method of collection of the taxes and ruling by the Internal Revenue Service have caused agricultural aircraft operators to pay the entire tax with only a small amount of it being refunded to individual farmers.

The Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970, Public Law 91-259, imposes a yearly excise tax of 2 cents a pound on gross weight over 2,500 pounds and a total fuel tax of 7 cents a gallon on aviation fuel. The average taxable weight per aircraft is 1,500 pounds. On 8,000 aircraft, that is a total of \$240,000.

In 1975, agricultural aviators flew over 2,000,000 hours, treating, seeding, and fertilizing more than 250,000,000 acres. Over 65 million gallons of aviation fuel is used for agricultural purposes each year. Fuel tax at 7 cents a gallon on 65 million gallons total \$4.5 million and the total tax burden on the agricultural aviation industries is \$4,740,000.

This "user" tax is placed into a trust fund for development, research, and improvement of public airports. The trust fund currently has an excess of over \$2 million and it is projected that the trust fund could have a surplus of \$3.6 million by 1980.

Figures developed by the Cost Allocation Study Group of the Department of Transportation during the preparation of working paper No. 5, "Measures of Use," show agricultural aircraft use the Federal system less than one-half of 1 percent of the time.

Basically, the bill that I have introduced today provides that no tax shall be imposed on the use of any aircraft by a person who holds a certificate as an agricultural aircraft operator, if such aircraft is equipped for farming operation.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of this legislation will relieve the heavy tax burden now imposed on aircraft operators who conduct agricultural activities. I urge the support of this bill by the House.

A WAY TO PREVENT THE SACCHARIN BAN

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this

point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, so that we can prevent the kind of senseless action represented by the plan of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to ban saccharin.

The current law requires FDA to refuse a safety rating for any food additive that has been tested and, in the words of the law, "is found to induce cancer in man or animal."

This is an unreasonable requirement, because it says nothing about the dosage of the additive to be consumed or the kind of test to be conducted.

You could induce cancer in just about any animal if you force-fed it a sufficient quantity of almost any additive—just as you could burn a hole in a car radiator by filling it with a full-strength portion of some antifreeze or antirust additive, which in its proper proportion would only constitute one part per thousand of the total solution.

In the Canadian Government's saccharin test on rats, the animals were given a daily dosage of the sugar substitute that a human being would only get by drinking 1,250 cans of diet soda every day.

That dosage of salt, pepper, Tabasco—just about anything—would also probably cause cancer. And if tested in the same way as the Canadian saccharin test on rats, these foodstuffs would also be banned by FDA under a strict interpretation of the current law.

Obviously no thought has been given to the enormous suffering that this saccharin ban will impose upon millions of Americans with heart ailments, weight problems, diabetes, and other health problems. What is the trade-off here? We prevent cancer for people who drink 1,250 cans of diet soda a day. But we cause tens of thousands of other possible deaths by banning a sugar substitute that many people must use for life itself. This is absolute stupidity.

The bill I am introducing today will hopefully provide a reasonable solution. It proposes a change in the current law to require that no food additive will be declared unsafe by the Federal Government, unless tests have proved the additive to be cancer-causing when consumed in normal quantities.

GAS INDUSTRY PROVING NEED FOR REGULATIONS

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following editorial from the Tennessean:

GAS INDUSTRY PROVING NEED FOR REGULATIONS

The actions of Tenneco Inc. in diverting natural gas from interstate delivery to the higher-priced intrastate market is an example of how the monopolistic fuel industry is able to manipulate supplies to American consumers to increase its profits.

Tenneco has long contracted to sell natural gas to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co., which supplies Nashville Gas Co. and most other areas of Tennessee. Gas sold in this manner moves between states and the price of it is regulated by the Federal Power Commission. The maximum price ceiling on this gas is currently \$1.44 per thousand cubic feet.

Tenneco admitted to the Securities and Exchange Commission last week that as far back as 1965 it had been diverting gas pledged to Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co. into the intrastate market, where rates are currently as high as \$2.25 per thousand cubic feet.

Tenneco said it did this by selling gas intended for Tennessee Gas Pipeline to one of Tenneco's own subsidiaries, Channel Industries Gas Co., of Texas.

The subsidiary is aptly named, because since 1965 Tenneco has used it to channel 350 billion cubic feet of gas into the unregulated intrastate market, according to a preliminary investigation by a House subcommittee. An FPC spokesman said Tenneco had been selling approximately 30 million cubic feet of gas a day to Channel.

The gas and oil industry frequently complains that it should not be called a monopoly. But what can you call it when a major gas company, free from the pressures of any genuine competition, is able to set up a subsidiary through which it can escape federal regulation, ignore binding agreements, and sell its gas for the highest price it can get.

When an industry is so powerful and so sure of its market that it can withhold its product from a large body of consumers during an emergency to profit by selling it to another group of consumers, it deserves to be called a monopoly.

One thing is clear: The FPC has not been doing its job when a major gas company, over a period of 12 years, can set up a subsidiary through which it can escape price regulation and sell its gas to whoever is able to pay the highest price for it.

Tenneco maintains its transactions "had nothing to do with the current shortage nor with the recent contention that companies were withholding from the interstate market."

However, it is doubtful if the public would ever have known about Tenneco's diversions if the fuel crisis had not developed. And Nashville consumers, at least, will disagree that the transactions "had nothing to do" with the so-called shortage.

At the height of the crisis—when Metro schools and some businesses were shut down and homes were threatened with interruption of supply—the FPC authorized Tennessee Gas Pipeline to buy some 32 million cubic feet of gas per day from Channel Industries at "emergency" unregulated prices up to 60% greater than the regulated prices.

It is not known how much this has cost Tennessee gas consumers. But the consumers should be concerned about it and perhaps should consider trying to recover any overcharges they may have suffered.

The Tenneco practices are one more reason why Congress should move to reverse the concentration of fuel reserves into fewer hands.

In view of the industry's tendency to use whatever means available to increase profits, it is absurd for the government to be thinking about deregulating the price of natural gas. It is clear that what is needed is more regulation, not less, and stricter enforcement of the regulations.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FRANCHISING TERMINATION PRACTICES REFORM ACT

(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, today 29 of our colleagues have joined me in introducing the Franchising Termination Practices Reform Act. This bill is intended to correct inequities in certain franchise practices, to provide franchisors and franchisees with protection from unfair practices, and to provide consumers with the benefits which accrue from competition and a free market economy.

The bill is similar to one which I introduced last year and which eventually attracted over 110 cosponsors. The widespread support for last year's bill indicated the need for legislation to equalize the relationship between franchisors and franchisees. I am also very appreciative of the suggestions which last year's cosponsors have offered on ways to improve the bill.

The new bill retains the most significant provisions included in the version introduced in the 94th Congress. As in last year's bill, franchisors must give notice to franchisees of decisions to cancel or terminate the arrangement except in certain carefully prescribed situations; franchisors must have good cause for canceling or terminating a franchisee; and Federal courts may grant legal and equitable relief to remedy the effects of prohibited conduct under the act. The bill also encourages the arbitration of disputes, a process which is quite often quicker and far less expensive than court litigation.

