

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Senate amendment to the title of H.R. 4378 is agreed to. There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the legislation just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 29, 1986.

Hon. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5, Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit sealed envelopes received from the White House as follows:

(1) At 5:30 p.m. on Friday, September 26, 1986 and said to contain a message from the President in accordance with the Impoundment Control Act of 1974; and

(2) At 5:30 p.m. on Friday, September 26, 1986 and said to contain H.R. 3247, an Act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1987 through 1990, and a veto message thereon; and

(3) At 9:25 p.m. on Friday, September 26, 1986 and said to contain H.R. 4868, an Act to prohibit loans to, other investments in, and certain other activities with respect to, South Africa, and for other purposes, and a veto message thereon.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN J. GUTHRIE,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1986— VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States.

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 4868, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986. Title III of this bill would seriously impede the prospects for a peaceful end to apartheid and the establishment of a free and open society for all in South Africa.

This Administration has no quarrel with the declared purpose of this measure. Indeed, we share that pur-

pose: To send a clear signal to the South African Government that the American people view with abhorrence its codified system of racial segregation. Apartheid is an affront to human rights and human dignity. Normal and friendly relations cannot exist between the United States and South Africa until it becomes a dead policy. Americans are of one mind and one heart on this issue.

But while we vigorously support the purpose of this legislation, declaring economic warfare against the people of South Africa would be destructive not only of their efforts to peacefully end apartheid, but also of the opportunity to replace it with a free society.

The sweeping and punitive sanctions adopted by the Congress are targeted directly at the labor intensive industries upon which the victimized peoples of South Africa depend for their very survival. Black workers—the first victims of apartheid—would become the first victims of American sanctions.

Banning the import of sugar, for example, would threaten the livelihood of 23,000 black farmers. Banning the import of natural resources is a sanction targeted directly at the mining industries of South Africa, upon which more than half a million black laborers depend for their livelihood.

By prohibiting the importation of food and agricultural products, the measure would invite retaliation by South Africa, which since June has purchased over 160,000 tons of wheat from the United States. Denying basic foodstuffs to South Africa—much of which go to feed the black population—will only lead to privation, unrest, and violence. It will not advance the goals of peaceful change.

Are we truly helping the black people of South Africa—the lifelong victims of apartheid—when we throw them out of work and leave them and their families jobless and hungry in those segregated townships? Or are we simply assuming a moral posture at the expense of the people in whose name we presume to act?

This, then, is the first and foremost reason I cannot support this legislation. Punitive economic sanctions would contribute directly and measurably to the misery of people who already have suffered enough. Using America's power to deepen the economic crisis in this tortured country is not the way to reconciliation and peace. Black South Africans recognize that they would pay with their lives for the deprivation, chaos, and violence that would follow an economic collapse. That is why millions of blacks and numerous black leaders in South Africa are as firm in their opposition to sanctions as in their abhorrence of apartheid.

The imposition of punitive sanctions would also deliver a devastating blow to the neighboring states in southern Africa that depend on Pretoria for transportation, energy, markets, and

food. An estimated million-and-a-half foreign workers, legal and illegal, now live in South Africa. The number of people, women and children especially, outside South Africa who are dependent upon the remittances of these workers for their survival has been estimated to be over five million. Do we truly wish to be directly responsible for increased suffering, and perhaps starvation, in southern Africa? Do we truly wish our action to be the rational Pretoria invokes for expelling these workers? Do we truly wish to trigger a cycle of economic sanctions and counter-sanctions that end up crippling the economy of South Africa and devastating the economies of the frontline states? What sense does it make to send aid to those impoverished countries with one hand while squeezing their economies with the other?

Disrupting the South African economy and creating more unemployment will only fuel the tragic cycle of violence and repression that has gripped that troubled country. Black unemployment in South Africa in some areas is over 50 percent—and adding to it will create more anger, more violence, and more competition among blacks struggling to survive. It will not improve prospects for negotiations.

Another feature of the bill would require Administration to publicly identify within six months any and all nations that have chosen not to join us in observing the U.N. arms embargo against South Africa, "with a view to terminating United States military assistance to those countries." But the United States will not revert to a single-minded policy of isolationism, with its vast and unforeseen effects on our international security relationships, that would be dictated by the unilateral decisions of our allies. No single issue, no matter how important, can be allowed to override in this way all other considerations in our foreign policy. Our military relationships must continue to be based upon a comprehensive assessment of our national defense needs and the security of the West.

Not only does this legislation contain sweeping punitive sanctions that would injure most the very people we seek to help, the legislation discards our economic leverage, constricts our diplomatic freedom, and ties the hands of the President of the United States in dealing with a gathering crisis in a critical subcontinent where the Soviet Bloc—with its mounting investment of men and arms—clearly sees historic opportunity. Therefore, I am also vetoing the bill because it contains provisions that infringe on the President's constitutional prerogative to articulate the foreign policy of the United States.

There are, however, several features of the measure that the Administration supports. Title II of the bill, for example, mandates affirmative meas-

ures to eliminate apartheid and provide assistance to its victims, including support for black participation in business enterprises as owners, managers, and professionals. It authorizes the President to take steps for the purpose of assisting firms to fight apartheid and extend equal opportunity to blacks in investment, management, and employment. The bill also contains a number of other useful and realistic provisions, such as those calling upon the African National Congress (ANC) to reexamine its Communist ties mandating a report on the activities of the Communist Party in South Africa and the extent to which it has infiltrated South African political organizations. Still other portions of the bill call upon the ANC to condemn the practice of "necklacing" and terrorism and to state affirmatively that it will support a free and democratic post-apartheid South Africa. These provisions, as well as many others in the bill, reflect the agreement of the Congress and the Administration on important aspects of an overall anti-apartheid policy.

The Administration has been—and remains—prepared to work with the Congress to devise measures that manifest the American people's united opposition to apartheid—without injuring its victims. We remain ready to work with the Congress in framing measures that—like the 1962 U.S. embargo of military sales and the carefully targeted sanctions of my own Executive order of 1985—keep the United States at arms distance from the South African regime, while keeping America's beneficent influence at work bringing about constructive change within that troubled society and nation.

It remains my hope that the United States can work with its European allies to fashion a flexible and coordinated policy—consistent with their recent actions—for constructive change inside South Africa. I believe we should support their measures with similar executive actions of our own, and I will work with the Congress toward that goal. It remains my hope that, once again, Republicans and Democrats can come together on the common ground that, after all, we both share: An unyielding opposition both to the unacceptable doctrine of apartheid as well as the unacceptable alternative of Marxist tyranny—backed by the firm determination that the future of South Africa and southern Africa will belong to the free. To achieve that, we must stay and build, not cut and run.

That American should recoil at what their television screens bring them from South Africa—the violence, the repression, the terror—speaks well of us as a people. But the historic crisis in South Africa is not one from which the leading nation of the West can turn its back and walk away. For the outcome of that crisis has too great a bearing upon the future of Africa, the

future of NATO, the future of the West.

Throughout the postwar era, we Americans have succeeded when we left our partisan differences at the water's edge—and persevered; as we did in the rebuilding of Europe and Japan, as we are doing today in El Salvador. We have failed when we permitted our exasperation and anger and impatience at present conditions to persuade us to forfeit the future to the enemies of freedom.

Let us not forget our purpose. It is not to damage or destroy an economy, but to help the black majority of South Africa and southern Africa enjoy a greater share of the material blessings and bounties their labor has helped to produce—as they secure as well their legitimate political rights. That is why sweeping punitive sanctions are the wrong course to follow, and increased American and Western investment—by firms that are breaking down apartheid by providing equal opportunity for the victims of official discrimination—is the right course to pursue.

Our goal is a democratic system in which the rights of majorities, minorities, and individuals are protected by a bill of rights and firm constitutional guarantees.

RONALD REAGAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 26, 1986.

Mr. FASCELL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, that would be setting a precedent, and the Chair believes we should read the message.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the veto message.

□ 1750

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today the House casts a very significant vote. Those of you who listened to the veto message from the President did not hear anything new or different, and nothing has changed in South Africa since the time Congress first acted on

this bill. As a matter of fact, I think it is fair to say the situation continues to get worse.

I shall let others talk about the moral, political imperatives which make it necessary to take this legislative and resulting economic action. But suffice it to say, we need to express very clearly once again our feelings as Americans and as the institution representing the American people. We must express the feelings that we have with regard to apartheid; that we want to separate ourselves in every possible way from the actions of the South African Government and in support of principles that are democratic and not repressive.

The President can, of course, at any time issue an executive order. It does not have to be issued now. One would have to take into consideration the reasons issuing it at this time; and the reasons I think are quite obvious.

We do disagree, but this bill has been through the political process. It is overwhelmingly supported by both parties. So when you look at it in the cold light of day, it concerns the question of votes in the other body. That is the only difference that exists today, and that is, in my judgment and without being disrespectful in any way, the reason for this new executive order.

We, the President and the Congress, have come closer and closer on this issue every time it has come up. But I think the time has come and the time is today, to vote yes on this bill and send a clear and unified message on a bipartisan basis.

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

(Mr. BROOMFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all Americans stand united in their condemnation of apartheid and the human toll that results from this ghastly system of institutionalized racism.

The President spoke for all of us when he stated in his veto message Friday that "normal and friendly relations cannot exist between the United States and South Africa until it become a dead policy."

The United States is on the side of change in South Africa and against those who would maintain the status quo in that country. That is not to say that we are on the side of violence or those who advocate it.

It is my belief that constructive change in South Africa will come about not from the barrel of a gun or from the destruction of the South African economy.

The economy is the most effective force for change in South Africa that exists today.

We should strengthen it, not weaken it.

We should help to build a future for blacks throughout southern Africa.

We should not contribute to the destruction of the major vehicle for their liberation.

I do not consider this position to be dishonorable, as some in South Africa and here in the Congress seem to imply.

Archbishop Tutu has characterized President Reagan's as position "racist", apparently because the two men do not agree on the best way for the United States to encourage constructive change in South Africa. I object to this kind of name-calling. It is not only inflammatory, but does not contribute to a peaceful resolution of the South Africa tragedy. In fact, the archbishop owes the President an apology.

Many prominent anti-apartheid activists in South Africa disagree with the economic sanctions approach. Chief Buthelezi and Helen Suzman surely cannot be accused of racism, and yet opposition to economic sanctions is their position.

In instituting economic sanctions against South Africa—and in effect, all of southern Africa—the Congress would be ensuring the need for dramatically higher levels of foreign aid to most countries in the region. In an era when foreign aid is targeted for deep cuts, can we afford this? I do not think so.

The United States needs to effectively support the forces for peaceful, constructive change in South Africa. This can best be accomplished through joining with our allies in western Europe and with Canada and Japan in whatever actions we take.

For maximum effect, the western industrialized democracies must speak in one clear voice when addressing South Africa. To balkanize our policy response to South Africa reduces the impact we can have on the situation there.

As the President stated in his remarks Friday, "It remains my hope that the United States can work with its European allies to fashion a flexible and coordinated policy—consistent with their recent actions—for constructive change inside South Africa. I believe we should support their measures with similar executive actions of our own, and I will work with Congress toward that goal."

In my judgment, the administration has been dragging its feet. It should have more vigorously pursued this joint approach long ago. However, I believe the President is sincere in his desire to do so now, and he has my support in his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, the escalating violence in South Africa offers no solutions to the plight of blacks in that country. Similarly, doing violence to the economy of South Africa destroys the best change the country has for rapid change and an end to the system of apartheid.

The vote we will soon have to make today poses a dilemma.

On the one hand, we are frustrated by the slow pace of change in South Africa, by the continuing injustice of the apartheid system.

On the other hand, this bill is not a solution to the problem.

I again quote from the President's remarks:

Let us not forget our purpose. It is not to damage or destroy any economy, but to help the black majority of South Africa and southern Africa enjoy a greater share of the material blessings and bounties their labor has helped to produce—as they secure as well their legitimate political rights.

That is why sweeping punitive sanctions are the wrong course to follow, and increased American and western investment—by firms that are breaking down apartheid by providing equal opportunity for the victims of official discrimination—is the right course to pursue.

Our goal is a democratic system in which the rights of majorities, minorities, and individuals are protected by a Bill of Rights and firm constitutional guarantees.

In a letter to the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL, and myself, the President today outlined the contents of a new executive order he will soon sign which will encompass measures recently adopted by many of our allies. I believe this joint approach has a great deal of merit and a copy of the letter follows my remarks.

A few minutes ago, I talked to the President's national security advisor, Admiral Poindexter, who emphasized the importance at this difficult time of sustaining the President's authority. He also emphasized that the President is committed to assisting responsibly in resolving southern Africa's tragic dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this measure and sustain the President's veto.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, September 29, 1986.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Republican Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC

DEAR BOB: I understand and share the very strong feelings and sense of frustration in the Congress and in our Nation about apartheid, an unconscionable system that we all reject. The ongoing tragedy in South Africa tests our resolve as well as our patience. None of us wants to aggravate that tragedy.

In the last several months, the South African Government, instead of moving further down the once promising path of reform and dialogue, has turned to internal repression. We all know that South Africa's real problem traces to the perpetuation of apartheid. And we know that the solution to this problem can only be found in lifting the present State of Emergency, repealing all racially discriminatory laws, releasing political prisoners, and unbanning political parties—necessary steps opening the way for negotiations aimed at creating a new, democratic order for all South Africans. The South African Government holds the key to the opening of such negotiations. Emerging from discussion among South Africans, we want to see a democratic system in which the rights of majorities, minorities, and individuals are protected by a bill of rights and firm constitutional guarantees. We will be actively pursuing diplomatic opportunities and approaches in an effort to start a movement toward negotiations in South Africa.

I outlined in my message to the House of Representatives on Friday my reasons for vetoing the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, principally my opposition to punitive sanctions that harm the victims of apartheid and my desire to work in concert with our Allies. I also indicated in that message that I am prepared to sign an expanded Executive order that strongly signals our rejection of apartheid and our desire to actively promote rapid positive change in South Africa. I am prepared to expand the range of restrictions and other measures that will characterize our relations with South Africa. There would be strong sanctions in my new order, sanctions that I earnestly wish were unnecessary. These sanctions, directed at the enforcers not the victims of apartheid, encompass measures recently adopted by many of our Allies, as well as many elements of the original Senate Committee version of the bill. They are incontestably necessary in today's circumstances. My intention is to make it plain to South Africa's leaders that we cannot conduct business-as-usual with a government that mistakes the silence of racial repression for the consent of the governed.

My new Executive order will, therefore, reaffirm and incorporate the measures I imposed last year (i.e. bans on loans to the South African Government and its agencies, all exports of computers to apartheid-enforcing entities and the military and police, all nuclear exports except those related to health, safety, and IAEA programs, imports of South African weapons, the import of Krugerrands, and a requirement for all U.S. firms to apply fair labor standards based on the Sullivan principles). The Executive order will also add:

A ban on new investments other than those in black-owned firms or companies applying the fair labor standards of the Sullivan principles;

A ban on the imports from South Africa of iron and steel;

A ban on bank accounts for the South African Government and its agencies;

A requirement to identify countries taking unfair advantage of U.S. measures against South Africa with a view to restricting their exports to the United States by the amount necessary to compensate for the loss to U.S. companies;

A requirement to report and make recommendations on means of reducing U.S. dependence on strategic minerals from southern Africa;

A requirement to provide at least \$25 million in assistance for scholarships, education, community development, and legal aid to disadvantaged South Africans with a prohibition on such assistance to any group or individual who has been engaged in gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;

The imposition of severe criminal and civil penalties under several statutes for violation of the provisions of my Executive order;

A requirement to consult with Allies in order to coordinate policies and programs toward South Africa;

A requirement to report on whether any of these prohibitions has had the effect of increasing U.S. or allied dependence on the Soviet bloc for strategic or other critical materials, with a view to appropriate modifications of U.S. measures under my Executive order should such dependency have been increased;

And a clear statement that the Executive order constitutes a complete and comprehensive statement of U.S. policy toward South Africa, with the intent of preempting

inconsistent State and local laws which under our Constitution may be preempted.

Sanctions, in and of themselves, do not add up to a policy for South Africa and the southern Africa region. Positive steps as well as negative signals are necessary. This unusually complex and interrelated part of the world is one that cries out for better understanding and sympathy on our part. We must consider what we can do to contribute to development of healthy economies and democratic institutions throughout the region and to help those who are the victims of apartheid.

Following the Congress' lead and building on existing programs, I plan to expand our assistance to those suffering the cost of apartheid and to help blacks as they prepare to play their full role in a free South Africa. We spent \$20 million in FY 86 and have requested \$25 million in FY 87. We will do more, much of it along the lines incorporated in the South Africa bill.

I am also committed to present to the next Congress a comprehensive multi-year program designed to promote economic reform and development in the black-ruled states of southern Africa. We intend to seek the close collaboration of Japan and our European allies in this constructive effort. Our goal is to create a sound basis for a post-apartheid region—a southern Africa where democracy and respect for fundamental human rights can flourish.

I believe the United States can assist responsibly in resolving southern Africa's tragic dilemma. Many observers in and outside South Africa regard present trends with despair, seeing in them a bloody inevitability as positions harden over the central question of political power. This is a grim scenario that allows no free choice and offers a racial civil war as the only solution. It need not be so if wisdom and imagination prevail.

