our international antagonists for our supply of this essential metal.

The domestic policies of Rhodesia should not be our primary concern here. Rather we must consider the consequences of a foreign policy that makes a nation dependent on its enemies rather than its friends for strategic defense materials.

Moreover, the excessive prices we are paying for the chrome ore adds dollars to the coffers of the Soviet Union at a time when the U.S. monetary position is very weak.

Many will argue that the failure of Rhodesia's white minority to enfranchise the black majority is sufficient reason for continuing the sanction. Others will claim that removing the restrictions on even just chrome ore will further erode the United Nations' limited enforcement powers.

Both points, however, pale in the light of national security considerations and sound international relations.

We would be in a far better position to influence domestic policies in Rhodesia as a friend instead of an enemy. Additionally, our support of the colonial interests of the United Kingdom against the declaration of independence by Rhodesia is contrary to our American principles.

Certainly I would like to see a broader based electorate in Rhodesia, but I would remind my colleagues that this Nation had a very limited number of people enfranchised in its early days. Blacks, women, and people under 25 did not receive the right to vote for almost a century or longer after this Nation's founding.

The Senate amendment permitting resumption of trade in chrome ore with Rhodesia should be accepted by the House. I hope my colleagues will support this policy change and urge the House conferees to do the same.

TO PROHIBIT PCB'S

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of 23 of my colleagues, yesterday I reintroduced my legislation to ban the distribution of polychlorinated biphenyls—PCB's—in interstate commerce.

H.R. 10086, which I originally introduced, and its companion with cosponsors (H.R. 11219) would provide the one step that is now essential to insure that our health and our environment are safeguarded from the hazards of this highly persistent, extremely toxic industrial chemical: prohibit PCB's totally.

In recent months we have witnessed a significant number of incidents of massive PCB contamination of our food supply—contamination that has infected milk, turkeys, chickens, fish, shell eggs, swine, catfish, broken egg products, and a wide variety of packaged foods.

Yet the real tragedy of these occurrences is that they could have been prevented. During the past 2 years, I have urged the appropriate Federal agencies to take administrative actions that would have forestalled such incidents of PCB-contamination and would have guaranteed the health and safety of the public. But in an almost unprecedented display of disregard for the public health and welfare, that action was not forthcoming.

Given the failure of the Federal Government to live up to its responsibilities to protect the well being of our citizens, the Congress must act now. And the only thing that will insure that future contamination from PCB's does not occur is to ban them completely—as proposed in the legislation I have introduced. Certainly this is not a very complex task, for there is one sole domestic manufacturer of polychlorinated biphenyls: The Monsanto Co.

A list of those joining me in sponsoring this legislation follows:

Mrs. Bella Abzug, of New York.
Mr. Jonathan Bingham, of New York.
Mr. Phillip Burton, of California.
Mr. Ronald Dellums, of California.
Mr. John Dow, of New York.
Mr. Joshua Eilberg, of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Ella Grasso, of Connecticut.
Mr. Seymour Halpern, of New York.
Mr. Michael Harrington, of Massachusetts.
Mr. William Hathaway, of Maine.
Mr. Augustus Hawkins, of California.
Mr. Ken Hechler, of West Virginia.
Mr. Henry Helstoski, of New Jersey.
Mr. Edward Koch, of New York.
Mrs. Patsy Mink, of Hawaii.
Mr. Parren Mitchell, of Maryland.
Mr. Charles Rangel, of New York.
Mr. Robert Roe, of New Jersey.
Mr. Benjamin Rosenthal, of New York.
Mr. Paul Sarbanes, of Maryland.
Mr. James Scheuer, of New York.
Mr. Robert Steele, of Connecticut.
Mr. Gus Yatron, of Pennsylvania.

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS TO THE MORALE CRISIS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

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

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, even though American involvement in the war in Vietnam seems now to be winding down and the number of troops stationed in Southeast Asia declines accordingly, we are being made increasingly aware of the deterioration of morale among members of the Armed Forces and the consequent problems this produces for the military's future in our Nation.

The House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, has been examining a number of the contributing factors to the morale crisis. Drug abuse, the desertion rate, reports of so-called fragging of officers and accounts of virtual mutiny in the ranks of some units reflect adversely upon the reputation and dependability of American fighting forces.

Very clearly, the divisiveness caused by the Vietnam war among the people of these United States is having its effect on many within the armed services. However, one aspect of this morale situation which has not been widely revealed or understood is the matter of attempted subversion of the men in uniform by militant extremists of the far left. These include, of course, those with Marxist-Leninist leanings who actually seek a Communist victory in Asia and hope to promote an American defeat or, at least, a humiliation of this country and its military forces.

There is reason to suspect that there is much exaggeration in what is being said and written about the plight of our Armed Forces in terms of morale but—at the same time—we know that where there is so much smoke there must be some fire. The House Committee on Internal Security, which I have the honor to Chair, became more knowledgeable of attempts to subvert the military during the extensive hearings the committee conducted in 1969 with respect to the Students for a Democratic Society. Some additional information along these lines came to light during our lengthy 1970 hearings on the Black Panther Party.

This year, as we turned our attention in hearings on the leadership of the National Peace Action Coalition and the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice—the organizations which coordinated and conducted the large antiwar demonstrations of last spring—even more evidence came to light showing that Marxists of the Communist Party U.S.A. variety and those of the Trotskyite variety were instrumental in developing ways to reach and try to undermine the morale and loyalty of America's fighting men.

To date, it appears, these efforts have had but limited success—an unquestioned credit to the fundamental character and good sense of the Nation's servicemen. But because of the insidious nature of the attempts and the great potential for harm the House Committee on Internal Security today agreed the subject merited closer scrutiny. To obviate any duplication of effort or conflict of jurisdiction, I have conferred with the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the Honorable W. C. DANIEL who is chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Recruitment and Retention. While we are each mindful of the mandate and responsibilities of our respective committees, we will closely coordinate in order to preclude overlap and duplication.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge anyone wishing to be heard on this subject to contact the office of the Chief Counsel of the House Committee on Internal Security promptly for we are most interested in obtaining all information pertinent to our inquiry.

As our committee commences this probe, initial research shows that the "GI Movement" is the term used by the radical left to refer to that aspect of the antiwar movement directed against the military. There are numerous organizations involved in the GI Movement—ranging from those originated and promoted by the old left, such as the GI's United—backed by the Trotskyite Communist Socialist Workers Party—SWP—and its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA—to those which appear to be simply against continued involvement in the Vietnam war, such as the Concerned Officers Movement. There are about six major groups in the movement and many small, localized groups.

The groups in the GI Movement which preliminary data indicates have revolu-

MONS 031476