However, the bill also contains some important changes which I think represent significant improvements. Because it is often difficult to agree upon new terms after the conclusion of a franchise arrangement, the bill permits franchisees to sell their interest in the franchise to a new franchisee subject to the approval of the franchisor. Should the franchisor fail to approve the sale, reasonable compensation must be paid the franchisee. This provision recognizes that a successful franchise operation depends upon the individual operating the franchise as well as the corporate efforts of the franchisor.

Finally, the bill includes an important new protection for franchisees. Upon passage of this bill, franchisors will be required to treat all their franchisees equally unless there are substantial geographic differences between the franchisees justifying different treatment.

Last Congress, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Consumer Protection and Finance held 3 days of hearings on the matter of franchisees. During that hearing, it became clear that the value of the franchising form of business was becoming more important in American commercial life. However, it was also clear that too often franchisors took advantage of superior bargaining power to force franchisees to accept arbitrary and unfair treatment. Of course, immediate termination is a powerful tool to insure compliance.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will not correct all the abuses in the franchise system. Nor will it put franchisees in a dominant position vis-a-vis franchisors. It is simply designed to put both partners in the eco-

nomical relationship on a more equal footing. It is intended to provide both franchisors and franchisees with evenhanded protection from unfair and unjustifiable practices.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SIMON, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. ROYBAL in including the text of the Franchising Termination Practices Reform Act in the RECORD:

H.R. 5016

A bill to correct inequities in certain franchise practices, to provide franchisors and franchisees with evenhanded protection from unfair practices, to provide consumers with the benefits which accrue from a competitive and open market economy, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Franchising Termination Practices Reform Act".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) A substantial amount of useful business activity in and affecting interstate commerce is today carried on and conducted under franchise agreements or relationships between franchisors and franchisees.

(2) Such agreements and relationships benefit the economy, enhance commerce, and promote competition by providing a means for combining centralized planning, direction, and standard-setting by the franchisor with local decisionmaking, initiative, and capital formation by the franchisee in a way which appears to be at least as effective as commercial arrangements based on principal and agent relationships.

(3) Because the franchise relationship in its present form is a relatively new one, existing law has not evolved sufficiently to protect adequately the parties to the franchise relationship and to insure against overreaching, unjust enrichment, and unjustifiable termination. Traditional antitrust, agency, and contract law doctrines fail to provide sufficient remedies for conduct that should, in this context, be characterized as wrongdoing.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act to provide certain remedies to franchisors and franchisees to assure fair dealing, to protect franchisees from inequitable practices, and to guarantee to consumers the greater benefits which would flow from more equitable franchise agreements and relationships.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act:

(1) The term "antitrust laws" includes—
(A) the Sherman Act (15 U.S.C. 1 et seq.);
(B) the Clayton Act (15 U.S.C. 12 et seq.);
(C) the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41, et seq.);

(D) sections 73 and 74 of the Wilson Tariff Act (15 U.S.C. 8 and 9); and

(E) the Act of June 19, 1936, chapter 592 (15 U.S.C. 13, 13a, 13b, and 21A).

(2) (A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term "franchise" means any commercial relationship which affects commerce and which is created by agreement, contract, lease, or other understanding, whether written or oral, express or implied, in which—

(1) a person (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "franchisor") grants to another person (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "franchisee") the right to, or permits such person to, offer, sell, or distribute—

(I) goods or commodities manufactured, processed, or distributed by such franchisor; or

(II) services established, organized, or directed by such franchisor;

(11) (I) the franchisor represents that it will lend more than nominal assistance to the franchisee in the franchisee's organization, promotional activities, management, marketing plan, method of operation, or other business affairs; or

(II) the operation of the franchisee's business is substantially associated with the franchisor's trademark, service mark, trade name, or other identifying symbol or name owned or controlled by the franchisor; and

(III) not less than \$25,000 in annual gross revenues of the goods, commodities, or services sold by the franchisee each year is derived from the franchise business.

Such term includes any franchise described in the preceding sentence under which a franchisee is granted the right, or is permitted, to offer, sell, or negotiate the sale of such franchises in the name of or on behalf of the franchisor.

(B) The term "franchise" does not include any commercial relationship under which a person is granted the right or is permitted to offer, sell, or distribute, on a commission or consignment basis, goods or commodities manufactured, processed, or distributed by another person and bearing the trademark, service mark, trade name, or other identifying symbol or name owned or controlled by such other person.

(3) The term "good cause", when used with respect to the cancellation of, termination of, or failure to renew a franchise, means—

(A) continued failure by the franchisee, without reasonable excuse or justification, to comply substantially with an essential and reasonable requirement imposed by the franchisor under the terms of the franchise; or

(B) continued bad-faith conduct or unjustified and unreasonable failure to act by the franchisee with respect to the carrying out of the terms of such franchise.

(4) The term "marketing area withdrawal" means the cancellation of, termination of, or failure to renew a franchise by a franchisor for the purpose of enabling such franchisor to withdraw from the business of granting, organizing, supplying, or directing franchises within a particular marketing area of the United States—

(A) which is not a violation of the anti-trust laws;

(B) with respect to which such franchisor does not sell or provide, directly or indirectly, in such marketing area the same goods and services covered by such franchise during the five-year period beginning on the date of such cancellation, termination, or failure to renew; and

(C) with respect to which such franchisor pays the franchisee involved reasonable compensation for the value of such franchisee's business, including goodwill, or, if agreed to by such franchisee, provides for the replacement of the franchise with a new franchise of equivalent value.

(5) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, or transportation—

(A) between a place in a State and any place outside thereof, or

(B) which affects trade, traffic, commerce, or transportation described in subparagraph (A).

(6) The term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

NOTICE TO FRANCHISEES

SEC. 4. (a) (1) Except as provided in subsection (b), no franchisor may cancel, fail to renew, or otherwise terminate a franchise unless such franchisor furnishes prior notification in accordance with paragraph (2) to the franchisee affected.

(2) The notification required under paragraph (1) shall be in writing and shall be sent to the franchisee by certified mail not less than ninety days before the date on which such franchise will be canceled, not renewed, or otherwise terminated. Such notification shall contain a statement of intention to cancel, not renew, or otherwise terminate, together with the reasons therefor, the date on which such action shall take effect, and a statement of the remedy or remedies available to such franchisee under this Act, including a summary of the applicable provisions of this Act.

(b) A franchisor may cancel, fail to renew, or otherwise terminate a franchise without furnishing the notification required under subsection (a)—

(1) in order to protect against an imminent danger to public health or safety caused by the franchisee;

(2) in the event of insolvency or bankruptcy of the franchisee; or

(3) in the event of voluntary abandonment by the franchisee of the franchise business.

TERMINATION OF FRANCHISES

SEC. 5. No franchisor may cancel, fail to renew, or otherwise terminate a franchise unless—

(1) the franchisor is effecting a marketing area withdrawal; or

(2) the franchisor has good cause for such cancellation, failure to renew, or termination and, in any case in which prior notification is required under section 4, the franchisor has furnished such notification and the franchisee has not corrected the conduct specified in such notification as the reason for such cancellation, failure to renew, or termination within 60 days after the date of receipt of such notification.