South Africans continue to search for solutions. Their true friends should help in this search. As I have said before, our humanitarian concerns and our other national interests converge in South Africa as in few other countries. With the actions I propose today, I believe it is clear that my Administration's intentions and those of the Congress are identical. May we unite so that U.S. foreign policy can be effective in bringing people of good will and imagination in South Africa together to rebuild a better, just, and democratic tomorrow.

Sincerely,

RONALD REAGAN.

□ 1800

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEMP].

(Mr. KEMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise with real sadness in my heart. All Americans and particularly those of us in this body have to deal with an issue that is vexing, not only to this body but to parliamentary democratic bodies all over the world. I hope folks listened to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], who made a very thoughtful and positive contribution to this debate.

I hope that one's motives are not challenged for taking a position that seems to, on the surface, look somehow insensitive to an evil that is being

practiced in South Africa, the problem of apartheid. We cannot be insensitive to evil and I share the view that pressure on South Africa is essential to the ending of this evil of apartheid.

The gentleman from Michigan reminded us, Mr. Speaker, that all of us who want to dismantle apartheid have to give thought to how we do that without dismantling the economy of the country, how we can help lead a peaceful transition from the evil of apartheid to the justice of democracy and freedom, and equal opportunity for all people in South Africa.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that constructive engagement is enough, and we need to move beyond constructive engagement. I would hope that our country could establish the type of a moral climate of diplomacy as we did under Camp David, between Israel and Egypt, to bring black and white together in South Africa, to bring down apartheid and those barriers that exist to freedom, dignity, and democracy.

I do not see how we, as Members of this Congress, who will next year celebrate the 200th anniversary of the American Constitution, can do anything less than to speak out and to help put pressure on South Africa to help bring down this practice so abhorrent to all men and women of good will and liberal democratic values.

But I want to say as a matter of conscience that I do not think that disinvestment is the answer. I do not think that preventing new investment is the answer, Mr. Speaker. Frankly, one of the most liberal institutions in South Africa, other than the church, is that led by those men and women who are trying to conduct business or abide by the Sullivan principles which were codified by this body; incidentally, I am very proud to have helped codify those Sullivan principles in an earlier vote on this issue last year.

I hope, as we look for solutions, that we give some thought to what takes place subsequent to apartheid and how we can bring about property rights, political rights, democratic rights and equal rights for blacks for all people in South Africa; and so I am going to support the veto; but want to make it very clear that I think we need to move, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BROOMFIELD) pointed out, beyond constructive engagement, and help make sure that while we take steps to dismantle this evil that we do it in such a way as we help lead to the peaceful transition to democracy, that all men and women of good will want to see occur.

Mr. Speaker, at Camp David we saw a President of your party, President Carter, bring together the leaders of two sovereign nations, which had been long and bitter foes. They reached a peace once thought impossible. As I said, I hope we could do the same for South African blacks.

The hour is not too late—indeed the time is now—for new American leadership in South Africa—leadership that rejects the way of division and violence, and that reaches out to all people willing to work for a just and democratic society. We need a "third force" strategy that rejects communism, and apartheid.

But the President must have our support. We can begin today by standing with him against punitive sanctions, and uniting to help bring a peaceful end to apartheid that will put the United States on the right side of history.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RUDD].

(Mr. RUDD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUDD. Mr. Speaker, supporters of the South Africa sanctions package say that we need to send a moral signal to South Africa about our outrage over apartheid. But we have sent that signal and although most reforms have been recent, the reforms have been made and the culture of South Africa is in a state of change.

So what are we doing with these sanctions? The European nations have agreed on a set of sanctions and President Reagan is expected to follow suit this week to comply with their sanctions that are more severe than our own. Numerous polls have shown that the people of South Africa, both black and white, are opposed to any of these sanctions because it will cripple the economy upon which they both depend for survival.

In fact, the bill that was vetoed by the President will devastate the black population, the very people we are trying to help. It will also hurt the estimated 500,000 blacks attempting to immigrate to South Africa annually. They come to South Africa because of the economic opportunity there and that directly benefits their own economically troubled countries like Zimbabwe, who, through growing Marxist practices, are destroying their own economies. In Zimbabwe, a state of emergency has existed for 6 years. And where also as many people were massacred by government troops in Matabeleland in 1983 as have died in all the racial violence in South Africa these past 2 years. Yet this same Congress that voted economic sanctions against South Africa has annually approved economic assistance for Mr. Mugabe.

The bill before us today bans the import into the United States of South African agriculture commodities and products. This will result in a loss of 446,000 jobs to support 2.2 million workers and their families. It will ban the import of South African coal, iron and steel. This will result in another loss of at least 145,000 jobs that support 725,000 workers and their

families. The bottom line is a loss of 600,000 jobs that provide the livelihood for more than 3 million South African black workers and their families—15 percent of the entire black population. Such unemployment will only lead to more black misery and radicalization seriously reducing the chances for a free and prosperous postapartheid South Africa.

Despite the claims of supporters of sanctions, the pain would not be felt by the South African Government. Pretoria recently announced that it had been stockpiling strategic materials for the last 10 years, in preparation for just such sanctions. Clearly, then, sanctions will not achieve their purported purpose: they will not send a moral signal—one has already been sent—and they will not force the South African Government to do anything more than they are physically able to do.

What is needed instead is a strategy to increase Western contact with and therefore influence with South Africa. The United States, should not withdraw investment from South Africa; rather it should increase western investment there, while continuing to place diplomatic pressure on Pretoria. Sanctions will result in a weakening of Western influence for positive and peaceful change and will lead to further political polarizations that can only benefit those forces seeking a radical and non-Democratic outcome. Therefore, we in Congress, should vote today to sustain the President's veto, and continue through other productive means to speed the demise of apartheid in South Africa.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely disappointed that our President has once again failed to seize an opportunity to embrace the consensus of the Congress, of the American people and of the world with regard to South Africa by not signing the sanctions bill which Congress recently overwhelmingly adopted.

Nations all around the world are expressing their condemnation of apartheid, and yet this administration had to be pushed and prodded by the Congress to take any action to put this country on record against the South African system of apartheid.

Bishop Desmond Tutu said on Sunday, and I agree, that President Reagan will be judged harshly by history for his veto of tough economic sanctions legislation against South Africa.

Indeed the President's refusal to act fairly with the black population of South Africa is preparing a sorrowful place in history for the United States. If we follow the President, we do so knowing that, years down the road, South Africans will remember that our Nation, which is a beacon of hope for liberty, justice, and equality, stood by this time and did nothing.

Mr. Speaker, it is our responsibility and our great privilege in this House to reflect the fundamental beliefs of the American people and make sure they are embodied in our Nation's policies. There is no more fundamental belief and no greater goal our people strive for than the principle of the equality of man. Our foreign policy should reflect that goal.

Take a stand with the American people on behalf of all the people of South Africa. Vote for freedom. Vote for equality. Vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, the President's position seems to be that the adoption of this legislation would hurt the very people we are trying to help in South Africa.

If President Reagan had evinced any sympathy in the past for the black majority in South Africa, this might have some credibility. As it is, his expressions of concern make crocodile tears seem like Perrier water.

If the black leadership in South Africa were opposed to sanctions, it would constitute a compelling argument against this legislation; but in view of the fact that the overwhelming majority of black leaders; Nelson Mandela, Oliver Tambo, Bishop Tutu, The Reverend Boesak; and black organizations like the United Democratic Front, the Council of Churches, the Conference of Bishops, and virtually all of the organized black independent labor unions in the country are also in favor of sanctions.

It seems to me that the President's position in opposition to this legislation is an act of incredible moral arrogance and supreme political cynicism because he is in effect saying that he knows better than they do what is in their own best interests.

Some have argued that there is no need for this legislation and we should sustain the veto, because the President is about to issue a new Executive order; but there is no relationship between the Executive order and the bill; the Executive order is a counterfeit version of the legislation.

Unlike the bill, it does not prohibit new investment or new loans in South Africa. It does not prohibit agricultural or textile imports. It does not provide for the transfer of the sugar quota from South Africa to the Philippines. It does not prohibit landing rights for South African Airways.

The total economic impact of the bill on South Africa is \$3.6 billion, the impact of the Executive order would only be \$267 million.

If this vote is sustained, there will be praise in Pretoria and sadness in Soweto; and consequently, I ask you to override the President's veto and vote for the enactment of the legislation.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEVINE].

(Mr. LEVINE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1810

Mr. LEVINE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the vote to override President Reagan's veto of H.R. 4868, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986.

I am not surprised by the President's action. First, through his failed policy of constructive engagement, and most recently behind a smokescreen of professed concerns for the well-being of South African workers, this administration has done everything it can to frustrate efforts to impose tough economic sanctions.

Mr. Speaker, one would have hoped that the administration might have been swayed by the overwhelming bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress that supported H.R. 4868; by the desire of the American people to see our Government take strong and unambiguous steps against the odious Pretoria regime; by the support for sanctions by South Africa's black leadership; and by the knowledge of the key leadership role the United States—the leader of the free world—could take in the struggle against apartheid through the implementation of sanctions.

Alas, such was not to be the case. The administration remained unmoved, with its feet stuck in cement and its head stuck in the sand, as one of the most important moral struggles of our time—the battle against apartheid—passed it by.

The potential fallout from the Reagan veto is particularly troubling. Even the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—usually a strong supporter of the administration—stated after the veto that this action, if sustained, would make the United States “apologists for apartheid,” regardless of Presidential protestations to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, as the saying goes, actions speak louder than words, and the Reagan veto—of a weaker bill than this body originally passed—represents a flagrant disregard for the will of Congress and the American people, and for the plight of those in South Africa suffering under the yoke of apartheid. As the senior Senator from my own State of California, ALAN CRANSTON, said several days ago, “The President is sacrificing and damaging America's moral leadership in the World.”

Frankly, I would have preferred a tougher sanctions bill. I am not convinced that these sanctions will have a meaningful impact on the South African economy. However, the great need for some action, combined with the powerful symbolism which accompanies the imposition of sanctions, compels me to support this bill.

The administration rationale for the veto is that sanctions hurt those they

are designed to help, namely, South African blacks. We have heard this argument before, and we should dismiss it. It is merely a cover for continuing the failed policy of constructive engagement.

Mr. Speaker, the case for sanctions against South Africa now is compelling. The moral case for such action is overpowering. American interest and American values are at stake. The South African Government must realize that no amount of force can control the aspirations of millions to be free. We must do all that we can to ensure that black South Africans are free, free from tyranny and free from fear, and that they are free to determine their own destiny. Overriding the President's veto will set forces in motion which will assist that process, and will represent a repudiation of the Reagan approach. I urge my colleagues to vote for the override.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto.

This administration's policy on South Africa is clear. President Reagan wants to do as little as possible, as late as possible.

For 5½ years, the Reagan administration has been soft on South Africa. Over and over we have heard soothing words about quiet diplomacy, constructive engagement, and restraint.

Is this the kind of language that the South African Government understands? Did that Government use restraint in detaining over 5,000 men, women and children under the state of emergency declared this past June? Have the South African police used restraint as they fired shotgun blasts at unarmed demonstrators—and then attacked the funerals of the people they killed? Was South Africa thinking of constructive engagement when it starved the people of Lesotho into submission, overthrew their government, and installed a quisling regime?

Since the collapse of Nazi Germany, South Africa has been the only country on Earth whose legal and political system is based on explicit, systematic, and all-encompassing racial discrimination. It is the only country that occupies a United Nations trust territory—Namibia—in violation of international law.

South Africa has an unparalleled record of aggression against its neighbors. It has mounted air and ground attacks against Botswana, Zimbabwe, Mozambique, Swaziland, Angola, and Zambia, killing hundreds of people and causing some \$10 billion in damage. South Africa, the richest power in the region, has done more than any other to keep its neighbors destitute.

South Africa has shown its contempt for quiet diplomacy and constructive engagement. We have no choice but to show a firmer hand.

Last year President Reagan stopped a sanctions bill with a token Executive order. This year he waited until the last minute to veto a strong antiapartheid bill.

The days of too little, too late are over. The President's veto won't stop this bill. We will override his veto in both houses of this Congress. This is one bill that won't get lost in the last-minute crunch.

There is a growing consensus in this country. In cities and towns and State legislatures across America, people are saying no to apartheid. They are saying no to institutionalized racism. Now we in the Congress are joining that consensus. We must take the necessary action to bring about progressive change in South Africa now.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington, Mr. MILLER.

(Mr. MILLER of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I respect the President's leadership on foreign affairs. Most of what he has done to promote American pride and the cause of freedom abroad I have supported.

But on this issue I cannot support him. On South Africa, the President is wrong.

It all comes down to this—the United States, the leader of the free world in the struggle against Fascist and Communist oppression, must also be a leader in the struggle against racist oppression.

What we say and do here today could help determine whether South Africans are forced to choose between an existing racist police state and a looming communist dominated revolution—or whether there is a third choice—a democratic peaceful alternative.

Our place is with all South Africans who seek that third choice.

Mr. Speaker, we should override the President's veto.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

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

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the President's veto.

The proponents of sanctions against South Africa seem to regard this action as a major initiative, a "shot heard 'round the world." It is instead a shot in our own foot.

Our farmers are faced with a lingering crisis. One of our few positive trade balances in agriculture is with South Africa. Next year—without sanctions—we expect \$292 million in exports to that nation, in wheat, rice, corn, cotton, barley, oil, seeds, and animal products. With sanctions, we stand to lose that market to other suppliers.

In 1984, we exported \$151.5 million in computer and telecommunications equipment.

Again, sanctions will mean the loss of this market to other countries.

We are also plagued with a depressed oil economy. The United States currently exports \$50 million in petroleum products to South Africa. Sanctions will thus mean even fewer profits and jobs in our hard-hit oil-producing States.

South Africa is a major buyer of United States aircraft. Purchasing \$242 million in planes and equipment in 1983. Again, another American industry is targeted for losses thanks to sanctions.

To add insult to injury, we are also making ourselves liable for litigation. The sanctions bill calls for immediate suspension of the South African airline's landing rights. Our current, in force air agreement requires 12 months notification of termination. An immediate suspension thus gives South Africa an opportunity to sue for damages and reparations.

In all these instances, the intended "victim" is South Africa, but the actual victim is the United States taxpayer. We stand to worsen the plight of farmers, energy producers, and aerospace and high-technology industries. And any damages awarded as a result of breaking a contract must also be born by the taxpayers.

It is obvious that the noble intention of taking a positive stand for human rights has been lost in the harsh reality of this mistaken legislation. South Africa can locate alternative sources and options. We stand to lose much more. Are all those other nations rushing to impose sanctions going to take up the slack and buy our products?

There is also the question of the effects of this legislation on South Africa. The danger to the South African economy, and especially to black workers, looms at least as large as to us. Thousands of jobs are dependent upon U.S. business and investment.

More crucial, however, is the political impact. Sanctions are but one more attempt to destabilize the South African Government. The hidden agenda behind sanctions is not so much reform or human rights as it is the overthrow of a pro-West government which is taking steps to become more democratic and ensure greater freedom for all its citizens.

This, of course, is nothing new. We have been down this road before. In 1965, the White minority-controlled Government of Rhodesia declared its independence from Britain. Because there was no provision at that time to transfer power to the majority blacks, sanctions were imposed. This was followed, in 1968, by a U.N.-sponsored trade embargo. The United States dutifully went along and, among other items, stopped buying Rhodesian chrome. After all, this was in the name of human rights. We subsequently obtained chrome from the Soviet Union—at three times the price, and we know how wonderful their human rights record is.

By the late 1970's, revolution threatened Rhodesia. We heard many voices here in the United States raised in support of Robert Mugabe, head of one of the largest black political parties, the Zimbabwe African National Union. Others voiced concern that Mugabe was a Soviet puppet who would destroy Zimbabwe-Rhodesia rather than save it. But we were so concerned about the outward appearance of "human rights" that we lost our sense of perspective. Today, 6 years after assuming

power, Mugabe has been waging incessant warfare on other blacks; some 6,000 have been killed in the past 2 years. And the economy, once robust and boasting the highest standard of living for Blacks on the African Continent—that distinction, ironically, now belongs to South Africa—has been ravaged.

Is this what we have in mind for South Africa? Replace Mugabe with Nelson Mandela, replace the ZANU, with the ANC—African National Congress—the similarities are striking. And ominous.

The President has valiantly stood his ground against this travesty. It may very well be like trying to stop a runaway train, but this member, at least, is proud that the President is standing firm for principles. We don't need any symbolic act of self-immolation, or of throwing—once more—an ally to the wolves. It is time we aim straight and stop shooting ourselves in the foot.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this attempt to override the President's veto of H.R. 4868. Let me make it clear that I am in complete agreement with those that say that apartheid is an affront to human rights and dignity. In fact, I voted with the majority of the Members of this House for last year's bill, which imposed a number of restrictions on our dealings with the South African Government.

However, the bill before us today simply goes too far, and unduly interferes with the President's ability to conduct our foreign policy. Beyond that, I just don't believe that the sanctions contained in the bill will have the effect that its sponsors anticipate.

In the Philippines, we supported successfully a peaceful transition from autocratic rule to a democracy through our great political leverage over the Marcos government. But, this does not parallel the situation in South Africa. Our already limited political and economic influence over the South Africans will be further reduced by the punitive sanctions contained in this bill. We will not end apartheid any faster by exerting this type of economic pressure, because the South Africans will simply withdraw, as they have always done in the past, and become more self-sufficient and less amenable to outside persuasion.

Further, the disruption to the South African economy caused by these sanctions will serve to support the efforts of the Communist-dominated ANC in their attempt to violently overthrow the current government.