COMPENSATION FOR FAILURE TO RENEW A FRANCHISE

SEC. 6. A franchisor who fails to renew a franchise for other than good cause shall—

(1) permit the franchisee, for a period of not less than 90 days beginning on the date of expiration of the franchise, to sell the franchise subject to the approval of the franchisor; or

(2) if no sale is made under paragraph (1), pay the franchisee reasonable compensation for the loss of the value (including goodwill) of the franchisee's business attributable to the franchisor's failure to renew the franchise.

If the franchisee and franchisor do not agree on the amount of the reasonable compensation described in paragraph (2), they shall submit the determination of such amount to binding arbitration in accordance with section 9(b).

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTIES

SEC. 7. A franchisor may not discriminate between franchisees in the charges offered or made for royalties, goods, services, equipment, rentals, advertising services, or in any other business dealing, unless, and then only to the extent that, any classification of, or discrimination between, franchisees is reasonable, is based on franchisees granted at materially different times, and is reasonably related to such difference in time or is based on other proper and justifiable distinctions considering the purposes of this Act, and is not arbitrary.

JUDICIAL REMEDIES AND BURDEN OF PROOF

SEC. 8. (a) If a franchisor engages in conduct prohibited under this Act, a franchisee may maintain a suit against such franchisor.

(b) The court shall grant such equitable relief as is necessary to remedy the effects of conduct which it finds to exist and which is prohibited under this Act, including declaratory judgment, mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief, and interim equitable relief. The court may, unless required by this Act, award damages, including the value of goodwill. The court may, if such suit is successful, direct that costs, including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees, be paid by the franchisor. If the court finds that the franchisor has acted in bad faith in invoking the provisions of section 4(b) as justification for cancellation, failure to renew, or termination of a franchise, it shall award actual damages, as well as costs, as provided for in this subsection.

(c) A suit under this section may be brought, without regard to the amount in controversy, in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which the franchisor against whom such suit is maintained resides, is found, or is doing business. No such suit shall be maintained unless commenced within two years after the cancellation, failure to renew, or other termination of the franchise, unless the franchisor has allegedly re-entered the marketing area after having effected a marketing area withdrawal, in which case no such suit shall be maintained unless commenced within two years after the date of such alleged re-entry.

(d) In any suit brought under this section, a franchisor availing himself of any of the justifications specified in section 4(b), 5(1), 5(2), or 7 as a defense to such action shall have the burden of establishing and proving such defense.

PROHIBITION ON WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND ARBITRATION

SEC. 9. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, any condition, stipulation, provision, or term of any franchise agreement waiving any right granted under this Act, or relieving any person from liability imposed by this Act, shall be void and unenforceable.

(b) Nothing contained in this Act shall limit the right of a franchisor and a franchisee to agree to binding arbitration of disputes, if—

(1) the standards applied in such arbitration are not less than the requirements specified in this Act, and

(2) any arbitrator employed in such arbitration is chosen by the parties from a list of impartial arbitrators supplied by the American Arbitration Association or by any other impartial third party agreed to by the parties.

ANTITRUST LAWS

SEC. 10. No provision of this Act shall repeal, modify, or supersede, directly or indirectly, any provision of the antitrust laws of the United States. This Act is and shall be deemed to be supplementary to, but not a part of, the antitrust laws of the United States.

EFFECTS ON STATE LAW

SEC. 11. Nothing in this Act shall invalidate or restrict any right or remedy of any franchisee under the law of any State.

SEVERABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 12. If any provision of this Act, or the application of any provision of this Act to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act, or the application of such provision to persons and circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 13. This Act shall apply to any cancellation of, failure to renew, or other termination of any franchise occurring after the date of enactment of this Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Ms. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. GUYER (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for today and tomorrow, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. NEAL (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT), for March 14, 15, and 16, on account of official business.

Mr. VANDER JAGT (at the request of Mr. RHODES), for the week of March 14, on account of official business.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. RHODES), until 3 p.m. today, on account of attendance at a funeral.

Mr. BOB STUMP, for today, on account of official business.

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. LEACH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SARASIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KEMP, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. SEBELIUS, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. EMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CONABLE, for 60 minutes, March 17.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERTEL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. AKAKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BINGHAM, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. ASPIN, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. DODD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BENJAMIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KRUEGER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, on March 16.

Mr. BENJAMIN, for 10 minutes, on April 14.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. McDONALD, immediately prior to the vote on the Bauman amendment.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LEACH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. JEFFORDS in two instances.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. BOB WILSON.

Mr. DEL CLAWSON.

Mr. O'BRIEN.

Mr. KASTEN.

Mr. CONABLE.

Mr. SCHULZE.

Mr. GRADISON.

Mr. SNYDER in two instances.

Mr. STANTON.

Mr. RHODES in three instances.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.
Mr. GRASSLEY.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois in two instances.
Mr. CORCORAN of Illinois.
Mr. PRESSLER in two instances.
Mr. WHITEHURST.
Mr. MADIGAN.
Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
Mr. BURKE of Florida.
Mr. ROUSSELOT.
Mr. EVANS of Delaware in two instances.

Mr. MICHEL.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ERTEL), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WEAVER.

Mr. HEFTEL.

Mr. BAUCUS.

Mr. DENT.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

Mr. FRASER in two instances.

Mr. ZABLOCKI.

Mr. HANNAFORD.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. SANTINI in two instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California in three instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. BOLLING.

Mr. EILBERG in two instances.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. WEISS in two instances.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. LEHMAN in 10 instances.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. EDGAR in three instances.

Mr. OTTINGER in three instances.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE.

Mr. BONKER.

Mr. McDONALD.

Mr. HOWARD.

Mr. TEAGUE.

Mr. PERKINS.

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. 213. An act to amend the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 to provide for the audit, by the Comptroller General, of the Internal Revenue Service and of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms; to the Committee on Government Operations.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 269. Joint resolution making an urgent supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, for disaster relief.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 15, 1977, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

998. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1977 and amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1978 (H. Doc. No. 95-97); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

999. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act, as amended, in order to extend the authorization for appropriations, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 95-98); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1000. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of March 1, 1977, pursuant to section 1014(e) of Public Law 93-344 (H. Doc. No. 95-99); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1001. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notice of the intention of the Department of the Navy to sell the destroyer *Bordelon* (DD-881) to the Government of Iran, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1002. A letter from the Acting U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a review by the National Advisory Committee on the Handicapped of a GAO report on Federal programs for training educators for the handicapped; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1003. A letter from the Staff Director, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 to extend for 6 months the deadline for transmittal of the Commission's report on unreasonable age discrimination, and to authorize the Commission to provide information and technical assistance to the Government officials responsible for implementing the prohibition against unreasonable age discrimination in federally assisted programs and activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1004. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on the Department's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1976, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1005. A letter from the Acting President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting a report on the agency's activities under the Freedom of Information Act during calendar year 1976, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1006. A letter from the General Counsel, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting notice of a proposed change in a system of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1007. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 92-287 to provide certain additional authorities for the re-

placement of a metallurgy research center now located on the campus of the University of Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1008. A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1978; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1009. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on International Relations.

1010. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Administration, transmitting a report covering the months of October and November 1976 on changes in market shares of the statutory categories of retail gasoline marketers, pursuant to section 4(c)(2)(A) of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1011. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Energy Administration, transmitting a report covering the month of November 1976, on changes in the refiner distribution and market shares of the statutory categories of refined petroleum products, pursuant to section 4(c)(2)(A) of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1012. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1114 of title 18 of the United States Code to make the killing, assaulting, or intimidating of any officer or employee of the Federal Communications Commission performing investigative, inspection, or law-enforcement functions a Federal criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1013. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1978 and 1979 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1014. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting a prospectus proposing alterations at the South Bend, Ind., Federal Building-U.S. Courthouse, pursuant to section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1015. A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on Indian education in the public school system (HRD-76-172, March 14, 1977); jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, and Education and Labor.

1016. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a revised draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended and section 305 of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974, as amended, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, International Relations, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on Mar. 10, 1977 the following reports were filed Mar. 11, 1977]

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. Supplemental report on H.R. 4876. A bill making economic stimulus appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 95-68, Pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4877. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 95-68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 14, 1977]

Mr. ZABLOCKI: Committee on International Relations. Report on allocation of budget totals under the third concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1977 (Rept. No. 95-69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. Report of the Committee on Education and Labor pursuant to section 302 (b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Rept. No. 95-70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California: Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Report on suballocation of spending authority from the third concurrent resolution for fiscal year 1977 in accordance with section 302(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (Rept. No. 95-71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STRATTON: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3702. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to make certain changes in the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan and the Survivor Benefit Plan as authorized by chapter 73 of that title, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 95-72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DODD: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 402. Resolution providing consideration of waiving certain points of order against H.R. 4876. A bill making economic stimulus appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 95-73). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 403. Resolution providing consideration of waiving certain points of order against H.R. 4877. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1977, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 95-74). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. AKAKA (for himself and Mr. HEFTEL):

H.R. 4878. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 to provide manpower programs for Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4879. A bill to amend the Indian Education Act and certain other related education assistance programs to provide Federal financial assistance to Hawaiian Natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4880. A bill to extend the provisions of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 to Na-

tive Hawaiians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4881. A bill to extend the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to Native Hawaiians; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, and Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL JR., Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. ETEL, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. ICHORD, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. MADIGAN, Ms. KEYS, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. SISK, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 4882. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code (respecting firearms) to penalize the use of firearms in the commission of any felony and to increase the penalties in certain relating existing provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. BADELLO, Mr. CARR, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. FISH, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. ETEL, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Ms. OKAR, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. SCHULZE, and Mr. VOLKMER):

H.R. 4883. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of service pensions to veterans of World War I and the surviving spouses and children of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. AMMERMAN, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLOUNT, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ETEL, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. FUQUA):

H.R. 4884. A bill to authorize Federal assistance under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act with respect to using solar energy in residential structures on family farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HOLT, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTYNGER, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. PATTON of New York):

H.R. 4885. A bill to authorize Federal assistance under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act with respect to using solar energy in residential structures on family farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. PETTIS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SANTINI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SISK, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. THONE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 4886. A bill to authorize Federal assistance under the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act with respect to using solar energy in residential structures on family farms; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. AMMERMAN, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EGGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERTEL, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. FUQUA):

H.R. 4887. A bill to provide more Federal assistance under certain housing programs for dwelling units which utilize solar energy; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HOLT, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. PATTISON of New York):

H.R. 4888. A bill to provide more Federal assistance under certain housing programs for dwelling units which utilize solar energy; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. PETTIS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SANTINI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SISK, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. THONE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. WOLFE):

H.R. 4889. A bill to provide more Federal assistance under certain housing programs for dwelling units which utilize solar energy; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. AMMERMAN, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BURGNER, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARR, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EGGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. EMERY, Mr. ERTEL, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. FRASER, and Mr. FUQUA):

H.R. 4890. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide Federal loans and loan guarantees to veterans for the purchase and installation of heating and cooling systems which utilize solar energy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mrs. HOLT, Ms. HOLTZMAN, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LENT, Mr. MANN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NEAL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. PATTISON of New York):

H.R. 4891. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide Federal loans and loan guarantees to veterans for the purchase and installation of heating and cooling systems which utilize solar energy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. PEASE, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. PETTIS, Mr. PRITCHARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUNNELS, Mr. SANTINI,

Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SISK, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. THONE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WEAVER, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, and Mr. WOLFE):

H.R. 4892. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide Federal loans and loan guarantees to veterans for the purchase and installation of heating and cooling systems which utilize solar energy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 4893. A bill to abolish the National Security Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4894. A bill to provide that payments for military retired pay shall be made by the Civil Service Commission and that appropriations for such purpose shall be made to the Civil Service Commission; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BOB WILSON, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. CARR, and Mr. TRIBLE):

H.R. 4895. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 4896. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the retirement of customs and immigration inspectors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. CARR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. NIX):

H.R. 4897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a taxpayer conscientiously opposed to participation in war may elect to have his income, estate, or gift tax payments spent for non-military purposes; to create a trust fund (the World Peace Tax Fund) to receive these tax payments; to establish a World Peace Tax Fund Board of Trustees; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. PHILIP BURTON, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. MATHIS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. St GERMAIN):

H.R. 4898. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative determinations made by the Board of Veterans Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BINGHAM (for himself, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. EILBERG):

H.R. 4899. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative determinations made by the Board of Veterans Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. FARY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WON PAT):

H.R. 4900. A bill to create a national sys-

tem of health security; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 4901. A bill to amend title 5 of the United States Code to establish a uniform procedure for congressional review of agency rules which may be contrary to law or inconsistent with congressional intent, to expand opportunities for public participation in agency rule making and for other purposes; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

By Mr. DERRICK:

H.R. 4902. A bill to prohibit the appropriation and expenditure of unvouchered funds (except in the case of intelligence agencies) unless specifically authorized by law, and to provide for reports on and audits of authorized expenditures of unvouchered funds; jointly to the Committee on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 4903. A bill to provide for the recovery by the prevailing party of attorney's fees from the United States in civil actions where the United States is a party which does not prevail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

H.R. 4904. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 for the purpose of providing insurance against damage caused by the movement of frozen water into property located along shorelines; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 4905. A bill to provide that certain cost-of-living and other increased benefits received under title II of the Social Security Act will not be considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility and the amount of benefits of participants in the food stamp program and for purposes of determining eligibility and the amount of benefits of participants in certain programs concerning surplus agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4906. A bill to provide that social security benefit increases occurring after May 1977 shall not be considered as income or resources for the purposes of determining the eligibility for or amount of assistance which any individual or family is provided under certain Federal housing laws; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4907. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make certain that individuals otherwise eligible for medicaid benefits do not lose such eligibility, or have the amount of such benefits reduced, because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4908. A bill to establish certain rules for the appearance of witnesses before grand juries in order to better protect the rights of such witnesses, to provide for independent inquiries by grand juries, to require periodic reports to Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4909. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make certain recipients of veterans' pension and compensation will not have the amount of such pension or compensation reduced, or entitlement thereto discontinued, because of certain increases in monthly benefits under the Social Security Act and other Federal retirement programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4910. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to make certain that recipients of aid to families with dependent children and recipients of supplemental security income benefits will not have the amount of such aid or benefits reduced because of increases in monthly social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 4911. A bill to reaffirm the intent of the Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce; to reaffirm the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service in certain instances; to require the Federal Communications Commission to make certain findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4912. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary education of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4913. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 4914. A bill to establish in the Department of Housing and Urban Development a direct low-interest loan program to assist homeowners, builders, and small business concerns in purchasing and installing solar heating (or combined solar heating and cooling) equipment; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself and Mr. BUCHANAN) (by request):