In essence these sanctions will create more black unemployment, reduce the influence of the forces of moderation that are working for peaceful change, and fuel the tragic cycle of violence gripping South Africa.

This is a clear case of bowing to the passions of the moment by cutting off our nose to spite our face. Only it is not our noses that will suffer from our actions, it is the good people, black and white, in South Africa who will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I come before this House today with a heavy heart. It's not easy to come to this floor and ask Members to oppose the President of the United States, the President of my party. But today I must.

I went to South Africa 27 years ago. I saw firsthand the deprivation and brutal conditions under which blacks were forced to live. I saw black people restricted to so-called homelands that weren't fit for cattle. I saw black people branded with passbooks that had to be on their person at all times, or God save them from the consequences. And 27 years later, what has changed? Ten years after Soweto, what has changed? Five years after constructive engagement, what has changed?

Nothing has changed, Mr. Speaker, nothing. Blacks are still second-class, or really third-class citizens in their own country. So-called radicals are still jailed in the name of preserving law and order. And the hopes of those seeking peaceful change and justice are still snuffed out like a candle in a gale.

The bill before us today is already a compromise. It's a far cry from the divestment bill that this House approved, and that I supported, in June. And it's a far cry from the divestment bill signed into law recently by the Republican Governor of California. We can compromise on sanctions no further. Now is the moment for every Member of this House to dig down deep within his or her convictions and vote to hold the line on South Africa. Sanctions will hurt, but from Archbishop Tutu to the Eminent Persons Group, the call has gone out for sanctions as the last, best hope to avert a potential bloodbath in South Africa.

So I stand before this House with a heavy heart, because I think America should speak with one voice on this issue. I beg Members, I plead with you—do the right thing, do the just thing, do the only proper thing and vote to override. Yes, Mr. Speaker, sanctions will hurt, but apartheid kills. Sanctions yes, apartheid no. Vote to override.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

(Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the President on Friday evening in his veto message said black workers, the first victims of apartheid, would

become the first victims of American sanctions.

I believe today we have an opportunity to provide a moral and diplomatic wakeup call for a President who does not understand the issue.

Black South Africans are already the victims; they are suffering under apartheid and they know that sanctions may hurt, but they also know that apartheid kills. Over 130 per month this year.

Why is it today we are having such a difficult time understanding that? I cannot for the life of me understand why our President will not listen to the majority, to the Desmond Tutus, to the mine workers, to the black labor leaders, to the Soweto mothers? And why does he listen to P.W. Botha, who says to us the blacks will suffer. Second, the President said the neighboring states will suffer. Well, the neighboring states have issued a joint communique including, some of them having imposed their own sanctions. They know what is in their best interests. Is it not interesting that we know what is in their best interests better than they do?

Then finally the President said we would just be morally posturing. Well, let me tell you something, my friends: Sometime we need to feel good about who we are, what we stand for and what we participate in. And that is why in 20 nations around the world we have imposed sanctions. We did not ask about the victims in Nicaragua, we did not ask about the victims in Cuba, Libya, Poland, Afghanistan or Iran. Why? Because we wanted to stand for something.

Let me tell you something else to those who are concerned about Marxism. This Congressman is concerned about Marxism, too, but you do not stop the spread of communism by supporting racism.

Today we have a choice. We can stand with P.W. Botha and apartheid and Ronald Reagan, or we can stand with the American people, we stand for our ideals and send a wakeup call.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

(Mr. CRANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's veto of H.R. 4868, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986. Like the President, I agree with the declared purpose of this measure, but fear the impact of imposing punitive economic sanctions against South Africa. Pressure can be brought to bear against the system of apartheid in South Africa without threatening to destroy the entire economy of southern Africa.

Proponents of sanctions claim that this legislation will make a political statement against apartheid. In reality, it is more likely to bring about increased unemployment, starvation,

social unrest, and ultimately, violence. Thus, while Congress votes to morally clear its conscience, the blacks in all of southern Africa will suffer the economic consequences.

For example, the provision that bans the import into the United States of South African agricultural products and commodities will cost 446,000 black jobs that support some 2.2 million workers and their families. At the same time, a similar ban on the export of United States agricultural products to South Africa will negatively impact an already depressed American farming industry. The United States maintains a trade surplus in agriculture with South Africa. Some \$300 million in U.S. exports of wheat, rice, corn, cotton, barley, oil seeds, and animal products would be prohibited at the expense of making a political statement. I hope that those Members representing farming districts can justify this additional blow to the American farmer as the elections approach.

Recent statistics indicate that this legislation will result in the loss of some 800,000 jobs for blacks in South Africa. Each of these displaced workers is likely to support a family of five, thereby impacting about 4 million blacks in South Africa. The economic ramifications of this legislative effort is even more extensive when one considers that the economy of southern Africa is closely tied to that of South Africa. Estimates warn that 2 million blacks, supporting about 10 million people, could lose their jobs as a result of this bill. Are the proponents of this bill prepared to shoulder this responsibility?

What is even more distressing, is that these sanctions are not likely to bring about a more representative and free society. The only political system that can possibly emerge from this economic chaos will be a one-party, pro-Soviet, dictatorship. The seeds of a Communist Party have already been planted in South Africa. Let's not be responsible for fostering and nurturing the growth of this movement.

I urge my colleagues to vote responsibly and support the President. We can bring about positive change in South Africa without economically destroying the entire region.

At this time I insert for the record an editorial written by Patrick Buchanan, assistant to the President and White House Director of Communications, which appeared in the New York Times, September 18, 1986.

DESTROY SOUTH AFRICA TO SAVE IT?

(By Patrick J. Buchanan)

WASHINGTON.—On television, you don't sense the daily squalor, the filth, the dehumanizing way people are just thrown together," said a stunned Archbishop of Canterbury, as he toured the Crossroads squatters camp near Cape Town. "It's so much more dramatically squalid than I had expected."

Yes, it is—and these impoverished workers who came to Cape Town in search of jobs will be the first fatalities of the economic

war that Congress has just declared upon South Africa.

Why are we doing this? Because, comes the arch reply, we want to stand up against Botha's regime—and stand with all the people of South Africa. But the people of South Africa, black and white, are opposed to sanctions. According to The Sunday Times of London, a plurality of blacks and virtually the entire white population is begging us not to join this international cartel to cripple the economy upon which they both depend for survival.

Congressional sanctions are targeted directly at South Africa's mining industry, where some 600,000 blacks are employed. Shut down those mines, and the dependent families of migrant workers could starve back home in Malawi and Mozambique. Will these black laborers then think better of the United States? When the Xhosa and Zulu peoples, confined in their segregated townships, are also jobless and hungry, will we all sleep better in Chevy Chase and Georgetown?

Suppose, during the Great Depression, Britain declared she would lead a worldwide boycott of American steel and coal until President Roosevelt desegregated the South and moved America to one-man, one-vote. Would the destitute American workers have welcomed that as the act of a trusted and reliable friend?

Sanctions will advance democracy, our legislators insist. But is so, why are lifelong South African democrats like Helen Suzman and Alan Paton so passionately opposed to them? Why is every antidemocratic element—from the South African Communist Party to the Soviet bloc—demanding their imposition?

And if sanctions advanced democracy, why not impose them upon Zimbabwe, where Prime Minister Robert Mugabe is moving toward a single-party Marxist state, where the state of emergency has lasted six years, where perhaps as many people were massacred by Government troops in Matabeleland in 1983 as have died in all the racial violence in South Africa these past two years? Yet, the same Congress that voted economic sanctions against South Africa has annually approved economic assistance for Mr. Mugabe.

Well, sanctions are designed to make a political and moral statement, we are told. But what political message is sent when the world's richest nation sets about systematically destroying the economy of a developing country that has done no harm to the United States? What moral message is sent when Congress votes to close down to South African Airways the same airports we are opening up to Aeroflot?

When Senator Malcolm Wallop urged the Senate, in the name of some moral symmetry, to impose upon the Soviet Union the same sanctions we impose upon South Africa, moderate Republicans threw in with liberal Democrats to defeat him.

"How can anyone who favors sanctions for Nicaragua oppose them for South Africa?" the press asks.

The answer is simple. While South Africa's racial sins (like our own) are scarlet, she has not adopted as her ruling ideology the century's most odious form of tyranny over the mind of man; she has not endorsed the decade's most monstrous crime—Afghanistan; she has not converted her territory into a staging area for the export of Communist revolution; she has not aligned herself with a regime that has 9,000 ballistic missile warheads pointed at the United States.

South Africa has never sought to be an enemy of the American people. In two World Wars and Korea, her soldiers fought

alongside ours. When American pilots attacked the terrorist base camps of Col. Muammar el-Qaddafi, South Africa was almost alone among third world nations to applaud the American action.

What have the people of South Africa done to us that we are now anxious to collude with the most despotic regimes on earth in waging economic war against them? Is it necessary to destroy this country in order to save it?

Surely, Americans can "make a statement" against the discredited doctrine of apartheid without adding to the suffering of its victims. Surely, Americans can manifest their distaste for Pretoria's racial policies without collaborating with a jackal pack of hypocritical despots and Marxists, whose ambition is to bring down the South African republic.

While the Senate clamors for sanctions and the House demands total economic withdrawal—lest we be morally tainted by contact with such a country—Cuban troops, East German secret police, North Korean military advisers and Soviet "diplomats" continue to arrive in neighboring states. Serious men, their agenda does not include power-sharing in Pretoria or desegregating the lunch counters of Durban.

At times, it seems a just God has turned His face against Africa. In the first quarter century of independence, tens of thousands perished in civil wars in Angola and Mozambique and Chad and the Sudan, perhaps a million in Nigeria. Hundreds of thousands died in tribal massacres in Rwanda, Burundi and Uganda. Countless thousands succumbed to barbarism in Equatorial Guinea and the Central African "Empire." Millions have starved in the Sahel region; and in Ethiopia, the greatest human rights holocaust since the fall of Cambodia continues to unfold. Yet no Western moralists clamor for sanctions against these regimes. No Congressman has been sighted lumbering up toward the Ethiopian Embassy to get himself arrested signing "We Shall Overcome."

One wonders exactly which country on the continent Congress wishes South Africa to emulate. Which government in the neighborhood should serve as role model for the South African republic, so that she, like so many of them, can qualify for Western approbation and aid?

"Black Africa has become a theatre of barbarism and exported political sentimentality," writes Bruce Anderson in The Spectator. "Throughout the continent, 'governments' are robbing, oppressing, incarcerating, flogging, torturing and murdering their subjects—but no one in the West gives a damn."

Comes now the Congress of the United States to counsel us that social justice will be advanced on this bleeding patch of earth—if only President Reagan will join hands in choking off the last industrial engine operating on the African continent.

The answer is no. As President Reagan told the world weeks ago, we Americans will not be a party to something like that.

"We know no spectacle so ridiculous as the British public on one of its periodical fits of morality," wrote Thomas Babington Macaulay, a century and a half ago. Unfortunately, Lord Macaulay never got inside the Beltway.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CARNEY].

(Mr. CARNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I stand to express my disapproval of the Presi-

dent's veto of H.R. 4868, Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986.

The United States has expressed its outrage over apartheid—failing a response from Pretoria—we must express out sentiments in stronger language. For the United States to be a credible voice in Africa and the Third World, we must speak and act plainly. Our opposition to apartheid should be viewed as sincere and tangible.

I regard the President's policy of constructive engagement as a valid attempt to address the repressive and segregatory apartheid. Unfortunately, the reality is that Pretoria has not responded to our efforts in a manner acceptable of an ally. To the contrary, the situation is only deteriorating. Judging from the amount of time this policy has been in effect, and Pretoria's intransigent response to our patient diplomatic efforts, I now feel that the United States must take a stronger stance on this issue and send a more powerful message of disapproval to the South African Government.

I continue to believe that by accepting the Senate version of this bill, we will not be "washing our hands of South Africa," as some more radical proponents of disengagement would suggest. We must retain a voice in that country's affairs and use it constructively. The sanctions offered in the bill send a strong message of disapproval, but are not a punitive strike which will further inflame the situation in that state.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, once these sanctions are in place, we cannot turn our backs on the South African citizens nor the South African Government in the belief that we have done all that we can do. Congress must have a long-term commitment to the resolution of this dilemma, and to bringing about a just and lasting peace to this troubled nation.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

(Mr. MINETA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, on September 26, 1986, the President of the United States vetoed the Comprehensive Antiapartheid Act. In doing so, he turned his back on the millions of South Africans who are crusading for the freedom and justice now denied to them by their Government. Indeed, the President of the United States used the prestige and power of his office to sentence millions of South Africans to a life of terror and oppression.

Now, it is up to the Congress—with the full backing and support of the American people—to overturn this indecent decision by the President.

The Congress did not easily reach the decision to impose economic sanctions on South Africa, knowing as we do the severity of such a policy. But, the intransigence of the South African Government and their rock-solid com-

mitment to apartheid leaves us no alternative. What moral suasion do we have left? The elegant rhetoric and mild rebukes used thus far have produced no discernible progress, and no promises that conditions will improve tomorrow or the next day or the day after. Without this legislation, we have no policy in place to end apartheid. On the contrary, our inactivity breathes new life into a regime that understands all too well empty gestures and unkept promises.

Ours is a nation which treasures justice; and, just as we have fought oppression at home, so must we reject a regime that would perpetuate oppression elsewhere. The South African Government is not my ally and it is not America's ally. The Government spreads more evil than it can contain. The South African Government is not our bulwark against communism nor is it a guarantee of stability. No good can come of a morally corrupt regime.

Therefore, let us not hesitate to act as one nation against apartheid. We must not cede to any President the right to seal the fate of millions to a life of poverty, of humiliation, and worst of all, of hopelessness.

We can be proud when Congress overrides the President's veto. But, we can celebrate only when all South Africans are free. And so, let us begin. Let us repudiate the President's tragic policy toward South Africa.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] a member of the committee.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1825

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

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

(Mr. McGRATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the efforts to override the President's veto of the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, punitive sanctions are a form of economic warfare that will be felt not just by the white government, but by the labor intensive industries which provide the jobs, the food, clothing, and shelter for millions of black workers.

Standing over here, with our won civil rights battles hardly over, and pointing our sanctimonious finger at South Africa certainly makes us feel good—it nourishes our supply of self-righteousness—but it moves that tragic land closer to bloody, bloody revolution, and farther away from any evolutionary solution.

What's more, we lose influence and leverage with the Government of South Africa, and leave them to confront those organized revolutionary forces such as the African National

Congress to whom free enterprise is as distasteful as apartheid.

In overriding the President's veto, we turn a deaf ear to the moderate black leaders such as Chief Buthelezi, and Helen Suzman who point out the fatal flaws in a program of punitive sanctions, all the while living under and condemning apartheid as no American can do.

We are rushing in exactly the wrong direction—what is needed is more and more investment which could result in the integration of the work place and the economic betterment of those now in poverty, and accomplish in the factories what ultimately must be accomplished in the nation as a whole.

We should be encouraging the dispossessed blacks to become urbanized, and by working in industry become an indispensable element of the South African economy. Political power will follow as it did to those blacks who migrated to the cities of America during and after World War II.

As many of you vote to override the President, let me express the forlorn hope that some day the citizens of the Soviet Union can organize labor unions and go on strike as they have in South Africa, and that Andrei Sakharov and other victims of the religious apartheid that is institutionalized in the Soviet Union can come and go from Russia as easily as Bishop Tutu can leave and reenter South Africa.

Let us await the millennium when those forces which are unyielding in the face of apartheid spend one-tenth the moral energy on human rights throughout the continent of Africa—starting with Ethiopia and working their way down the map.

The feeding frenzy is on. We all scramble to take the moral high ground. But we are to become engines in a tragedy we will live to regret.

I will support the President's veto as the correct, and yes, the moral choice.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

(Mr. LEVIN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. FAZIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's veto and in support of the override.

Mr. Speaker, in vetoing this legislation, President Reagan has said no to justice, no to civil liberties, and no to the principle of freedom which each of us in this country holds dear.

He has said yes to more oppression, yes to more injustice, and yes to more violence.

But this House must override the President's veto of H.R. 4868, the South Africa sanctions bill. It's time for the United States to

stand firmly and unequivocally on the side of freedom and justice once again. The black men, women, and children of South Africa are the real freedom fighters of this decade. They are depending on us, and we cannot afford to let them down.

Since the House and Senate passed their separate economic sanctions bills last year, Government repression and wide-scale civil unrest and violence have escalated not declined. Mr. Botha has shown no inclination to negotiate a peaceful settlement with the leaders of the black majority. And we must punish the Botha regime for its intransigence.

The Reagan administration's policy of constructive engagement has in fact provided no constructive progress in its six year reign. Rather than promoting "reform," the administration's policy has served to consolidate white minority rule and further entrench the abominable system of South Africa.

Contrary to the claims of critics, the economic sanctions in this bill will not hurt blacks in South Africa. It is the moderate blacks themselves who are calling for new sanctions. They insist that the long-run benefits of sanctions far outweigh any limited economic costs. Moreover, sanctions are one of the few peaceful weapons left to help force the Botha government to change.

Our country cannot sit on the fence any longer. The black South Africans need us to be strong, to be true to our ideals, to be true to our principles. That's what this vote is all about. President Reagan is unwilling to lead, unwilling to stand up for the moral imperatives that are in jeopardy this and every day in South Africa.