H.R. 4915. A bill to amend title II of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1977 (Public Law 94-350; 90 Stat 829), to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1978 and 1979, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 4916. A bill to amend title I of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 1977, (Public Law 94-350; 90 Stat. 823) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1978 and 1979 and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 4917. A bill to amend the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973 and to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1978 and 1979 for carrying out that act; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4918. A bill relating to the appointment of district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 4919. A bill to name the lake located behind Lower Monumental Lock and Dam, Washington, Lake Herbert G. West, Sr.; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 4920. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain agricultural aircraft from the aircraft use tax, to provide for the refund of the gasoline tax to the agricultural aircraft operator, and other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BENJAMIN, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. FISHER, Mr. SHARP, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.R. 4921. A bill to add certain lands to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, to redesignate such area as the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area, to withdraw certain authorities for timber harvesting and vehicle use within such area, to increase the payments made to counties respecting such area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. DODD, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. EMERY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. KAS-

TENMEIER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. MEYNER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. STEERS, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 4922. A bill to insure the development of U.S. ocean mining capabilities and to support the continuation of the Law of the Sea Conference negotiations; jointly to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, International Relations, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 4923. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that bonds issued to finance facilities for production and purification of synthetic natural gas by coal gasification not be considered industrial development bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRADISON:

H.R. 4924. A bill to amend section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the purpose of changing the criterion used for determining eligibility of families assisted under such section; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 4925. A bill to require that imported meat and meat food products made in whole or in part of imported meat be subjected to certain tests and that such meat or products be identified as having been imported; to require the inspection of imported dairy products and that such products comply with certain minimum standards of sanitation; to require that the cost of conducting such tests, inspections, and identification procedures on imported meat and meat food products and on dairy products, as the case may be, be borne by the exporters of such articles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4926. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, to exclude from coverage under the act households which have members who are on strike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit union organization in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4928. A bill to authorize a career education program for elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4929. A bill to authorize a career education program for elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4930. A bill to provide for loans for the establishment and/or construction of municipal, low-cost, nonprofit clinics for the spaying and neutering of dogs and cats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4931. A bill to strengthen the penalty provisions of the Gun Control Act of 1968; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4932. A bill to provide an opportunity to individuals to make financial contributions, in connection with the payment of their Federal income tax, for the advancement of the arts and the humanities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4933. A bill to provide that the changes made by the Tax Reform Act of 1976 to the exclusion for sick pay shall only apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1976; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4934. A bill to provide for the monthly publication of a consumer price index for the aged and other social security beneficiaries, which shall be used in the provision of the cost-of-living benefit increases authorized by title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4935. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain agricultural aircraft from the aircraft use tax, to provide for the refund of the gasoline tax to the agricultural aircraft operator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction for State and local public utility taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4937. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the employment of handicapped individuals by providing a tax credit for a certain portion of the wages paid to such individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4938. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4939. A bill to provide for quality assurance and utilization control in home health care under the medicare, medicaid, and social services programs in accordance with a plan to be developed by a commission specifically established for that purpose; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4940. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to include eligible drugs, requiring a physician's prescription or certification and approved by a Formulary Committee, among the items and services covered under the hospital insurance program; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4941. A bill to provide for congressional review of all regulations relating to costs and expenditures for health care, reimbursements to individuals or providers of health care, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Ways and Means, and Rules.

By Ms. HOLTZMAN (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. STEERS):

H.R. 4942. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to exclude from admission into and to deport from the United States all aliens who persecuted others on the basis of religion, race, or national origin under the direction of the Nazi government of Germany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS (for himself and Mrs. KEYS):

H.R. 4943. A bill to amend title 21 of the United States Code, the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. ARMSTRONG):

H.R. 4944. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to exercise his authority under the Safe Drinking Water Act to make grants for certain demonstration projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KASTEN:

H.R. 4945. A bill to reorganize the executive branch of the Federal Government to eliminate excessive, duplicative, inflationary, and anticompetitive regulation; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

H.R. 4946. A bill amending title 5 of the United States Code to improve agency rule-making by expanding the opportunities for public participation, by creating procedures for congressional review of agency rules, and by expanding judicial review, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Rules.

H.R. 4947. A bill relating to the promulgation of rules and regulations by agencies of

the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4948. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to establish in the Congress a zero-base budgeting process, with full congressional review of each Federal program at least once every 6 years; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIAIMO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'BRIEN, and Mr. PATTERSON of California):

H.R. 4949. A bill to require candidates for Federal office, Members of the Congress, and officers and employees of the United States to file statements with the Comptroller General with respect to their income tax and financial transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER (for himself, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. PEPPER, Mrs. PETTIS, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. ROSE, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. STEERS, Mr. TSONGAS, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. YOUNG of Missouri):

H.R. 4950. A bill to require candidates for Federal office, Members of the Congress, and officers and employees of the United States to file statements with the Comptroller General with respect to their income and financial transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MITCHELL of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mr. STOKES):

H.R. 4951. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to replace existing Federal public assistance and welfare programs with a single program under which all residents of the United States are guaranteed an adequate minimum income, with incentives to work for those who are able to do so, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 4952. A bill to amend chapter 55 of title 10 to provide additional dental care for dependents of active duty members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 4953. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that for purposes of determining the amount of tax to be withheld, payments paid to Federal employees and members of the uniformed services for accumulated leave shall be considered to be paid on the basis of an annual payroll period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 4954. A bill to amend the Fishery Conservation Zone Transition Act in order to give effect during 1977 to the Reciprocal Fisheries Agreement between the United States and Canada; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee:

H.R. 4955. A bill to repeal the earnings limitation of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARKS:

H.R. 4956. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1974; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture, and Small Business.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 4957. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to increase the penalty for committing certain crimes with a firearm or while unlawfully carrying a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4958. A bill to amend section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to passive investment income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 4959. A bill to reaffirm the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce; to reaffirm the authority of the States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service; to require the Federal Communications Commission to make certain findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland:

H.R. 4960. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, to change the title and duties of the Associate Administrator for Finance and Investment of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland (for himself, Mr. AMMERMAN, Mr. JOHN L. BURTON, Mr. DENT, Mrs. KEYS, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. WALGREN):

H.R. 4961. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand assistance under such act to minority small business concerns, to provide statutory standards for contracting and subcontracting by the United States with respect to such concerns, and to create a Commission on Federal Assistance to Minority Enterprise, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Small Business, Government Operations, and Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4962. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 4963. A bill to authorize appropriations for the fiscal year 1978 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 4964. A bill to prohibit any increase in the price of certain consumer commodities by any retailer once a price is placed on any such commodity by such retailer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4965. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to extend certain benefits to former employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4966. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a beneficiary who dies shall (if he is otherwise qualified and it would not reduce total family benefits) be entitled to a prorated benefit for the month of his death; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4967. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for inclusion of the services of licensed (registered) nurses under medicare and medicaid; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 4968. A bill to reaffirm the intent of Congress with respect to the structure of the common carrier telecommunications industry rendering services in interstate and foreign commerce; to reaffirm the authority of the