If President Reagan is unwilling to hand out anything more than a slap on the wrist to the Botha regime, then we in the Congress must fill that void. The costs in spilled blood, wasted lives and human oppression are far too great to ignore. The black men, women, and children of South Africa are calling out for our help, for freedom, and we must listen. We must not turn a deaf ear to their cries. If we do, the result will only be an escalation of the violence, a potential holocaust. We must override the President's veto.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the President has said, and I quote: "For us to take an action now such as some are suggesting, turning our backs and walking away, would leave us with no persuasive power whatsoever."

The truth is that trying to assuage the apartheid government of South Africa is what is undermining our persuasive power.

Secretary of State George Shultz has said, "Moral posturing is no substitute for effective policies."

The truth is that a policy soft on immorality is the one doomed to ineffectiveness.

The President says this bill would isolate America. The truth is that it is the President's unwillingness to stand tall, to stand up and be counted on this issue, that is isolating our country. A policy that makes an enemy out of a person of peace and good will, Bishop Tutu, is a policy doomed to failure, to tragic failure. The only answer is override.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ROEMER].

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we are back again. As I listen to the debate today, I am really saddened by what seemed to me to be very lame excuses for us not to stand together on this. For a long time, many of us in the House have worked hard and together on both sides of the aisle to make sure that two things happened: No. 1, that America's position about apartheid is understood in every corner of the Earth; and No. 2, that the Government of South Africa felt some legitimate pressure to negotiate and to yield some freedom and opportunity to all of its citizens.

At the heart of the matter has been the organized Government of South Africa's willingness to treat human beings there like animals, with numbers and degradation by color. It is not right. And America can reach out to South Africa and the people there, but not this way.

I was not surprised when the President offered his veto. I was saddened. I was very saddened. I do not like to have to override a veto on principle. He is my President, too. But here the House must speak and speak with a single voice. We want peace and prosperity and opportunity in South Africa. And if it takes us taking the profit out of apartheid, so be it.

I hope the House can stand as one and tell the President that he is wrong. Let us override this veto. It has as much to do with our country as it does in South Africa; and in both places it puts us on the high road for the long term, and in both places it is the key to peace and opportunity. Override the veto.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, last week 12 people from South Africa came to see me. They were members of Inkatha. They were black South Africans speaking for 1.3 million blacks. They told me, speaking for Chief Buthelezi, as well, who represents 6 million Zulus, black South Africans, that these sanctions will work exactly the opposite of what we want them to do. They told me that it is going to play right into the hands of the Communists and the ANC and cause all kinds of problems as far as blood running in the streets down the road. They told me it is going to put hundreds of thousands of black South Africans out of work.

I want to ask a couple of questions. Do we really want to hear what the black South Africans have to say or a handful of leaders? And is everybody who opposes these sanctions racist? Is Lucy Mvubelo, head of the garment

workers union over there a racist, the largest union in South Africa, or at least it was at one time? Bishop Barnabas Lekganyane, head of 6 million black South Africans in his church, the Zion Christian Church? Chief Buthelezi, head of 6 million blacks, is he a racist? Of course not.

Let me ask a few questions because I think these are very relevant.

Do we really want to put 600,000 black South Africans out of work? There is no unemployment compensation over there. There are no food stamps. There are no welfare benefits. Three and a half million black South Africans will be without food in a very short period of time because of these sanctions. Those very same people will be ripe for revolutionary rhetoric coming from the ANC and other radical groups in a very short period of time. They are going to be the cannon fodder in this revolution.

Do we really want to do that? Should we listen to the African National Congress that represents 5,000 to 6,000 people instead of people like Chief Buthelezi who represents 6 million people?

Let us bring this home to America. How would we feel if a foreign government passed legislation that would put Americans out of work by the hundreds of thousands? In your congressional district, how would you feel? Did any country do that in the fifties or sixties when we were suffering racial prejudice in this country and racial strife run rampant in this country? Did any country do that then, and how would we have felt about that?

Last, do we want to hurt Americans? You know, 2.7 million metric tons of corn was purchased by South Africa just 2 years ago. They bought more wheat this year than the Soviet Union has, and they are a cash buyer. And there are many other products that they buy from the United States. It is going to come home to roost and to hurt us as well.

My feeling is, and I feel this sincerely, President Reagan is against apartheid. I am against apartheid. I have been there and have seen how repugnant it is. But to hurt the very people we want to help is not the answer.

So I say to the President of the United States, Mr. President, I admire you standing against this tide, because I believe you are right and I think history will prove you are right.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the veto of H.R. 4868, the South Africa sanctions bill.

We are asked to undo our already modest efforts and instead follow the lead of our European allies in fashioning a policy. We are told that the sanctions passed by Congress would hurt

black South Africans, and would hurt the countries bordering South Africa which rely on their trade and transportation routes across South Africa. I'd like to address each of these points briefly.

The European community—with their economic ties to South Africa—has adopted the "least common denominator" in the spectrum of sanctions. Their sanctions are far weaker than those adopted by Congress and by the 49 commonwealth nations, including the so-called front-line nations bordering South Africa to the north. These nations are calling for tough sanctions. We are asked to oppose the nations with the most at stake simply because the nations of Europe will not take a lead position in supporting strong sanctions. This is unacceptable; it is we who can and should take the lead in taking clear, positive steps.

The sanctions adopted by the Commonwealth nations after the report from the Eminent Persons Group are nearly the same as those adopted by the U.S. Congress: severing air links to South Africa, a ban on new investments and new bank loans, and a ban on the importation of agricultural goods and iron, coal, steel, and uranium. The sanctions passed by the U.S. Congress are therefore clearly in line with the policies of the other countries of the world dedicated to fostering peaceful change in South Africa. It is also clear that to do less would be to abrogate our position as world leader, a position already in doubt by black South Africans after years of hesitancy in our policies.

The Eminent Persons Group, charged with formulating a Commonwealth policy to arrest South Africa's drift to civil war and to initiate a process which might usher in a new era, maintains that without support for majority rule from the United States and Great Britain, the long-term result will be an escalation of violence and counterviolence, a drawn-out guerrilla civil war, and a country destroyed. The commonwealth nations maintain that the hurt done blacks in such event would be infinitely greater than that from sanctions. They warn time is running out.

On August 8 Prime Minister Mugabe of Zimbabwe announced his intention to put into effect the Commonwealth-recommended sanctions, despite his nation's reliance on South African trade and transportation. So much for the assertion that South Africa's neighbors might be hurt by sanctions against South Africa. They understand this, but are imposing sanctions themselves nevertheless.

South Africa's blacks support sanctions and they understand clearly they may be affected. Archbishop Tutu has always supported sanctions, but the most eloquent statement of black South African sentiment was made by Winnie Mandela on the "Good Morning America" television show July 15 with interviewer David Hartmann. He

asked her, "Mrs. Mandela, the U.S. Government is saying that economic sanctions against your country would hurt the people it's designed to help, that it would cause even more poverty, more problems. What's your reaction to that position by our government?" Her response: "We have told the rest of the caring world; we have appealed to democratic governments who do care, who are not Pretoria's allies, to impose sanctions on our country. We know what we are talking about. We know we shall be the casualties of that kind of measure. We know of no other course that is still open to us. We know of no other door, no other peaceful door, that is still left open for us. We are asking the rest of the caring world to impose sanctions as the only peaceful measure we know of which would reduce the violence we have in the country; which will, in fact, help us save the lives we are losing every day; which would stop the flowing of the blood of innocent men and women, the blood of innocent children, who dared to protest and did what is regarded as democratic throughout the world. To lodge a voice of protest about what you do not agree with in racist South Africa, you die for that."

By doing less than that called for by H.R. 4868 we strengthen Pretoria's intransigence. By taking the steps mandated by H.R. 4868, we exert leadership in concert with the other nations of Africa and of the commonwealth to pressure white South Africans to free political prisoners and negotiate a new order in good faith. I therefore urge my colleagues to vote "aye," override the veto of H.R. 4868, and help set a clear, firm, and positive American policy course in South Africa.

□ 1835

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

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

(Mr. McKINNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McKINNEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

[Mr. McKINNEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

(Mr. GUNDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUNDERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the dispute today if not over goals, it is over methods. Last year, I visited South Africa and last year I introduced legislation calling for conditional investment. Yet today I come before you with these conclusions.

First, we cannot and will not succeed in changing the internal policies of the South African Government and therefore we, as a country, ought to be pur-

suing policies in our own, long-term best interests.

Second, we must remember that with leadership comes responsibility, and I will forever remember the plea of that black woman in South Africa who said, "If the free leader of the world will not stand up for us, who will?"

Third, let us, with this in mind, remember that whether you are in South Africa, Zimbabwe, Angola or any of the countries of southern Africa, the blacks in that area, right or wrongly, fairly or unfairly, look at free enterprise and democracy and at home, in their land, see that also as meaning political repression. If we want to send a signal that freedom, free enterprise and democracy are all one, we today have to override the President's veto.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the distinguished ranking member of the full committee for his caring and very strong leadership on what certainly is a very difficult issue.

Mr. Speaker, I abhor apartheid. President Reagan abhors apartheid and has made it very clear in his message, he said, "Normal and friendly relations cannot exist between the United States and South Africa until it becomes a dead policy."

Mr. Speaker, a number of people have intimated here, in fact have said strongly, that we will not see a satisfactory resolution of this until we do impose sanctions. I happen to believe that the misery will be greater than apartheid. As the President also said, "The misery of the people who already have suffered enough is too great." We have to look at what the people really want in South Africa. Every single survey that has been taken has overwhelmingly indicated that the people oppose our imposition of sanctions.

The Institute for Sociological and Demographic Research of the Human Sciences Research Council found that 67 percent of all blacks over 18 opposed apartheid and opposed sanctions. Every other organization has done likewise that has taken a survey.

I urge support of the President's veto.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. PURSELL].

Mr. PURSELL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, I had the opportunity to visit Africa. I think if you walk down the streets and you talk to the people, the leaders, the blacks and the whites, I think it is obvious that this is a moral issue. That this is a political issue. That this is an economic issue, even in our best inter-

ests, if we were to look at it from a very selfish standpoint.

The moral issue is: Will the African people eventually move toward the East or toward the West? I think it is very important today that those who made an early commitment to support and cosponsor the original Gray bill stand up and be counted.

This is one of the easiest votes for me in the 10 years that I have been in Congress. I think we should override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LELAND].

(Mr. LELAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LELAND. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the well not as a Member of Congress except by the privilege that I have to stand here, but as a human being who cares about the plight of the humanity of those people in South Africa.

I come here to plead with my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle to support the override. To support something that has not been done yet, so therefore, we have not been able to evaluate whether or not sanctions do indeed represent an effective way by which we deal with the abhorrent apartheid that is imposed on those millions of people.

I speak from an emphatic perspective because I have learned my black history and what happened in this country when black people were fully employed in this country as slaves.

The same thing is happening to those people in South Africa. All I can say is that we were willing, my forebears were willing to suffer all kinds of ill fate, if you will, just to be free. All the people of South Africa are asking is that they should be free. Give them an opportunity and let us, America, stand up and do what is right. Not what is political or what is practical. Let us do what is right.

The President is wrong on this issue. Mr. Speaker, please, I hope that my colleagues in this House will listen to us who are asking for this Presidential veto override.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has 10½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I also yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. MARTIN] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank both gentlemen from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, back home, we believe that if you work, you have a chance to succeed. Your folks don't have to be rich—they don't have to have been there for 500 years. If you try, you can even be President.

In fact, my district produced this President from just such a background.

But in other parts of the world this dream has died, killed by those who limit opportunity, deny talent, and destroy potential.

That is why, representing that part of America that is home to President Reagan, I must rise to oppose him today.

For, Mr. President, in this veto message about South Africa, you are wrong. What if you had been refused an education in Tampico, IL, because of your color? What if your parents couldn't have moved to Dixon because of travel passes? What if you could not be President because your supporters were denied the right to vote?

This issue finally comes to that—not pious platitudes about specious economic problems or arrogant axioms about patience.

It is a vote on keeping a dream alive. The vote matters not because of what it says about South Africa; it matters more because of what it says about America.

To the party of Lincoln: We cannot forget our roots, and we must vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MARLENEE].

(Mr. MARLENEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1845

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, embargos have been labeled the poison that has killed American agriculture. A vote for the override of the President's veto is a vote for sanctions, make no mistake about that. And a vote for sanctions is essentially a vote for a self-imposed grain embargo against one country.

Another vote of poison for the American producer, a vote of poison exchanged for an illusionary good that we are going to do for some nation. Keep in mind that since June of this year, a short while ago, South Africa has purchased 160,000 tons of wheat, and this body is subsidizing Communist Russia to take some grain.

What a confusing world this Congress creates, what a confusing world. Subsidizing our enemy so they will take grain, and yet, a trading partner that takes cash, that has taken more grain than the Soviet Union, is going to be essentially embargoed.

Our trading partner and friend, South Africa, has purchased over 1.2 billion dollars' worth of U.S. products in the past year, and this body is going

to cut off that trade? I never cease to marvel.

I never cease to marvel at the business acumen of Congress. No wonder we have a trade deficit. No wonder we have an overwhelming deficit in our own affairs, internal deficit.

Vote to sustain the President's veto. No more poison for producers, no more sanctions, no more embargoes against American agriculture.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

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

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

(Mr. GEPHARDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of overriding the veto of the President.

Mr. Speaker, our presence here today should have been unnecessary, for the voice of the American voters has been loud and clear. Unfortunately, their message was not heard in the White House. By vetoing this bill, President Reagan has sent a misleading signal to South Africa and has made effective reforms even more difficult.

More than 3 months ago the House voted for a tough and realistic program of anti-apartheid sanctions. Then, when the Senate followed our lead with a less restrictive bill, we agreed to their language without lengthy debate. We agreed because we believed this legislation is important and timely. We also believed its moderation would convince the President to join us in a bipartisan willingness to back up our concern with concrete actions. He would not even meet us half way.

Congress does not expect American sanctions to crumble the system of apartheid overnight. But we should not minimize the importance of our example in mobilizing international action and in convincing the South African Government to begin a real dialogue with all her citizens. In addition, the world still looks to us for moral leadership; still hopes we believe the words in our own Declaration of Independence. Sanctions against the Government of South Africa are an important expression of our faith in democracy. They serve notice that we will not condone apartheid.

Yes, an effective international program of sanctions may impose hardship on the black majority in South Africa. Yet, who are we to say that their dignity is less important than our own, that their struggle for equality is not worth sacrifice? Americans should make it clear that we are committed to justice in South Africa. We must contribute to a solution rather than to the problem.

I am confident that the House of Representatives and the Senate will override this veto by near-unanimous votes. The message will be clear, not just to South Africa, but to our friends around the world.

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

Mr. MATSUI. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I urge an override of the President's veto.

One thing was clear from our recent debate on the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985—we all deplore the apartheid system in South Africa and are searching for ways that we as a nation can express our support for human rights and democratic reforms in that troubled country.

The legislation before us would prohibit the importation of South African and Namibian coal, uranium ore, and uranium oxide into the United States. Despite the fact that our country has among the largest coal deposits in the world, we continue to increase our coal imports from South Africa—the leading importer of coal to the United States. Our uranium imports from South Africa and Namibia have increased 350 percent since 1981—and this is at a time when the number of domestic uranium mines has dropped from 362 to 15 and 90 percent of our miners have lost their jobs.

While the importation of these minerals holds economic implications for this country, it is also a significant moral issue—labor conditions for black miners in South Africa and Namibia are deplorable. Black miners have virtually no job security; they must contract for a limited number of months and then reapply for their jobs. They are not allowed to live with their families; white miners are. They are prohibited by law from holding skilled labor positions; these slots are reserved for white workers only. They must pay for their health insurance; white miners receive free insurance. And their low wage—one fifth that of the white miner—has artificially depressed the world price of uranium and coal, making U.S. coal and uranium less competitive.

Some 60,000 American coal miners are out of work; our uranium industry is in danger of extinction. We in the Congress now have the opportunity to right two serious wrongs—to hasten the end of apartheid policies which are anathema to our way of life and to show American miners we are willing to take strong measures to put them back to work. I accordingly urge support for overriding the President's veto.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I come in strong support to override the President's veto. There are basically two reasons I would like to set forth as to why we should do this.

I have heard on the other side of the aisle that there are a lot of jobs to be lost if, in fact, we impose the economic sanctions in our bill. I find that very hard to swallow and understand because I thought that this country, this great Nation of ours, stood for something more than merely materialistic things.

If, in fact, we would have made that statement in the 1770's, we would still today be under British rule. I think that the people of South Africa deserve the right to vote; they deserve freedom from imprisonment without justice, without cause. That is the reason why this battle is being fought, not because of the issue of jobs.

Second, I think that we are giving up our moral leadership. The Members all saw what the Commonwealth nations did just 3 months ago, when they refused to come up with strong sanctions. The reason they did that is because they want to find out what this country would do, what signals we would send.

Just last Friday, a number of us met with a leading official from the nation of Japan, and we asked him why Japan was not imposing stronger sanctions. His answer to us was, "We are looking at you; your President has these sanctions and we are following him."

We have a responsibility to show strong moral leadership on this issue. I urge an override.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I hope we will vote to override the veto.

We are talking here today about the difference between quantity of material things and the quality of life.

It was said in the southland from which I came, and come, and am still a part, that the black people needed their jobs and that slavery should continue. A similar thing is happening now in South Africa.

I am sure the people there want the quality of life. They want to be free; they want to be able to vote; they want to participate in their government.

America should stand by them. America should stand for principle, stand for democracy against totalitarianism of any form.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GARCIA].

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto.