States to regulate terminal and station equipment used for telephone exchange service; to require the Federal Communications Commission to make certain findings in connection with Commission actions authorizing specialized carriers; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 4969. A bill to provide for common situs picketing on construction sites; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RICHMOND (for himself, Mr. SCHEUER, and Mrs. SCHROEDER):

H.R. 4970. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide for the annual collection and publication of world population statistics and data; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. COTTER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HARRINGTON, and Mr. HAWKINS):

H.R. 4971. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Administrative Procedure Act), to permit awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and other expenses for public participation in Federal agency proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (for himself, Mr. KOCH, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JENNETTE, Mrs. KEYS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEVITAS, Mrs. MEYNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NIX, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WIRTH, and Mr. ZEPERETTI):

H.R. 4972. A bill to amend chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Administrative Procedure Act), to permit awards of reasonable attorneys' fees and other expenses for public participation in Federal agency proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 4973. A bill to provide that the Federal Government shall assume 100 percent of all Federal, State, and local welfare costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 4974. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for health planning and related programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. PREYER, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. MAGUIRE, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. MADIGAN):

H.R. 4975. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for biomedical research and related programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 4976. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, title V of the Social Security Act, and the program of assistance for home health services to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1978 for health services programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUDD (for himself and Mr. DEVINE):

H.R. 4977. A bill to amend the Federal Food,

Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the safety of food additives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSO (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, and Mr. HUGHES):

H.R. 4978. A bill to authorize the Comptroller General to audit the programs, activities, and financial operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association, and to amend certain housing laws for the purpose of improving Federal programs which insure home mortgages; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANTINI:

H.R. 4979. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of General Services to convey certain public and acquired lands in the State of Nevada to the County of Mineral, Nev.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4980. A bill to declare that all right, title, and interest of the United States in 2,640 acres, more or less, are hereby held by the United States in trust for the Paiute and Shoshone Tribes of the Fallon Indian Reservation, Nevada to promote the economic self-sufficiency of the Paiute and Shoshone Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4981. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4982. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BOWEN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARTER, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. KEYS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. MANN, Mr. MARKS, and Mr. MIKVA):

H.R. 4983. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional consultation and education to employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SARASIN (for himself, Mr. STEIGER, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. GARY A. MYERS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. SIMON, Mr. STEERS, Mr. TREEN, Mr. VAN DERLIND, Mr. VANDERJAGT, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. WHITE, Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.R. 4984. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide additional consultation and education to employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SEIBERLING:

H.R. 4985. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax-exempt treatment allowed to certain industrial development bonds be restricted to bonds the proceeds of which are to be used within economic development areas, and to allow national banks to underwrite these bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4986. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide special cost-of-living increases in benefits thereunder based on local differentials in the cost of food and other necessities (over and above the regular annual cost-of-living increases in such benefits which are provided under present law on a national basis) for individuals residing in high cost cities and other high cost areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. STANTON, Mr. AP-

PLEGATE, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CEDERBERG, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DENT, Mr. DODD, Mr. FINDLEY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MARKS, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MICHAEL O. MYERS, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. NIX, Mr. NOVAK, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTISON of New York, and Mrs. SPELLMAN):

H.R. 4987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the modernization of manufacturing plants by providing an additional investment credit for machinery placed in service in existing manufacturing plants or in nearby plants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. STANTON, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YATRON, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. ZEFERETTI, Mr. CARR, Mrs. MEYNER, and Mrs. FENWICK):

H.R. 4988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the modernization of manufacturing plants by providing an additional investment credit for machinery placed in service in existing manufacturing plants or in nearby plants; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. PANETTA):

H.R. 4989. A bill to provide price support for milk at not less than 80 percent of the parity price therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ROE, and Mr. CARR):

H.R. 4990. A bill to govern the disclosure of certain financial information by financial institutions to governmental agencies, to protect the constitutional rights of citizens of the United States, and to prevent unwarranted invasions of privacy by prescribing procedures and standards governing disclosure of such information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself, Mr. THORNTON, and Mr. HOLLENBECK):

H.R. 4991. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. RONCALIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4992. A bill to amend the Indian Financing Act of 1974 by revising the appropriations authorization for the Indian Business Development Program; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANDERJAGT:

H.R. 4993. A bill to direct the Food and Drug Administration to withhold its announced prohibition of the use of saccharin in foods and beverages pending further study by the National Academy of Sciences; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST:

H.R. 4994. A bill to give the Food and Drug Administration greater discretion in the control of food additives; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LLOYD of California, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. STEERS, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 4995. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to make a comprehensive study of the wolf for the purpose of developing adequate conservation measures, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. BLANCHARD, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FRENZEL, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. STEERS, Mr. WALGREEN, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. WEISS):

H.R. 4996. A bill to prevent the unnecessary large-scale killing of birds or mammals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WON PAT

H.R. 4997. A bill to amend section 216(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to entitle the Delegates in Congress from Guam and the Virgin Islands to make nominations for appointments to the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 4998. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act and related provisions of law to make the supplemental security income benefit program applicable in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam on the same basis as in the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 4999. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that benefits thereunder (including supplemental security income benefits) shall be made available and financed in the case of Guam and the Virgin Islands on the basis as in the case of other States; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 5000. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 with respect to the annuities payable under such act to the widows of retired railroad employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5001. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for annuities for surviving spouses under the civil service retirement system without reduction in principal annuities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEARD of Tennessee (for himself and Mrs. LOYD of Tennessee):

H.R. 5002. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in order to clarify the provisions of the act regarding Federal agency cooperation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 5003. A bill to provide for grants to States for the payment of compensation to persons injured by certain criminal acts and omissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHN L. BURTON:

H.R. 5004. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1974, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, and Small Business.

By Mr. COLLINS of Texas:

H.R. 5005. A bill to provide that Federal Taxes may not be increased during a 4-year period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DODD:

H.R. 5006. A bill to establish comprehensive requirements governing the operation of tankers within the 200-mile fishery conservation zone of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EMERY (for himself, Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mr. ROE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. WINN, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. KINDNESS, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. YOUNG of Alas-

ka, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. FRITCHARD, Mr. HILLIS, and Mr. MAZZOLI):

H.R. 5007. A bill to promote, consistent with the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974, research and development into expanding the use of alternative energy resources in transportation and power generation, through the establishment of experimental research and demonstration projects utilizing domestic synthetic fuels in the operation of certain Government-owned and maintained passenger vehicles and in the generation of peak electrical power from combustion turbines by public utilities, to report the scientific and environmental implications of such projects to Congress for use in developing energy and environmental policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 5008. A bill to amend chapter 49 of title 10, United States Code, to prohibit union organization in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 5009. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the medicare program for certain services performed by chiropractors; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 5010. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide operating assistance for projects located in areas other than urbanized areas, to provide for mass transportation assistance to meet the needs of elderly and handicapped persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. MADIGAN (for himself, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. HIGHTOWER, Mr. THONE, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. SKUBITZ, and Mr. STANGELAND):

H.R. 5011. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CORNWELL, Mr. COUGHLIN, and Mr. PATISON of New York):