We are considering today a bill that is in reality a watered down version of the bill that we originally passed. We are, therefore, being forced to override the President's veto of legislation that is, in the eyes of many of us, not nearly strong enough.

We are sending a message primarily to three groups with our action today. They are: South Africa's black, colored, and Asian communities; the people of the United States; and the White House. We are letting all three know that Congress is on the right side of this issue. We are on the side of morality and dignity. We are letting the President know that if he can levy sanctions against Poland, Libya, and Nicaragua then he should certainly be able to do the same against South Africa.

The European Economic Community and the Commonwealth of Nations have all decided that sanctions are not only appropriate but necessary. We must not ignore them and hide behind the straw man that the President is trying to create, that somehow if we don't override this veto we will help South Africa's majority community. We would not. We must listen to Allan Boesak, Winnie Mandela, and Desmond Tutu. They represent the voices of sanity and reason in South Africa. They represent the right side of this issue. If the so-called front line states in southern Africa are willing to support sanctions—and they clearly have more at risk than we do—then we should at the very least listen to their call for action against South Africa. We can do no less.

We are not merely arguing about foreign policy with this legislation. We are arguing about saving a nation. The status quo cannot be maintained. There must be change, real change, now. This is not Boer Bashing. This is the Congress of the United States, on behalf of the people of the United States, taking a stand in favor of the poor and oppressed in South Africa.

If what those who oppose sanctions in South Africa really fear is a Communist takeover of that nation, then we need only continue with our present course and we will make that a reality. We will push South Africa into the hands of our enemies. We must let the people of South Africa know that we are on their side. We must let those who have built South Africa with their sweat and poverty know that we will stand by them in their hour of need.

I visited Zimbabwe a couple of years ago, and I was impressed at how efficiently that nation functioned, both economically and politically. I realize that South Africa is not the same as Zimbabwe, but there is clearly a lesson to be learned from the success of that society.

I understand that the President has just said that he will impose some limited sanctions if we do not override his veto. That's too little, too late. If the President had wanted to truly work with us on this issue, then he had plenty of time. Now, it is our turn to let him know how we feel. I urge my colleagues to override his veto and cast a vote for morality.

In closing, I would like to leave you with a poignant quote from an editorial in today's New York Times:

"What if 1,800 whites had been killed by some regime somewhere in the world," Mr. (former Australian Prime Minister Malcolm) Fraser remarks. "Have we got to such a stage that we accept as normal for racist security forces to kill blacks, and that's part of the 20th century? To that terrible question, Mr. Reagan's veto offers a more terrible answer."

Finally, as part of my statement, I am including a list of states that already have imposed sanctions on South Africa, as well as a list of sanctions being imposed by other nations and economic communities, taken from this week's congressional quarterly.

SANCTIONS: SOME STATES ARE WEIGHING IN

State	Date adopted	Type of policy	Assets in funds covered by policy	Assets to be sold to meet policy	Amount sold to date
California.....	9/85	Divestment ¹	\$52.3 billion	\$6.3 to 7 billion	0
Colorado.....	7/86	Divestment ¹	9.4 billion	3.1 billion	0
Connecticut.....	8/85	No new investment ¹	983 million	0	0
Florida.....	6/82	Divestment ¹	4 billion	440 million	\$86.4 million
Iowa.....	6/86	No new investment	11.5 billion	0	0
.....	5/85	Divestment	3.6 billion	25.5 million	21.2 million
.....		Banking restrictions	(²)	0	0
Kansas.....	9/85	Divestment ¹	3 billion	0	23-24 million
Louisiana.....	7/85	Banking restrictions	(²)	(²)	0
Maine.....	6/85	Divestment ¹	1.3 billion	0	400,000 to 800,000
Maryland.....	3/84	Banking restrictions	500 million	0	0
.....	5/85	No new investment	8 billion	0	0
.....	5/86	Selective purchasing	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Massachusetts.....	1/83	Divestment ¹	3.25 billion	0	91 million
.....	7/86	No industrial bonds	Not applicable	Not applicable	Not applicable
Michigan.....	12/80	Banking restrictions	(²)	0	0
.....	12/82	Divestment ²	At least 267 million	At least 424,000	At least 62.98 million
Minnesota.....	10/85	Divestment	10.15 billion	0	0
Nebraska.....	4/84	Divestment	600 million	3.3 million	60.5 million
New Jersey.....	8/85	Divestment	17 billion	4.4-5.4 billion	2.9 billion
New Mexico.....	11/85	Divestment ¹	3.5 billion	Less than 180 million	(²)
North Dakota.....	7/85	No new investment ¹	950 million	0	(²)
Oklahoma.....	6/86	Banking restrictions	1.8 billion	0	(²)
Rhode Island.....	6/85	Divestment	126.9 million	0	54.8 million
Vermont.....	1/86	Divestment ¹	230 million	41-46 million	0
West Virginia.....	6/86	Divestment ¹	100 million	0	0
Virgin Islands.....	5/86	Divestment ¹	3.9 billion	570 million	85 million
.....	10/84	Divestment	304 million	(²)	(²)

¹ Policy adopted by administrative action.² This law applies to the 13 state universities and colleges in Michigan. The figures in this line are based on responses that have come in from Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State University.³ Figures not available.

Source: Investor Responsibility Research Center, Inc.

SANCTIONS LEVIED AGAINST SOUTH AFRICA BY NATIONS AND ECONOMIC COMMUNITIES

Divestment	Bank loans	Import restrictions	Export restrictions	Landing rights/tourism
H.R. 4868 (cleared by Congress Sept. 12, 1986). Bans new corporate investment in South Africa and any new loans to government agencies (\$1.3 billion in remaining U.S. investments in 1985).	Prohibits U.S. banks from accepting deposits from any South African government agency (\$329 million held by U.S. banks for South African banks and government agencies in March 1986). Bans loans to South African government agencies (\$148 million outstanding in 1985).	Bans import of steel and iron (\$293.6 million in 1985). Bans import of uranium and coal (\$140 million, uranium; \$43.4 million, coal, in 1985). Bans import of Kruggerand gold coins (1984: \$486 million; 1985: \$101 million before ban took place). Bans textile imports (\$55.1 million in 1985). Bans import of agricultural products (\$52 million in fruits and vegetables and \$129 million in other products in 1985). Bans import of agricultural products (\$52 million in fruits and vegetables and \$129 million in other products in 1985).	Bans export of computers to South African agencies enforcing apartheid. Prohibits petroleum or crude oil exports to South Africa.	Ends landing rights in United States for South Africa Airways (95,000 passengers in 1985).
Reagan Order No. 12532 (extended Sept. 4, 1986). Bans new loans by U.S. banks or other agencies to any "apartheid-enforcing agency" in South Africa.	Bans new loans by U.S. banks or other agencies to any "apartheid-enforcing agency" in South Africa.	Bans import of Kruggerands with option of waiving the order should South Africa begin implementing reforms.	Bans export of computers to South African agencies enforcing apartheid. Bans export of nuclear technology intended for nuclear production facilities.	
Great Britain (announced or renewed Aug. 5, 1986). Calls for voluntary end to new investment in South Africa (\$418 million in 1983).		Bans import of steel and iron (\$45 million in 1985). Bans import of Kruggerands (\$7 million in 1985). Monitoring of an embargo on trade in arms and paramilitary gear.	Halts oil exports to South Africa. Halts export of "sensitive" equipment destined for use by South African police and armed forces.	Calls for a voluntary end to promotion of tourism. Recalls military attaches accredited to South Africa and refuses to accredit their counterparts in European Community.
European Economic Community (announced or renewed Sept. 16, 1986). Bans new investment (\$380 million net investment by the community, excluding Britain, in 1984; \$418 million investment by Britain in 1983).		Bans import of iron and steel effective Sept. 27 (\$424 million to 12 community nations in 1985). Monitoring of an embargo on exports and imports of arms and paramilitary gear.	Halts oil exports to South Africa. Halts export of "sensitive" equipment destined for use by South African police and armed forces.	Recalls military attaches accredited to Pretoria and refuses to accredit their counterparts in European Community. Refrains from cultural and scientific agreements and freezes sports and security agreements.
Commonwealth of Nations (endorsed Aug. 5, 1986, by Canada, Australia, the Bahamas, India, Zimbabwe and Zambia). Bans new investment or reinvestment of profits earned in South Africa (no new investments except by Britain in 1986; British investments were \$418 million in 1983). Bans government contracts with majority-owned South African companies.	Bans new bank loans (outstanding South African debts to Britain were \$7.1 billion in 1985; few new loans approved in 1986). Ends double taxation agreements.	Bans import of agricultural products (\$1.1 billion in 1983). Bans government procurement of items contracted for production in South Africa. Bans import of uranium. Bans import of coal (\$49 million in 1983). Bans import of iron and steel (\$115 million in 1983). Bans Kruggerand imports, as of Sept. 10.	Ends government assistance to, investment in, and trade with South Africa (\$2.6 billion in export credits guaranteed by Britain in 1985).	Bans air links with South Africa. Bans South Africans from obtaining visas at Commonwealth consulates in South Africa. Bans promotion of tourism (366,000 tourists from Commonwealth visited, 46 percent of all tourists in South Africa in 1984). Bans government funding for trade missions to South Africa.
Japan (announced or renewed Sept. 19, 1986). Calls for Japanese to refrain from purchase and import of Kruggerands, effective October 1985). Bans import of iron and steel (\$200 million in 1985).			Bans export of computers to South African agencies that enforce apartheid, effective October 1985.	Suspends air links with South Africa. Prohibits use of South Africa Airways by Japanese government officials. Suspends issuing of tourist visas for South Africans. Requests Japanese citizens to refrain from traveling to South Africa.

Note: Listed loan and trade figures are approximations.

Sources: South African Embassy, British Embassy, Japanese Embassy, European Community Information Service, Investor Responsibility Research Center, The New York Times, Aug. 16, 1986

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALLON].

(Mr. TALLON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALLON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4868 and urge

all Members to override the President's veto.

This House now stands on the brink of historic legislation. Through the Anti-Apartheid Act, we will establish a national policy of opposition to South African racist governance by threat, violence and repression. One which defends essential democratic principles: the basic rights to vote and to participate on a one-person, one-vote basis in the national

Government. We will establish a policy that puts us clearly on the side of change in South Africa.

The Anti-Apartheid Act would prohibit new United States business investment in South Africa, ban some imports, including steel and other products from corporations controlled by the Government, and deny landing rights in the United States to the Government-owned South Africa Airways, along with imposing a

number of other restrictions aimed at the government and its commercial enterprises.

It threatens additional, stronger sanctions unless South Africa makes substantial progress within a year to end its apartheid system of racial segregation. The measure also provides for rescinding the sanctions if the South African Government takes steps such as lifting segregationist rules, freeing anti-apartheid leader Nelson Mandela, legalizing all political parties and negotiating with black political leaders.

Importantly, this legislation allows States and local governments to continue to individually regulate financial or commercial activity with regard to South Africa. It in no way preempts the efforts or decisions of State and local governments respecting South Africa.

These sanctions represent our first significant step to put moral force behind our rhetorical opposition to apartheid. If rhetoric would change the situation, the Government would have long since folded, and there would be no apartheid today. But that has not happened. South Africa has continued its rule of institutionalized racism, sustained by United States compliance.

The administration has come out quite soundly in support of the status quo in South Africa. Let us think for a moment what a status quo for South Africa means. Status quo in South Africa means repression of 22 million blacks who are deprived of the most basic rights such as the right to vote, to chose a job, an education or a place to live.

South Africa is the only nation on Earth that constitutionally enshrines racism by denying blacks the basic right to vote, the right to move about, freedom of association, equal protection under the law, virtually all of the constitutional freedoms that we know and cherish in this country.

Over the last 20 years some three and one-half million blacks have been relocated by the Government, forcibly onto worthless patches of land. Eight million of them have been stripped of their citizenship. During that same period of time, U.S. investment has grown from about \$150 million to a current combined direct and indirect investment of \$14 billion. But as the American role has grown in South Africa, so has the tyranny of the South African Government.

Violence and government repression have reached tragic new level in South Africa. The news media carries daily reports of brutal and senseless attacks by the white government against the blacks of South Africa. We see blacks seeking political and humanitarian rights are beaten and imprisoned. Meanwhile, the Government has prohibited almost all public dissent, closed opposition newspapers, and banned television and other press coverage of unrest and police actions.

Mr. Speaker, as the traditional leader of the free world, our Nation has to take a stand. And in the absence of leadership by the President, it is up to the House of Representatives to put America squarely behind liberty and equality. And this is in our own interest because I am certain that blacks in South Africa will inevitably come to power. As a nation, we must be at the time in a posture to be able to say that we were on the right side of this most important social justice issue. I hope my colleagues will join me in sending this message of message of U.S. support for peace and de-

mocracy. It is a message we can all be proud of.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MOODY].

(Mr. MOODY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOODY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the override.

Mr. Speaker, there are few issues in this country that touch the hearts and souls of Americans as strongly as the subject of South Africa and apartheid. We have not forgotten our own country's battles against slavery, racial discrimination, and segregation. From Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation to Rosa Parks' valiant determination to sit at the front of a Montgomery bus, we as a nation have developed values that simply will not let us forget the injustice of blatant and violent racism.

We all cringe at the moral stench of apartheid. We are all outraged at the system in South Africa. The debate here is over how best to get South Africa onto a path toward true representative democracy, and how to keep it moving on that path at something more than a snail's pace.

Tragically, President Reagan's South African policy statements are greeted with cheers from the Botha government. The policy itself associates our country with the crimes of an international pariah and leaves the machinery of repression intact. Such a policy is simply not good enough.

Our country was launched in 1776 with these words:

We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it.

How can a nation founded on these principles be satisfied with a policy that does nothing more than gently coax the oppressor to reform, while asking the oppressed to be patient? If we are truly committed to the philosophy penned by Thomas Jefferson, we cannot simply suggest change, we must insist upon it.

President Reagan believes sanctions against South Africa will only hurt those we are trying to help. I believe those people victimized by apartheid are willing to take the same risks our Founding Fathers were in order to ensure their freedoms and civil rights. I believe they are looking to us for help, conscious that there may well be short term costs.

American slaves were not guaranteed food or shelter when they were freed. Unable to read and write, many of them faced great adversity and hardship. But would anyone dare to suggest that the slaves should have been kept in shackles? Would anyone dare to suggest that the cause of freedom does not burn deeper in the heart of man than the desire for economic certainty? I don't think so, and I hope this is not what the President is suggesting.

As Thomas Paine said, "Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered." But we have a moral and historical obligation to try, Mr. Speaker. We know who is right and who is wrong in South Africa, and it is time we aligned ourselves with those who are right. I urge my colleagues to support the Anti-Apartheid Act and to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from the Virgin Islands [Mr. DE LUGO].

(Mr. DE LUGO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the override.

On June 18, 1986, this House overwhelmingly passed H.R. 997, a bill of which I was proud to be an original cosponsor, and which called for strong economic sanctions against the South African Government. This bill was supported by the American people as well as a majority of people around the world. Even the South African people, those who stand to lose the most under the provisions of the bill, have argued for and encouraged us to impose economic sanctions because they see it as the last peaceable means to bring about positive changes in that country. And yet, the Reagan administration continues to oppose economic sanctions, while advocating its failed policy of constructive engagement.

Today we must send another clear signal to the White House and the Presidential palace in Pretoria, that the American people have had enough and demand that they take action to end the abhorrent system of apartheid. The American people no longer want their Government to pay lip service to the ideals of democracy while at the same time supporting the system that feeds on racism, denies basic justice, promotes the destruction of the family unit, and continues to deny opportunities to children solely on the basis of their skin color. No; we will no longer condone these actions, directly or indirectly.

The measures that we are proposing today are far from adequate. But it is a start. It is a start to tell Pretoria that we are serious; that we, the United States Congress, will no longer give it the economic or political support of the American people until the system of apartheid is abolished. My colleagues, much remains to be done. But let this be the day when in spite of the fact that the President has acted contrary to the will of the American people we do our jobs by expressing the wishes of the American people and pass this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this override. Let this be the beam of hope that we send to the South African people to say that we understand their struggle and that we will actively support them and do whatever we can to bring about the end to the abhorrent system of apartheid.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN].

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the override.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in overwhelming support of the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 4868, the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Unfortunately, the Reagan administration has again missed a prime opportunity to stand up and show the free world that America lives by the principles on which our Nation was founded—liberty and justice for all. By vetoing this legislation, President Reagan has confirmed the beliefs of those who contend that his administration is not really interested in "constructive change" in South Africa. After 5 years of constructive engagement, the system of South African apartheid is still alive and well.

Black South Africans don't want a modernized version of apartheid, they don't want it stabilized, they don't want it weakened, and they don't want it reformed; they want it dismantled.

The President contends that this legislation will shut the door for further United States leverage in southern Africa. If the United States has so much leverage, where is it? Why hasn't it, after 5 years of constructive engagement, provided any positive improvement in the welfare of black South Africans? Critics say that by imposing these sanctions, we will hurt the very people we are trying to save. Yes, there is no denying that they will be affected. In the struggle for civil rights in this country, black Americans suffered hardships during the economic boycotts in the South. What happened as a result? Those short-term hardships turned into long-term freedoms.

Black South Africans will also suffer short-term hardships. Even moderate black South African leaders acknowledge that no matter what problems sanctions may cause, they can be no worse than what the Government has already done. The net effect of those short-term hardships will be achieving long term political and economic freedom.

The Government of the Republic of South Africa has shown no willingness to change. Constructive engagement certainly failed to budge it. President Reagan's limited sanctions, proposed only to short-circuit the will of this Congress, failed to budge it. We now have the opportunity to put our Government clearly and convincingly on the side of freedom. We have the opportunity to put human rights before profit rights. I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to reject the President's veto. Prove to the world that this is in fact the land of liberty and justice for all. Stand up to apartheid and vote to override the veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, to have the leader of the free world and the primary advocate of Judeo-Christian values stand in the road to block the only significant steps toward a peaceful solution to the problem of oppression in South Africa is indeed a tragedy. It is a

tragedy not only for the suffering black people of South Africa, it is also a tragedy for civilized people everywhere. If justice cannot be achieved by peaceful means in South Africa, then it will be accomplished by violence. The black majority of South Africa will be free in this century. By closing the gates to the peaceful process, President Reagan guarantees an inevitable bloodbath. This blood will be on the hands of the leader of the free world. Our only hope now lies with the Congress of the United States. This awful catastrophe of bloody upheaval can be averted only by overriding the President's veto. And after the override of this veto, Congress must hold firmly to the reins and maintain its initiative in the shaping of policy for southern Africa. Our executive branch of government has failed humanity. The challenge now belongs to the Congress. We must continue to act to guarantee that in our time there can be revolution and change without massive upheaval and bloodshed. Congress must act repeatedly to guarantee that in South Africa the best in mankind is allowed to triumph.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to override the President's veto of the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, H.R. 4868.

Mr. Speaker, I very much regret that our President decided to veto this legislation. The Anti-Apartheid Act is a moderate, though pointed, reminder to the South African Government and to the South African people that the American people want the apartheid system dismantled, and are willing to alter our relationship with South Africa to see that that goal is achieved. This is no time for business-as-usual, while thousands of South Africans are still imprisoned on flimsy evidence, and while the South African Government brutally suppresses political dissent in its black community in its present state of emergency.

May I remind my colleagues that this legislation is quite a bit milder than the bill which was passed by this body in June. We do not call for mandatory disinvestment. We do not ban all South African goods from entry into the United States after a date certain. Rather, we selectively ban certain imports and exports. Our sanctions legislation contains provisions designed to cushion the impact of the legislation on the black community, who after all do not bear any responsibility for the present Government's policies. Our legislation, which also bans new investments in South Africa, is calculated to make our point, rather than cause random damage to the South African economy.

Soon after the Anti-Apartheid Act was sent to the President, 40 House Republicans joined with me in a letter

to the President urging that he not veto the bill. Our letter pointed out that majorities of both parties in each House supported the legislation and asserted that the legislation "represents the consensus of American views on South Africa." I circulated that letter, because I feel that we, the law-making branch of the Government, should set the policy, and that the President should cooperate with us. However, should he feel that he cannot approve the bill, we must do our duty and see that it is passed notwithstanding his objection.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for the pending motion to override the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, I am submitting the full text of our letter to the President to which I referred, together with a list of signatories:

SEPTEMBER 19, 1986.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Republican Representatives who supported the House's decision to agree to the Senate amendments to H.R. 4868, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 we respectfully request that you not veto that legislation.

We feel that the sanctions contained in the bill, while moderate, clearly reflect the sentiment of the American people that economic pressure should be brought to bear on the South African government as a means of encouraging it to disband the apartheid system. It contains a number of safeguards designed to minimize harm to Black individuals and businesses, addressing a vital concern which we share with you. While this bill contains a number of important provisions, few if any of us, agree with the entire bill.

Nevertheless, this legislation, which was passed by overwhelming margins in both the House of Representatives and the Senate, with strong bipartisan majorities in each House, represents the consensus of American views on South Africa. We feel that it is important that the policy embodied in this act should be enacted into law, and we urge you to lead our Nation in that direction.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Benjamin A. Gilman (NY); Doug Bereuter (NE); Sherwood L. Boehlert (NY); Hank Brown (CO); Rod Chandler (WA); William F. Clinger, Jr. (PA); E. Thomas Coleman (MO); Silvio O. Conte (MA); Lawrence Coughlin (PA); Joseph J. DioGuardi (NY); Hamilton Fish, Jr. (NY); William F. Goodling (PA); Bill Green (NY); Steve Gunderson (WI); Paul B. Henry (MI); Elwood Hillis (IN); Frank Horton (NY); James N. Jeffords (VT); Nancy L. Johnson (CT); Jim Leach (IA); Norman F. Lent (NY); John McCain (AZ); Raymond J. McGrath (NY); John R. McKernan, Jr. (ME); Edward R. Madigan (IL); David O'B. Martin (NY); Lynn Martin (IL); John R. Miller (WA); Guy V. Molinari (NY); Sid Morrison (WA); Carl D. Pursell (MI); Thomas J. Ridge (PA); John G. Rowland (CT); Claudine Schneider (RI); Christopher H. Smith (NJ); Olympia J. Snowe (ME); Barbara F. Vucanovich (NV); Robert S. Walker (PA); Vin Weber (MN); George C. Wortley (NY).

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, we have reached a point in the debate on South Africa that most of us would have preferred to avoid.

Both the House and Senate have forcefully endorsed legislation establishing economic sanctions as the means by which to communicate to the Government of South Africa the repugnance with which the people of the United States view the policy of apartheid.

President Reagan has, unwisely, in my judgment, vetoed that legislation.

I intend to vote to override the President's veto and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Reagan's position on apartheid stands Teddy Roosevelt's "Big Stick" policy on its head.

The administration verbalizes its opposition to apartheid with words which sound quite convincing.

But they are words with nothing behind them.

The President's policy of constructive engagement has been rejected by this Congress for the best of reasons—it just doesn't work.

It doesn't convince South African officials that we are serious about the problem of apartheid, and it doesn't convince the millions of South African people oppressed by that system of discrimination that the United States is their ally.

The President's South African policy has failed, but instead of fashioning a credible alternative, he seeks to perpetuate it.

The modest program of economic sanctions put in place last year was the administration's reaction to a stronger plan passed by this House.

This year, after 12 months of imperceptible progress on the diplomatic front, and after countless acts of violence and civil disarray in South Africa, Congress has voted to make greater use of the only leverage we have with the South African Government, our economic relationships.

We have been joined by corporations, universities, and State governments from across our Nation.

Inexplicably, the administration, instead of upping the ante at this critical time, wants to fold its cards.

And as a result, it will deal a crushing blow to the image of the United States, as a force, for positive change in the world.

No one argues that economic sanctions are a perfect tool.

They are however, the only means available to the United States, to clearly demonstrate that the continuation of apartheid makes impossible, the conduct of normal affairs between our country and South Africa.

It is said that sanctions most harm those, we most want to help.

That argument assumes, that the political, social, and economic situation in South Africa is static.

But it is not.

That country is moving toward a terrible day of reckoning, the consequences of which, for all South Africans, cannot possibly be compared to the effects of United States imposed economic sanctions.

The only way to avoid that day is to encourage the South African Government to dismantle apartheid—now.

Sanctions can do that.

If we do not apply them, if we give South African officials reason to doubt our meaning or resolve, we hasten the arrival of a human and economic catastrophe in that nation.

Today, this House must choose.

Do we stand with the oppressed in South Africa, or their oppressors?

The ideals upon which our country was founded, and our history as a nation, should make our choice clear.

Override the veto.

□ 1855

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

(Ms. OAKAR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, this is a historic vote. We can learn from the past. The world stood idly by during the Nazi era when millions of people were massacred.

Apartheid is the moral equivalent of nazism. We cannot stand idly by again. We are the leaders in the world.

This vote reflects the ideals of our country. This vote reflects our view of basic human rights.

This vote reflects our morals, our standards.

The time is now for our country to say no to apartheid. The world is watching us today. Will we be idle, as the world was during the Nazi era?

This is an historic vote. Vote "yes" to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LUKEN].

(Mr. LUKEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote to override a veto which will put the United States on record against the continuation of South Africa's brutal and oppressive policy of racism. Unfortunately, the legislation before us today is not as strong as it should be—as it once was.

However, it is a first step to demonstrate to South Africa and the rest of the world our Nation's strong disapproval of apartheid. We, the Congress, are saying that we no longer want to be an accomplice to apartheid. We are also saying to the South African Government that they must understand that any hope of preserving minority rule in South Africa is an illusion.

And it is a strong first step. H.R. 4868 bans imports of textiles, agricultural products, coal, uranium, and steel from South Africa. It also bans products produced, manufactured, marketed, or otherwise by African parastatal agencies. It bans virtually all new investments

of United States dollars in South Africa, and the overwhelming majority of new loans. Furthermore, the sanctions may not be lifted unless and until South Africa meets a number of stiff criteria aimed at fostering a negotiated political settlement with the representatives of the black majority.

Finally, the bill threatens more sanctions within a year if the South African Government has not made substantial progress in ending apartheid and establishing a nonracial democracy.

The incentives and sanctions work together to provide a carrot and stick approach that has the best chance of bringing about a workable solution to the problem that we face. It is the one that can bring about much needed change in the South African Government.

It is time that we do more than simply talk about democratic values: we must implement them as we have done in other places in the world. It is time that we dispose of the "business as usual" attitude we now have toward South Africa. It is time that we act so that our rhetorical denunciations do not ring hollow. It is time that we override a Presidential veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, ending apartheid in this century is as great a moral imperative as ending slavery was in the last. This is particularly true of my political party, which was founded a little more than a century ago to end apartheid like conditions in the United States.

All we asked of this Republican administration is that it advance a foreign policy consistent with the views of the first Republican administration.

To be true to our heritage, the administration must not be allowed to walk blindly to the grave with the black glove of white supremacy.

This veto should be overridden.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished delegate from the District of Columbia [Mr. FAUNTROY].

(Mr. FAUNTROY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, it was 12 days ago that 308 of my colleagues in this great House of Representatives moved our Nation to the high ground of the principles that we enunciate, but often fail to live. We did it when we voted to approve the Senate-passed version of sanctions on South Africa. We must redo that vote today because the President has vetoed that measure.

We come now to the moment of truth on perhaps the most compelling moral issue of our time: the racist, oppressive system of apartheid in South Africa. The President has attempted to veto the conscience of America on this question: I hope that you will vote to override that veto. I hope that every Member here will examine his own conscience on this matter. This Nation was founded on the principle that Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the gov-

erned. Today we are committed to a worldwide crusade for democratic government. We preach voting rights and human rights around the world: in Europe, in the Middle East, in Latin America, in Southeast Asia. But, are we to say to the world, and much more importantly to each other, that we espouse the virtue of democracy for everyone except the black majority of South Africa. That we advocate human rights everywhere except for the black majority in southern Africa, who suffer under the brutal, repressive, iron heel of South African apartheid.

Are we to continue to say to the blacks of southern Africa that we affirm human dignity for all human beings except those that live on the continent of southern Africa.

Are we to continue to espouse the virtue of democracy in the world, but halt our championing of democracy at the borders of the nation of southern Africa.

The answers are obvious and compelling. In this vote to override the President's veto we are faced with what is primarily a moral issue. It cannot be dismissed by vague platitudes about how abhorrent apartheid is to us. It cannot be quieted by a symbolic gesture in the appointment of a black Ambassador. It is a time for action. The American people have spoken through us in the passage of this sanction's bill. They deserve to be heard. They don't deserve this Presidential veto. Speak to the President; speak to the black majority in South Africa; speak to the racist regime in Pretoria. Override the President's veto.

I leave you with the words of an English Methodist minister, who on one occasion stated that: "On some issues—cowardice asks the question, is it safe; and vanity asks the question, is it popular; and expediency asks the question, is it politic; but conscience asks the question, is it right?" I ask you to vote to override the President's veto, not because it is safe, or politic or popular to do so, but because conscience dictates that it is right.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON].

(Mr. MANTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that I must rise today on the issue of South Africa. I, like many of my colleagues, had hoped that we would not be forced to take today's action. I thought the President would recognize the strong commitment of the American people to the principles on which this country was founded—freedom, justice and equality. However, by vetoing H.R. 4868, the Anti-Apartheid Act, which passed the House and Senate by overwhelming majorities, the President has ignored the will of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that we have no choice today but to override

the President's veto. The situation in South Africa has reached crisis proportions. America can no longer remain silent in the face of such flagrant disregard for human life and dignity. America must be heard, and heard loudly for what we in America believe is an inalienable right for justice and equality. H.R. 4868 is a responsible reaction to the evil of apartheid and an effective inducement for a nonviolent political settlement in South Africa. We must vote to override the President and enact this vital measure.

For the past 6 years, President Reagan has been given wide latitude to fashion a policy which would bring an end to apartheid. The administration claimed that its program of "constructive engagement" would force South Africa to make important concessions. However, the administration's plan has been a failure. Instead of moving toward a more open and Democratic government, South Africa's response to the President's policy has been intransigence, increased violence and the establishment of the most repressive measures in that nation's history. The South African Government continues to ignore every call for negotiations. In short, we are no closer to negotiations than we were 6 years ago and in the interim thousands of black Africans have been beaten, wounded, imprisoned and killed.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want an end to the repression of South Africa. They want the U.S. Government to take the basic steps in H.R. 4868, which will place our Government firmly on record against apartheid and will increase the pressure on Pretoria to end the oppression of apartheid. Unfortunately, President Reagan fails to understand the position of the American people. With his veto, he has attempted to thwart its will. We must not let that happen. We must vote to override his veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JENKINS].

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, it is always with a great deal of reluctance that I rise to oppose a President in the direction of foreign affairs. In this particular situation, even though I believe that the executive branch should be the controlling force in foreign affairs, I simply believe that the President is wrong. I believe that there is a degree of right and wrong that every Member just make up his mind or her mind on this particular issue. This is not so much an imposition of sanctions, as it is with withdrawal of approval or support in an economic situation.

I do not believe that we as individuals ought to equate profits with human rights.

There is something much deeper than the loss of some economic benefits or the loss of some food. There is the injury of pride. There is the destruction of dignity. There is really a great disservice to the soul of a nation.

Therefore, I think that this body ought to override the President on this issue simply because it is the right thing to do.

I do not have a minority population. It is less than 5 percent in my district, but this issue transcends the normal partisan issues and I am delighted that Republicans and Democrats from the House as well as the Senate seem to be joining together in this particular spot.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALDON].

(Mr. WALDON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDON. Mr. Speaker, the future of South Africa must be based on comprehensive racial equality. If there is to be freedom in South Africa, then all of its people must be free. We can ensure that freedom by breaking the chains of apartheid. The imposition of sanctions with real teeth is the emancipating act in bringing freedom to this troubled land.

America is the cradle of freedom, but unless we move with determination and dispatch the babe of hope will be stillborn in Pretoria. If we fail to override this Presidential veto of H.R. 4868 we are stating to the world that we have a dual standard for freedom; one for blacks and one for whites.

Those who are from black Africa, though they be poor and huddled masses, should taste the joy of sweet freedom. If we fail to override this veto, we are turning our backs on 25 million of the family of man with a darker hue who are fervently looking to America for hope, for justice, and for freedom.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, although I rise in support of sustaining the President's veto, the first thing I want to do is congratulate those who have led the fight to impose sanctions against South Africa.

I disagree with your belief that this will help achieve freedom for black South Africans. But I admire your tenacity, the energy, the commitment and the single-minded purpose you have brought to this task. And to put it in the mildest possible terms, the administration has been less than brilliant in handling this issue.

I would have preferred a bit more cooperation, a bit more sensitivity, and a lot less grandstanding on both sides of this issue.

But just because the administration has not provided inspired leadership doesn't mean we can accept the package before us.

Let me begin by stating what is obvious but is often forgotten in the heat of debate.

We are all against human rights violations in South Africa. We are all against human rights violations in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union, in China, wherever they may occur.

The fact that we disagree as to the best means to help achieve freedom in all those countries shouldn't lead us to question the motives of those who choose different means toward the same end. No one in this House has a patent on morality of means.

The sanctions bill is so comprehensive that it would be impossible for me to discuss each section in detail. There are a number of positive aspects of the bill helping black South Africans with housing and education, that are excellent.

But the bill is not only positive. It is punitive. Our disagreement concerns who will be the target of the punitive measures.

Supporters of sanctions say it will be the South African Government opponents of sanctions—in and out of South Africa—say it will be the black majority.

I believe this sanctions package suffers from the same problems most sanctions suffer from—it won't achieve its intended goals and will hurt those it intends to help.

It has been said that those who oppose these sanctions are inconsistent because they support sanctions against Nicaragua, Libya, the Soviet Union, Poland and other countries.

Speaking for myself, I don't like sanctions in general. My record shows it.

But I do see one major difference between those sanctions and the ones proposed against South Africa.

When you have sanctions against Poland or the Soviet Union, you are denying the people of those countries what we produce.

But when you propose sanctions against South Africa, sanctions that prohibit new investment, you are not only denying South Africans—black and white—what we produce, but also, more importantly, denying them the living example of what we stand for.

We are in effect saying that American firms, which are the leading examples of racial equality and economic progress for black South Africa, can not expand that influence.

That is the difference. We don't have American firms in Poland or the Soviet Union that stand up every day against the totalitarian principles of those governments. There are no Sullivan principles at work in Leningrad or Warsaw.

But in South Africa, American firms put into practice economic progress and social advancement. Not just on the job, but in the black communities.

Sanctions against new investment in South Africa are aimed at stopping the expansion of the best thing we have going for us in South Africa right

now—the progressive, human-rights policies of American companies.