H.R. 5012. A bill to amend section 601(a) (2) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide that the salaries of Senators and Representatives may not be subject to any cost-of-living adjustment under such section before October 1, 1978; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARLENEE:

H.R. 5013. A bill to reveal section 154 of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the national maximum speed limit; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

H.R. 5014. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to remove the time limitation within which programs of education for veterans must be completed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BLOUIN, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. GINN, Mr. HALL, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVITAS, Mrs. LOYD of Tennessee, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H.R. 5015. A bill to repeal the changes made by the Tax Reform Act of 1976 in the exclusion of sick pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. SIMON):

H.R. 5016. A bill to correct inequities in certain franchise practices, to provide franchisors and franchisees with evenhanded protection from unfair practices, to provide consumers with the benefits which accrue from a competitive and open market economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIKVA (for himself, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FITHIAN, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JENNETTE, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. JOHN T. MYERS, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. RUSSO, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 5017. A bill to correct inequities in certain franchise practices, to provide franchisors and franchisees with evenhanded protection from unfair practices, to provide consumers with the benefits which accrue from a competitive and open market economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NOWAK:

H.R. 5018. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize payment under the medicare program for certain services performed by chiropractors; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:

H.R. 5019. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide that the aid to families with dependent children shall be payable with respect to unborn children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. RODINO, Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. TSONGAS):

H.R. 5020. A bill to provide guidelines and strict liability in the development of research related to recombinant DNA; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OTTINGER (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEDELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOTT, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 5021. A bill to promote the use of energy conservation, solar energy, and total energy systems in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 5022. A bill to provide a comprehensive approach to meeting the employment and training needs of youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RISENHOOVER:

H.R. 5023. A bill to amend the statute of limitations provisions in section 2415 title 28, United States Code, relating to claims by the United States on behalf of Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARASIN:

H.R. 5024. A bill to provide that salaries at levels of Vice President of the United States down to and including positions in the Executive Schedule not be increased by the next comparability pay adjustment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ROBERTS,

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. MOTT, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HALL, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. EDGAR, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CORNELL, and Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island):

H.R. 5025. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to revise the provisions therein relating to the construction, alteration, and acquisition of Veterans' Administration medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 5026. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to revise the provisions therein relating to the construction, alteration, and acquisition of Veterans' Administration medical facilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ROBERTS,

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HALL, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. EDGAR, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 5027. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the requirement that medical services be provided by the Veterans' Administration in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. WALSH and Mr. ULLMAN):

H.R. 5028. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to clarify the requirement that medical services be provided by the Veterans' Administration in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. ROBERTS,

Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. HALL, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. EDGAR, Mrs. HECKLER, Mr. HILLIS, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. GUYER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CORNELL, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. WALSH):

H.R. 5029. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to authorize contracts with the Republic of the Philippines for the provision of hospital care and medical services to Commonwealth Army veterans and new Philippine Scouts for service-connected disabilities; to authorize the continued maintenance of a Veterans' Administration office in the Republic of the Philippines; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. WOLFF):

H.R. 5030. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to authorize contracts with the Republic of the Philippines for the provision of hospital care and medical services to Commonwealth Army veterans and new Philippine Scouts for service-connected disabilities; to authorize the continued maintenance of a Veterans' Administration office in the Republic of the Philippines; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SISK (for himself, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. SOLARZ):

H.R. 5031. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide financial assistance to medical facilities for treatment of certain aliens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE (for himself, Mr. FUGUA, Mr. MILFORD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WIRTH, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. TONRY, Mr. WINN, Mr. FREY, Mr. GARY A. MYERS, Mr. HOLLENBECK, and Mr. WALKER):

H.R. 5032. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 5033. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to revise and improve the program of making grants to the States for the construction, remodeling, or renovation of State home facilities for furnishing hospital, domiciliary, and nursing home care for eligible veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 5034. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make financial assistance available to agricultural producers who suffer losses as the result of having their agricultural commodities or livestock contaminated by toxic chemicals dangerous to the public health, or whose agricultural commodities or livestock have been contaminated so as to adversely affect the economic viability of the farming operation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 5035. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to establish a program for assistance to States which establish programs of assistance for the protection and indemnification of individuals injured in their business or person by chemical substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 5036. A bill to amend section 1951 of title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal criminal offense to engage in violence or destruction at or near a construction site or any other place where work or business is carried on; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. ABDNOR, Mr. BALDUS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BEARD of Rhode Island, Mr. BADILLO, Mrs. BURKE of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. CORRADA, Mr. ROBERT W. DANIEL, Jr., Mr. D'AMOURS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DUNCAN of OREGON, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. ERTEL, Mr. FARY, and Mr. FLORIO):

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 8 of each year as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GEPHART, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GORE, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. HEFTEL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. KEYS, Mr. KETCHUM, Mr. LENT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. LLOYD of Tennessee, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MANN, and Mr. McHUGH):

H.J. Res. 318. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 8 of

each year as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. MITCHELL of Maryland, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOORHEAD of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARASIN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H.J. Res. 319. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 8 of each year as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ADDABBO (for himself, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. WON PAT, Mr. WAGGONER, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ZEFERETTI):

H.J. Res. 320. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim September 8 of each year as National Cancer Prevention Day; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California (for himself, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. BEARD of Tennessee, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. EDGAR, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. GORE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LE FANTE, Mr. LEVITAS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. O'BRIEN, Mr. PATTERSON of New York, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. YOUNG of Missouri, and Mr. RINALDO):

H.J. Res. 321. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of a week as "National Lupus Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.J. Res. 322. Joint resolution providing for the designation of a week in May of each year as National Burglary and Theft Prevention Week; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. HYDE):

H.J. Res. 323. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States allowing an item veto in appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT:

H.J. Res. 324. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of judges of the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.J. Res. 325. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week beginning November 6, 1977, and ending November 12, 1977, as "National Volunteer Firemen Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. CAPUTO, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LLOYD of California, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SIMON, Mrs. SPELLMAN, Mr. STEERS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WINN, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida):

H.J. Res. 326. Joint resolution calling for a wildlife preserve for humpback whales in the West Indies; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOSTMAYER,

Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ROE, Mr. STEERS, Mr. WALGREN, and Mr. WEISS):

H.J. Res. 327. Joint resolution calling for an immediate moratorium on the killing of the eastern timber wolf; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to income tax returns by Members of Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution to express support of the Congress for a coordinated program to convert to the metric system; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. RYAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MINISH, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. CARR, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. FREY, Mr. PATTISON of New York, Mr. PATTERSON of California, Mr. LLOYD of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and Mr. CHARLES WILSON of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution urging the Canadian Government to reassess its policy of permitting the killing of newborn harp seals; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHURST (for himself, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BRODHEAD, Mr. CAPUTO, Mr. CORCORAN of Illinois, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. EMERY, Mr. FASCELL, Mrs. FENWICK, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. KREBS, Mr. LLOYD of California, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MOFFETT, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. ROSE, Mr. SIMON, and Mrs. SPELLMAN):

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution calling for a regional conservation treaty to protect northern hemisphere pinnipeds; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H. Res. 398. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the effect on our society of the level of violence depicted on television requires more consideration and study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MADIGAN:

H. Res. 399. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the development of pay television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself, Mr. BROYHILL, Mr. SYMMS, Mr. SIMON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. LEDERER, Mr. POAGE, Mr. QUIE, Mr. KRUEGER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. FLYNT, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mrs. MEYNER, Mr. DAN DANIEL, Mr. WHITLEY, Mr. ROUSSELOT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. FRENZEL, and Mr. SARASIN):

H. Res. 400. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that no ban on saccharin should take effect without prior congressional approval; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAILSBACK (for himself, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. HANNAFORD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MANN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. PRITCHARD, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H. Res. 401. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the ef-

fect on our society of the level of violence depicted on television requires more consideration and study; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

38. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, relative to allowing totally disabled veterans to fly free of charge on commercial airlines on a space-available basis; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

39. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to preventing changes in social security

benefits from affecting veterans' pensions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEMP:

H.R. 5037. A bill for the relief of Jack R. Misner; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MIKULSKI:

H.R. 5038. A bill for the relief of Dr. John C. Hume; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SARASIN:

H.R. 5039. A bill for the relief of David D. Bulkeley; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

56. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Max Hirsch, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to technical analysis of Government programs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

57. Also, petition of the city council, New York, N.Y., relative to declaring New York City a disaster area due to damages caused by weather conditions; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

58. Also, petition of Bernardo P. Villas, Dumaguete City, Philippines, and others, relative to veterans' benefits for certain Filipino guerrillas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ARMS NEGOTIATIONS

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, March 14, 1977

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, three very interesting and informative articles appeared in the New York Times magazine of February 27, 1977, the first of which was titled "Perils of Détente," the second of which was titled "Promise of Disarmament" and the third of which was titled, "Negotiating With the Soviets." I ask unanimous consent that these three articles may be printed in the Extension of Remarks of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERILS OF DÉTENTE

(By Walter Laqueur)

Some 18 months ago, the C.I.A. announced that it had revised its estimates on Russian military spending. The Soviet Union was not spending 6 to 8 percent of its gross national product on defense, but double that amount. Which meant, the agency pointed out, that Russia was outspending the United States by 50 percent, if one stripped away pensions and similar items from the U.S. defense budget.

For many experts, this announcement did not come as a great surprise. They had long thought that the C.I.A. estimates were too low. However, Representative Les Aspin, one of the Pentagon's best-informed critics, was quick to point out that the new estimates were no more than an exercise in bookkeeping. They did not mean that the Russians had one more tank or plane than before. Indeed, in some ways, he observed, the news was good. Greater spending meant the Russian defense industries were less efficient than we believed, and it would be difficult to expand them.

Perhaps Aspin's points are well-taken, but he tends to ignore other conditions. First, there might well be even more tanks and guns and planes than previously believed, since the "means of national verification" (to use the official term) are so far from foolproof. And it certainly is not immaterial whether a nation allocates 6 to 8 percent of its G.N.P. to military spending, or twice as much.

More recently, Maj. General George J. Keegan Jr., former Air Force chief of intelligence, has argued that the U.S.S.R. was not only aiming at superiority but had already won it and there was hard evidence to suggest that the Soviet Union was actually pre-

paring for war. He referred specifically to the Soviet concentration of offensive weapons, and the construction of giant military and civilian underground silos. Similar warnings, perhaps slightly less emphatic, have emanated from other quarters. Against this it has been argued that the Russians were pursuing a chimera if indeed they aimed at superiority. For given the ability of the two superpowers to destroy each other several times over, superiority in any meaningful sense no longer exists. This argument is not however as strong as it appears at first sight, for if there is rough strategic equality between the two superpowers, nuclear weapons are not likely to go to the side with the greater conventional strength. Whether the Soviet leaders will risk a major conflict with the danger of escalation, is a different question; in the foreseeable future, they are unlikely to do so, unless, of course the disparity between the military strength of the two sides grows to such an extent that the risk will be negligible.

The pessimistic appraisal of Soviet capacities and intentions is relatively simple and straightforward, whereas the reasoning of those opposing military spending is more complicated and proceeds on various levels. They do not on the whole dispute the facts and figures about Soviet armaments. But some of them claim that the facts are wrongly interpreted, either intentionally by vested interests, such as the military-industrial complex, or unintentionally, by cold warriors who suffer from paranoid suspicions and always attribute to the Russians the worst possible motives. This is the Russians-are-not-10-feet-tall argument. Another school of thought concedes that the Russians have indeed made considerable progress, but claims that their technology is inferior to that of the West, that some of their weapons are quite outdated, that they have no combat experience. The Russians, in short, may be 10 feet tall, but they have a soft underbelly.

Yet others admit both Soviet numerical superiority and growing technological sophistication, but maintain that military superiority cannot be translated into political power in our day and age. A further argument is based on geographical considerations. In contrast to the United States, which does not have to defend its borders, the Russians have to defend themselves on their western and eastern frontiers. Others refer to historical-cultural-psychological factors. The Russians act out of fear, having suffered invasions more than once in their history; allowance has to be made for their apprehensions. Furthermore, Russians have always been great believers in numbers. It is also maintained that in a realistic comparison of the military strength of allies, Russia's allies are thought to be both weaker

and less reliable than America's partners in NATO.

Until fairly recently these arguments had a great deal of public support. In democratic societies there is always great reluctance to increase defense spending. As President Eisenhower once said, "Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket signifies a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed." Of late, however, the critics of the defense establishment have been very much on the defensive, facing the growing evidence about Soviet rearmament on one hand and Soviet secrecy on the other. The Soviet Union, unlike Western countries, is not in the habit of making details of its military efforts known. The only figure annually released is the budget total of the Ministry of Defense, which happens to be about 17 billion rubles. It has remained static with the slightest variations for many years and become something of a ritual. No one believes it, nor can anyone dispute it, for what it supposedly entails is unknown. It is one of the ironies of world politics that Soviet secrecy, deeply rooted in Russian history as well as the present political system, is politically counterproductive. For it defeats, of course, another aim of Soviet policy, to persuade the rest of the world of its peaceful intentions and above all not to arouse America.

It is not widely known that all the basic figures about the American and the Soviet military buildups, whether emanating from NATO or from strategic research institutes in London, Stockholm or elsewhere, actually originate in Washington. For only America has the facilities for large-scale satellite reconnaissance and communications analysis, which have almost entirely superseded traditional methods of intelligence gathering.

The general picture that emerges is, briefly, that the United States has 1,054 intercontinental ballistic missiles; the U.S.S.R., 1,618. The United States has 656 ballistic missiles on submarines; the U.S.S.R., 885; the U.S. has about a thousand bombers capable of delivering nuclear bombs; the Soviet Union about 550.

But these figures have given rise to endless disputes because they do not by themselves present an accurate picture of strategic balance, and they can be used to prove almost anything. If other things were equal, the side with the greater number of vehicles would have a distinct advantage. But, as Edward Luttwak has recently shown in his illuminating study, "Strategic Power: Military Capabilities and Political Unity," things are not equal. It is not warheads that count, he points out, but surviving warheads. The United States has more warheads (9,000 in comparison with Russia's 3,500); the Soviet Union has the bigger megatonnage; America is ahead with MIRV and accuracy, but the