I am no expert on South Africa. But Alan Paton is. He is the distinguished, courageous and internationally praised champion of black South African rights, himself a white South African. He is against sanctions.

Helen Suzman, courageous and dedicated white opponent of apartheid, of the Progressive Federal Party, has said:

“... I don't see how wrecking the economy of (South Africa) will insure a more stable and just society.”

Chief Buthelezi, head of 6 million Zulus, opposes sanctions. The New York Times has reported that there is a split in the antiapartheid groups about the effectiveness of sanctions. Are all these antiapartheid opponents of sanctions immoral? Are they dupes of the Boers? I can't believe for one moment they are.

Let me get away from the argument of how much these sanctions are going to hurt black South Africans and talk about something different—the distinct possibility that the white South African Government can overcome our sanctions and those imposed by the European Community and Japan.

The South Africans can transship coal and iron and other metals. They can sell them to Communist countries who may in turn, resell them.

As for the Japanese sanctions, does anyone believe that over the long haul the Japanese are going to let their companies suffer losses in this trade area?

I'm not saying this will happen. But it could. And then it would be only American workers who are hurt—as usual.

I opposed sanctions against the Soviet Union because I believed without their being universally applied and carefully monitored by all our allies, the only ones who would be hurt by such sanctions were American farmers and industry.

And I was proven right.

We are told by American supporters of sanctions that blacks in South Africa welcome more pain because they are already suffering and new suffering won't be anything different.

I really wonder if black South Africans—the poor ones the ones you don't hear much about—are as complacent about new suffering as their champions in the West believe? It's so easy to say more suffering won't matter, if you're not the one suffering.

I know from personal experience that the Afrikaners can be tough, stiff-necked, implacable, proud, arrogant, and racist people. I detest their system. But it is because I have met and talked with them that I know they are not going to start progress toward freedom for all South Africans just because we apply the pressure of sanctions. To the contrary—their extremists will be overjoyed.

In conclusion, let me say: Like Alan Paton, like Helen Suzman, like Chief

Buthelezi, like those black South Africans shown on last weekend's television, like the United States companies who are living not just talking about, racial equality. I side with those who believe American presence in South Africa helps rather than hurts the cause of black people in South Africa.

That's why I'm voting no to sustain the Presidents' position.

□ 1910

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEASE].

(Mr. PEASE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the veto.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan says that he vetoed this bill to impose additional sanctions against South Africa for fear that it would further harm the black victims of apartheid.

The truth of the matter is that much of these sanctions will have little or no practical effect. Who will be hurt by banning new bank lending to South Africa when, in fact, little or no such lending has occurred since that country suspended repayment of foreign loans last September? Who will be hurt by a ban on new investment by American firms in South Africa when most of these companies have already stopped because of the political turmoil and the weak economy?

Why then should we vote to override the President's veto? Because much of the world including the authorities in Pretoria will view our actions as a statement on American values and human decency.

Stand up against apartheid in the tradition of Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator. Do not bob and weave with the policy of Ronald Reagan.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

(Mr. ALEXANDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the motion to override the Presidential veto of the Anti-Apartheid Act.

Mr. Speaker, our action today is a vote to reaffirm the values on which our great Nation was built. Today we say to the Government of South Africa that we will no longer directly or indirectly patronize a system that is alien to our own beliefs and values. We will not patronize a system that is repugnant to the ideals of freedom and justice that Americans have given their lives to protect and defend. And we will not support a system that violates the common principles of all free people throughout the world.

For our national security and our national conscience, we can no longer support a relic of a colonial history that results in institutionalized, legally imposed racial discrimination.

I urge a vote in favor of the motion to override the President's veto.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any of us wish that this debate were taking

place this evening. It should not be taking place. The President missed a tremendous opportunity to reinforce one of the strongest bipartisan consensus, that has ever existed within this body when he chose to veto rather than to sign the economic sanctions legislation.

Let there be no mistake, that Presidential decision cost America dearly. It has done enormous damage. On the one hand, the President's continued opposition to economic sanctions against South Africa provides encouragement to the white minority regime which desperately wants to believe that it will be able to maintain the system of apartheid in place without fundamental economic cost, safe in the knowledge that our President will provide protection for the economic sanctions that the rest of the world are attempting to mobilize.

That delays the negotiations that are, in the final analysis, the only alternative to bloodbath in South Africa. That encourages greater repression, greater violence by the South African Government, and greater bloodshed.

Mr. Speaker, the President's action not only undermines the process of change in South Africa itself, but it also reinforces the perception throughout the world that the United States has become an accomplice to apartheid and is pursuing a double standard in our approach to South Africa.

The question that people throughout the world are asking is very simple: If the racial composition of forces in South Africa were reversed, and we had had a black minority imposing the terribly dehumanizing system of apartheid over a white majority, would we for decades now have been debating the wisdom and morality and effectiveness of sanctions?

Do you recall such a debate when we were talking about Nicaragua or Libya or Poland or Afghanistan, or virtually any other country in the world against whom sanctions have been applied? Clearly the answer is in the negative, and the world understands that. It is that double standard that is eroding America's moral authority and our political influence not only in South Africa but around the world.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we have an opportunity to speak not as Democrats and not as Republicans, but as Americans. Please, may this House by an overwhelming bipartisan vote reaffirm the best in American tradition and values. Let us vote to override that veto.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to express my strong support for H.R. 4868, the Anti-Apartheid Act, and to urge that we override the President's veto of this measure to impose economic sanctions against South Africa.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times succinctly presented the case for a veto override in an editorial over the weekend appropriately entitled, "Mr. Reagan's Veto, Not America's." In it, they rightfully conclude that President

Reagan, by vetoing the Anti-Apartheid Act, "does not speak for the American people." In urging a veto override, they point out that: First, "the vetoed bill is not the sweeping measure voted by the House but the moderate Senate bill"; second, "it expresses condemnation of apartheid without threatening great ruin"; and third, "all penalties would be lifted if Pretoria freed political prisoners and started good-faith negotiations with responsible black leaders."

Both Houses of Congress passed this legislation in overwhelming fashion. Like so many of my other colleagues, I would have preferred to have the tougher House version, but we realized that such a position could have prevented any anti-apartheid legislation from reaching the President's desk. We sent a sanctions bill to the President because it was the will of the American people and because apartheid and the bloody civil unrest it is spawning cannot be tolerated. These sanctions will help to force the South African Government to negotiate a peaceful settlement with representative black leaders.

Significantly, on the same day that the President vetoed this legislation, a bomb exploded in downtown Johannesburg, wounding three people. This was the 21st bombing in South Africa since a nationwide state of emergency was declared by President P.W. Botha on June 12. These explosions have killed 9 people and wounded 160 others. This violence cannot be allowed to continue and that message must be conveyed in something stronger than words. This legislation offers us that opportunity.

Finally, I would like to address the argument by President Reagan that while he supports the purpose of this legislation—to signal our abhorrence of apartheid—he feels economic sanctions are not the right method. He reasons that economic sanctions would not work and would, in fact, hurt the blacks of South Africa the most. It makes one wonder why that argument is conveniently and selectively used in the case of South Africa, but not in the case of some 20 other countries where United States economic sanctions have been imposed—countries like Poland, Libya, Nicaragua and Afghanistan. Unlike the President, I believe that the case for sanctions is at least as compelling in South Africa as it is in any of those other foreign countries.

But, certainly the best response to the President's concerns comes from the black victims of apartheid themselves. Bishop Tutu and other South African black leaders acknowledge that blacks will have to bear some pain as a result of these sanctions, but it is a price they are more than willing to pay. My distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAY, said black labor leaders gave him this message when he visited there in January: "Yes, restrictions will hurt, but we are prepared to endure that hurt if it means that our day of liberation and freedom may come closer because you raise the cost of apartheid for the minority who is living off of our oppression."

That statement, coupled with the accurate observation made by the New York Times that this sanctions measure "expresses condemnation of apartheid without threatening great ruin," should give us all the reason we need today to overwhelmingly vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, the sanctions in this bill are both reasonable and justified. They would ban new U.S. investments in South Africa. They would prohibit the importation of uranium, coal, textiles, iron, steel, arms, ammunition, military vehicles, agricultural products, and food from South Africa. They ban the export of all crude oil, petroleum products, and munitions to South Africa, as well as any parts or technical data used in connection with any nuclear facilities. And, they would ban South African airliners from landing in the United States, and prevent any U.S. carriers from flying to South Africa. It is an approach that is long overdue. Any further delay will simply mean further bloodshed and a continuation of the morally repugnant apartheid policy of the South African Government. I strongly urge a vote to impose economic sanctions and to override the President's veto.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the President's veto of H.R. 4868. The people of the United States oppose apartheid and are calling on their representative Government to express their views. The Congress passed this bill with overwhelming bipartisan margins because the people of America want to express their outrage at the conditions in South Africa.

It is unfortunate that the administration chooses to ignore this message. The Congress must now take the initiative where the administration has remained inactive. The United States should no longer appear to be on the side of racism in South Africa. Our outrage needs to be expressed not only by words but by actions to back them up. A message needs to be sent to the people of South Africa that the United States, a Nation which has long been a beacon for freedom and individual human dignity, will not be a part of a system that blatantly denies these freedoms to a majority of the population.

The American people have lost their patience with the failed, do-nothing policy of constructive engagement. This policy was given 6 years to work and has not produced any significant gains against the onerous system of apartheid. Morally and politically it is time to take a new course. I regret to say that on this issue the administration has been left behind, clinging to a failed policy.

I urge my colleagues to accept the responsibility for taking the initiative against apartheid and vote to override the veto.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of overriding the Presidential veto of the South Africa sanctions bill (H.R. 4868).

I deeply regret that the Presidential veto has deprived this country of the opportunity to present a totally united front to South Africa, and the rest of the world as other countries weigh responses to the evil of apartheid.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, when this veto is overridden—and I am hopeful that both Houses will do so overwhelmingly—I would hope that foreign observers, particularly in South Africa, would realize that ours is a government of law, and that H.R. 4868 will be the law.

Mr. Speaker, in enacting this legislation, Congress reaches out to the entire continent of Africa and aligns the United States with the future and with basic morality. Whether the present Government of South Africa goes away today, next year, or a decade from now. Whether it goes away by awakening to reality

tomorrow, or is washed away in blood thereafter—and of course we all pray that sanity will prevail—we must recognize that the white majority in South Africa is living out an illusion that ended decades ago.

By aligning ourselves with the inevitable future of South Africa, we espouse a foreign policy that will assure our future relations with that nation, rather than with those who temporarily hold the land by force of arms.

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, I plan to vote for overriding President Reagan's veto of this legislation by which we in Congress express condemnation of apartheid in South Africa.

Yes, I support this override attempt because this legislation forbids new investments, curtails loans and imports and denies landing rights to South African airliners. And all the penalties of this legislation would be lifted if Pretoria freed political prisoners and started good-faith negotiations with responsible black leaders.

President Reagan and Members of Congress who support the President's veto of H.R. 4868, the Anti-Apartheid Act, have been accused repeatedly of supporting racism. I regret these unfair accusations.

I want to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Paducah Sun, the daily newspaper in Paducah, KY. The editorial is written by the newspaper's editor, Jim Paxton, a constituent of mine whose youth, intelligence, liberal-to-moderate viewpoints and sincerity have won for him and his writings a large audience in western Kentucky and southern Illinois.

Jim Paxton, who is known by black friends as progressive but indeed not a racist, wrote in the following editorial the thoughts of several of my colleagues who will vote today to sustain President Reagan's veto of H.R. 4868.

[Editorial]

MERE GESTURES TO SOUTH AFRICA?

(By John Paxton)

We deplore South Africa's policy of apartheid, should any doubt remain among our readers. For those who may not know by now, apartheid is a system of segregation imposed by that country's white minority government. It denies voting rights and other privileges to blacks and citizens of mixed race.

Apartheid has become a major embarrassment for the United States, because of South Africa's status as our trading partner and military ally. Congress and President Reagan have been struggling to come up with ways to pressure the South African government to phase out this policy, because it is so severely inconsistent with this country's longstanding position that it will not support governments that flagrantly ignore human rights.

The problem is, Congress and the president apparently are not going to be able to agree about the best way to apply this pressure.

As we write this, it appears that the president is going to veto the method proposed by Congress—a ban on U.S. bank loans and new investments in South Africa, as well as prohibitions against importing certain goods made in South Africa. The president prefers a different method: the appointment of a black U.S. ambassador to South Africa. It further appears that Congress will override President Reagan's veto, so that both efforts to apply pressure will go into effect.

We believe both proposals fall short of the mark, however. Certainly, appointment of a black ambassador to South Africa will create some embarrassing situations for the

white government there, as it will almost certainly have to adopt a double standard if it wants to avoid a major diplomatic incident. But that's about it. South Africa has not allowed our past ambassadors to dictate how it runs its government, so it is naive to believe that it will treat our probable new ambassador, Edward J. Perkins, any differently.

The sanctions proposed by Congress are unlikely to fare much better. In addition to bans on new U.S. loans and investments, the sanctions will halt imports of South African uranium, coal, steel, textiles, military vehicles, and agricultural products. But as NBC News reported last Thursday, the only ban that will really put any significant sting on South Africa will be the ban on steel. South African Prime Minister P.W. Botha told the network those who will suffer most from this will be several thousand black workers who will be laid off from their jobs. The United States will continue to import large quantities of gold, titanium, and other products essential to defense programs and unavailable from other sources.

That is ironic. South African blacks, primarily, will suffer at the hands of the United States, while American producers of coal, steel, uranium, and agricultural products would seemingly benefit.

Thus, both moves, unmasked, are sure politics. They underscore the tentativeness that has made U.S. foreign policy embarrassingly ineffective in recent years. We really haven't given up anything. Meanwhile, we have indirectly added to the oppression of those we say we are trying to help.

If we really believe it is our place to try to force South Africa to end its racial policies—and given the concept of the sovereignty of countries, questions could be raised about whether it is—then we would not be stopping half way. It seems we would be willing to truly share the hardships, by finding substitutes for the commodities we apparently will continue to import. We would end all trade with South Africa, and we would withdraw our diplomats.

It is not our position—at this time—that those specific steps should be taken. We simply point out that the steps taken so far probably will accomplish nothing, and we fear that in the long run, they will be counterproductive for the United States.

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I don't like sanctions. They just don't work. At least I cannot recall any sanctions which ever served the intended purposes.

Dislike, however, is too mild a word for the feelings shared by most Americans, including myself, about apartheid. There is an overwhelming need for our country to take the lead in demanding an end to that loathsome system.

Of course, the vote is symbolic. Certainly we should not be deluded that our action today will improve conditions in South Africa. Even so, there is really no choice.

This is our only chance to express our feelings about apartheid. I would rather cast that vote for a bill I thought would do some real good. But, I don't have that luxury.

There is only one antiapartheid bill before us. I shall vote for it.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives takes the historic step of imposing economic sanctions against South Africa until that Government ends its racist policy of apartheid.

It is timely to call to the attention of my colleagues and other Americans an exceptional speech on this subject—informative and in-

spiring—by an extraordinary, industrialist, philanthropist, and leader, J. Irwin Miller:

I have been asked to discuss U.S. Government Policy Toward South Africa.

As one begins such a discussion, it is first necessary to ask why S.A. is a question of special importance to this country today. South Africa is not, like the Soviet Union, competing with the United States for influence in large and important areas of the planet. It is not, like Japan, a major industrial power invading American markets. It is not, like Cuba, attempting to establish a sphere of influence next door to this country. It is not alone in today's world in violation of human rights, or in possible use of torture.

It is after all a sovereign nation, and there are many sovereign nations whose internal policies we Americans find repugnant, but in whose affairs we feel no particular call to interfere.

Why South Africa?

Perhaps the answer lies in its economic importance to the United States. S.A. contains the world's largest known deposits of chromium, manganese, platinum, vanadium, and gold—all vital minerals to a sophisticated high technology society. In addition it has major deposits of copper, diamonds, iron, nickel, and uranium.

South Africa is an efficient miner, processor, and marketer. The safety and health record of its mine workers is among the best anywhere, and its internal transportation system is the best on the African continent.

Further, the United States has for some time protected itself against possible disruption of supply by a policy, not always fully funded, of stockpiling a 3-year supply of strategic minerals not available to it internally. If supply were shut off, this country could probably outlast South Africa, whose economy would suffer considerable injury if mineral exports to the U.S. were suspended or drastically reduced for an extended time. By intelligent buying on the spot market, a 3-year stockpile might effectively become a 6-year reserve. In short, it is possible with foresight to handle the strategic minerals problem.

South Africa also sits across the major shipping lane from Middle East oil fields to the United States, and might, if turned hostile, attempt to close that lane.

Our own Navy, however, states that the lane is approximately 1,000 miles wide around the Cape of Good Hope, as contrasted with the 50 mile width of the Strait of Hormuz, the most effective point of interdiction. If attempts are made to shut off shipping, the Cape is not the best place to try it.

Why South Africa?

The United States has annual trade with South Africa of \$3½ billion. In other sub-Saharan predominantly black African countries, however, its annual trade in the mid-1980s amounted to \$14 billion, four times greater. In short, economics does not seem the principal reason for our special concern.

The answer to our question, "Why this special concern for South Africa? Why not equal or more concern for change in Uganda, or Chile, or China, or the Soviet Union," The answer comes down to the imponderables, not to economics, and they are all summed up in that single word, Apartheid," broad discrimination solely on the grounds of race, embodied in the constitution, buttressed by more than 1,000 separate laws and regulations, and enforced by a most effective police and military.

In this word, "apartheid", we Americans are confronted with our own conflicting attitudes toward a number of matters: our

biases concerning race, our fears of the spread of Communism, our assumption that white S.A. is part of the West, of the "Free World," and our own remaining unsolved racial problems and tensions.

Perhaps we should stop right here and ask ourselves once more "Why isn't what happens inside S.A. their own affair, and after all none of our business?"

This is a pretty tough question to answer honestly. Our own race relations in the Mississippi Delta have certainly lagged the rest of the country in improvement. And I must confess that, if the Soviet Union were to say to Americans "We will have no more cultural or other exchanges with you until you practise what you preach in Mississippi," I, as one American, would instinctively reply "Mind your own business."

Such an argument, though strong, is nevertheless flawed.

Throughout history every nation has had to have a foreign policy. This might mean a policy to protect itself against a threatening neighbor tribe, or against an ambitious world power.

In today's world every nation is some kind of neighbor. We feel compelled to have an active ambassador in every capital city, and that ambassador is well aware of America's goals and targets in respect to that nation. He is well aware of his responsibility to advance them, and he is equally aware of the limitations on our ability to achieve them.

We also recognize the legitimacy of a foreign policy for others, by welcoming ambassadors from other nations, granting them normal freedom to pursue their policies, and diplomatic immunity as well. There are, of course, exceptions, but they are so remarkable and so few that we can nearly count them on our fingers.

So, if there is bound to be a U.S. Policy Toward South Africa, and if that policy is to be compatible with and aimed to advance American interests, what should it be?

Let me approach an answer by means of an analogue, which I will be the first to confess is only partly analogous. Cummins has done business in South Africa for well over 40 years. In our classes of products we have until very recently held dominant positions in the South African market.

The South African Government in turn has long been concerned to be self-sufficient in those important areas where they might be damaged if supply were cut off. Oil was one of these, and many years ago they developed, with American technology, plants to convert coal to oil.

In 1980 the S.A. Government decided that it was important to become self-sufficient in diesel engines. It appropriated \$500 million to build and equip a plant, and invited bids from all major world producers to submit engine designs, plant designs, and operating proposals.

Our company was probably a slightly favored bidder, because of the presence we already had in the South African market. We however, declined to bid. Another company from another nation won the bid, and our business in South Africa is now reduced to a fragment of what it was. Why did we decline? Why not operate in each country according to the policies of that country?

Well, a clear purpose of the South African proposal was to anticipate sanctions and to have a dependable government-owned supply of diesel engines for the South African police and military, as well as for domestic use. Since it would be government owned, the plant in all respects would have to operate according to government requirements.

Normally, in foreign operations, we would feel it incumbent upon us to be good citizens, to conform in both letter and spirit to

the laws and policies of the nation in which we operate.

In the case of South Africa there is for us a complication. For 50 years our company has done what it could to advance the ideal of equality of opportunity and equality of treatment for every employee and every citizen. We believe this builds a stronger, more competitive business. We believe it is the only sound way to operate. We have pioneered in opening employment to minorities, to welcoming women into every level. Our record has, of course, been spotty, nothing in my opinion to brag about, but the intention has been solid and continuous. Members of the company understand the policy, and it lies at the very heart of our management tradition. It is good for business.

We simply cannot operate in another country in a manner which contradicts what we have worked for and still stand for after 50 years. The internal consequences of such an action would be disruptive and potentially weakening to the whole corporation.

"How about the stockholders?" You have a right to say, "Isn't it the purpose of a corporation to maximize return on its shares? Are you being responsible when you give up annual sales of \$20 million and the profit on them for a reason so vague?"

The answer is that, in the continuing long term, the abandonment of the measure of credibility which we may have gained about equal concern for every member of the company would so shake internal confidence in management's commitment as to be truly damaging to shareholder interest. It was an easy decision to make.

It was also in a sense a peculiarly American decision, if I may say so, and relevant to this discussion tonight.

America is a peculiar nation in this world. It is at times difficult for either friend or opponent to understand. Our nation often seems unpredictable, inconsistent, and an unrealistic moralizer in a practical world—altogether a difficult friend and a baffling opponent.

At the same time Americans are apt to feel that they are proceeding perfectly logically, are misunderstood, and can't understand what all the fuss is about.

How can this happen? Well, nothing grips a people more strongly than its traditions, long established, deeply embedded.

For 2,000 years the nations of Europe, and for more than 300 years the nation of South Africa have defined their nations geographically, as cherished and beloved areas of land. To a Welshman Wales is the Welsh Mountains, to a Scot Scotland is the Highlands. To an Austrian Austria is the city of Vienna or the Salzkammergut, and so on. These pieces of land have been fought over, won and lost, for so many centuries that they embody the nation—even for generations who may not know the long history.

For Americans, however, their nation has never been defined in geographical terms. We have had relatively so much land for so few people throughout our history, our borders are not threatened, and we are still so mobile—that we do not define our nation as most others do.

Americans view their country differently. They define it and think of it in terms of principles and concepts—constantly using words like freedom, equality, or phrases like "log cabin to White House," "classless society," "I'm just as good as you." American to Americans is an idea, not a place.

Now our performance in living up to this idea is not any better than it should be. There have been selfish perversions and simplistic definitions of freedom. There continue to be denials of civil rights at the same time that we assert them. We make unequal

and unsteady progress on race and on opportunity for women. For years we may slide back, and progress may appear to stop.

But to our credit we are ashamed of bad performance. For all our talk about being or wanting someone to think we are "No. 1," we are less than certain about ourselves, and one of our greatest judges put it correctly when he said "The spirit of America is the spirit that is not quite sure it is right."

American behavior judged by European tradition can, therefore, be at times incomprehensible. American behavior, judged by its own tradition, can be as predictable as that of any other nation.

(Before leaving this discussion I ought in honesty to confess that all too often we Americans seem to think we invented the principles by means of which we define ourselves. We forget that they are in very great part an inheritance from Western Europe, from Greece, from Rome, and from Ancient Israel. It would do us good to remember and to acknowledge this more often.)

Any way—we are what we are. What then does that mean for a fitting U.S. Policy Toward South Africa?

As of 1980 the population of South Africa comprised: 19.8 million Black Africans, 4.5 million Whites, 2.6 million "Colored" (Mixed Race), .8 million Asians, for a total of 27.7 million persons.

Whites made up 16.25% of that total. Blacks, Colored, and Asians made up 83.75% of the population.

And Blacks alone were 71.5% of the whole. All racial groups are increasing—but at significantly different rates.

The White proportion, while growing in number, has been decreasing in percentage—Declining from 21.4% in 1911 to 16.25% in 1980.

In the same period the Black African segment increased from 67.3% to 71.5%.

The Colored from 8.8% to 9.4%.

And the Asian from 2.5% to 2.9%.

The White population is divided into 2 major components: The Afrikaners, who constitute 60% of Whites, and the Anglos, who settled later, and make up 40% of the Whites.

The Black birthrate is about twice that of Whites, but Blacks are divided. They are divided by tribal descent. They are divided by language. (There are among them more than 100 different languages and dialects.) And they are divided by regional differences as well.

If present trends continue, by 1990 (4 years hence) All Whites will have declined to 14% of total population, and Blacks, Colored, and Asians (those who are excluded from the vote) will be 86% of the total.

Since 1950, by law, every person has been assigned to one of three groups: White, Colored, or African.

Parliament is supreme, is composed only of Whites, and is chosen only by White voters, the 14%. The President is given extraordinary powers, rendering parliament much weaker than we normally suppose.

There are several thousand laws under which a person's rights depend on race alone. Under such laws a Black or Colored person is told where to live. Seven times as much is still spent on the education of each White child as is spent on each Black child. A person may be detained without right of counsel, with no requirement to notify families, and with no requirement to be charged or brought to trial by a specified time under apartheid laws. For 14% of the population to retain firm control over 86%, something like this is probably necessary.

Some laws (the mixed marriage or immorality act, for example) have, however, re-

cently been repealed, some ignored, and some modified.

I do not have time tonight to describe in more detail the whole apparatus of apartheid beyond this brief account. Suffice it to say that, in general, the White community is not about to give up control, but thinks there has been reform, a commitment to end apartheid some day, and cannot understand why there is growing violence. The Black community is well acquainted with the word, "Democracy," which doesn't apply to them, thinks all proposed reforms are shams, and that nothing has really changed—except that police repression has been increased.

Blacks have learned that, when they are quiet and patient, progress stops, and that the government, when it does move, seems nowadays to move only in response to violence or to the convincing threat of violence.

Blacks will now, however, for the first time tell you that "the end is in sight." At the same time they are well aware that the power of the government is very great indeed and more than adequate to the present occasion.

They feel that for the first time they have the initiative, that the government is reacting to them and has no real policy of its own. It is in the light of all this that Blacks today feel a new sense of confidence.

They will at the same time assure you that they have found no disposition whatever on the part of the S.A. Government to enter into any serious negotiations. This is why you will not find today in the mainstream of Black leadership any so-called "moderate" Blacks. There is a growing feeling that only violence will bring change.

There is also emerging—for the very first time—a broad agreement on what the Black agenda should be. This fact is in sharp contrast to the confusion and varieties of thought among Whites, and it gives the Blacks new confidence.

The consensus among Blacks is to be found in general terms around what has come to be called "The Mandela Package." In brief this could be described as:

Release Mandela.

Un-bann the African National Congress (ANC).

Permit unfettered political activity.

Dismantle all apartheid laws.

Begin serious negotiations toward a non-racial, democratic constitution in an undivided South Africa.

Redistribution of wealth.

A few comments: The demand is for one person, one vote. This is probably still negotiable today, but may not be for too long. If negotiations are seemingly forever postponed and only violence appears to produce movement, then this opportunity may at some time be lost. After all a winner doesn't have to negotiate.

Redistribution of wealth: This is a very fuzzy phrase. I sense no clear agreement as to what form it might take. Why is it on the agenda? Many of the Blacks admittedly live in circumstances no worse, perhaps even better than citizens of most sub-Saharan countries. But in South Africa there is a difference.

First, S.A. Blacks have no choice as to where they may live. They are told by the Government.

Next, thirty minutes to an hour away from squatter communities of half a million persons there exist some of the most beautiful residential communities you can see in any country in the world—all White. Further many township and squatter camp residents work every day as domestic servants in these beautiful residences, or as office

workers in downtown Johannesburg or Capetown. They have eyes; they can see.

Does this mean they are Communist, and that we non-Communists must provide arms to those who fear a Communist takeover?

I think it is not so simple as that.

The confrontation in S.A. cannot usefully be described as simply a Capitalist/Communist battleground. The first priority for both White Afrikaners and Black natives is to have the say in their own affairs.

The Afrikaner (10%) has only recently and with great difficulty come to power in his own land, when in history has a ruling group shared power willingly?

The Black (86%) is determined (as one put it to me) "to have a say in what happens to me." And when in history has a 10% ruling group for long been able to deny power to an 85% aroused group, regardless of who has the guns? Not in Czarist Russia. Not in Bourbon France. Not in Iran. Not in British India.

Voltaire said "History is only the patter of silken slippers descending the stairs to the thunder of hobnailed boots climbing upward from below."

Many Black leaders today identify Capitalism with apartheid. Existing, as they do, in such a system and feeling that there is no hope for any change except through continued violence, they find that only Marx and Socialism are using the phrases "social justice" and "elimination of greed." The Capitalist phrases they hear are "Law and Order," "Be Patient." Relatively blind to the failures of socialist societies, they perceive quite clearly that what they call the "Capitalist Nations" and we call the "Free World" are today taking the side of the White Afrikaner Government. So they begin calling each other "comrade."

What then might finally be a U.S. policy toward South Africa in 1986, a policy which our grandchildren in 2036 might say was wise, farsighted, truly in the best interests of this country?

Obviously I can make no claim to special wisdom on this subject. So, anything I say is no more than one person's opinion, and therefore good for little more than to be challenged and disputed.

To me the first great big fact is that the Blacks are going to win—not today, or tomorrow, but sooner or later, and probably sooner than we may think, or than most White South Africans probably think.

The second fact is that, if the Blacks are going to win, it is in our interest that they (whoever "they" may turn out to be) come to look on America as a friend and that we thus might be enabled to have some appropriate and favorable influence in future South African affairs.

A third fact is that, if they are to look upon us as a friend, we must win and deserve that friendship now, in their hour of need, when the issue is still in doubt, when they need us, and not delay and attempt to win their friendship only after they have won.

A final fact is that we have a special interest in doing what we can to help bring about a negotiated power-sharing rather than simply to stand by and watch the final and horrible bloodbath take place.

A violent all-out revolution in S.A. will force this country to take sides. If we cannot avoid taking sides, and if the ultimate outcome is pretty clear (with only the timing uncertain), it would seem more prudent to take sides sooner rather than later.

The Blacks think we have already taken sides, and that we are on the side of the White S.A. Government—regardless of how many times how many American officials say they "Abhor Apartheid." Black South African feelings about the U.S. have

reached a new level of hostility and mistrust.

The White S.A. Government is in turn not all that unhappy with our official policy of "constructive engagement," which in six years has not moved them to the negotiating table on Namibia, nor to any meaningful negotiations with any real Black leaders at home. The S.A. Government is comfortable with our present policy.

If then we are once again backing the ultimate loser, if that loser is clearly oppressive and clearly wrong by all standards to which Americans adhere, what should we do? What actions on our part might convince the Black majority that we are their friend and, a revolutionary people ourselves, that we are broadly "on their side?"

To begin with, I think that actions will probably be more convincing than talk.

Second, I believe the U.S. must go ahead and take any actions it decides upon unilaterally. I see little hope for concerted action by the Western powers in the foreseeable future.

Next, I am well aware that unilateral action is very much weaker than concerted action—and may be economically ineffective.

So we come to "sanctions."

The case to be made against sanctions is devastating.

Unilateral sanctions by the U.S. would not end apartheid.

Unilateral sanctions by the U.S. would cause anger but possibly only small inconvenience to the White S.A. Government.

To the extent that sanctions did inconvenience the economy of S.A., any harm caused would be visited mainly on the Black employed population. The Government has the power and the disposition to see to this—and to make life difficult for the border nations as well.

Sanctions might only harden the commitment of the White population to support of present policies.

That is most of the case against sanctions.

On the other side, there is really only one argument. For the Black community as a whole, and for the emerging Black leaders of growing power, the adoption of significant sanctions has now become the test of "whose side you are on."

In a peculiar sense, the same can be said of the White S.A. Government. Regardless of economic consequences, a unilateral move by the U.S. to meaningful sanctions would come as a major shock.

Now we are in the position where our President says he will veto meaningful sanctions, and the House and Senate will probably send to him for his signature a fairly strong sanctions bill.

If this happens, if it is vetoed, if the veto is sustained, our chances for present and future respect and influence with the Black African majority must be rated very small indeed.

What would I do? I would support a very flawed and imperfect solution. I would adopt a package of sanctions which would constitute at least the minimum that would persuade the Black majority that we were "on their side," and I would do it now, while the issue is still in doubt.

I have not always felt this way. I am aware that, by moving unilaterally, we give considerable opportunity to great Britain, West Germany, and Japan to profit at our expense. I am aware that such an action by us may not work, but we will have come down on the right side, at some cost to ourselves, and in the long run there is no better foreign policy than that.

I would, however, not stop here.

I would promptly establish open communication with the African National Congress, come to know them and their leaders in depth, and gain some measure of knowledge as to their probable reaction to any actions we contemplate.

It has not bothered us to invite the Nicaraguan "Contras" to Washington, even though we maintain our Embassy in Nicaragua. It has also not bothered us to invite Mr. Savimbi to Washington. Both of these groups practise violent revolutionary tactics, as does the ANC.

But the ANC, whose influence in the Black S.A. population is large and growing, may well have a better claim to be termed "Freedom Fighters" than either of our other two friends.

I would next turn attention to the so-called "Front Line" nations, Angola, Mozambique, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Zambia, Tanzania, Zaire, Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland. In a stagnant world economy these nations are in economic depression. Many of them depend on trade with South Africa, and can ship to the world their products and their minerals only by means of South Africa's excellent railway and port facilities. Most of them have been pressing the West for sanctions, though they have not themselves imposed sanctions. If the U.S. acts unilaterally on sanctions, South Africa has the power and incentive to punish these states, with whom we have a potentially important future.

I would regularly consult with and listen to these nations about our policy options in respect to South Africa. And I would go further—I would begin to entertain the possibility of the modern equivalent of a "Marshall Plan" for sub-Saharan Africa.

This would include relief from their landlocked dependence on South Africa, necessary improvements to their own infrastructure—and, under proper conditions, new credits.

I say all this, well aware that many of these nations are riddled by corruption, have one party systems that oppress opposition (certainly far from "democracy"), and are embarked on ill-conceived Socialist adventures, which are either failing already, or are almost bound to fail.

If we were to consider an equivalent "Marshall Plan" for Africa, I would bargain very hard indeed. I would be implacable on corruption and would withdraw aid where corruption continues to be flagrant.

I would move cautiously with unstable governments.

I would not demand that they move dramatically from a socialist ideology to a free enterprise ideology. For many of them, at this stage in their development, neither is appropriate.

Instead I would encourage them to drop slogans, and to move pragmatically rather than ideologically. Insofar as they listened, I would cooperate. Insofar as they were immovable I would not advance funds for guaranteed failure.

Such a "Marshall Plan" is needed. However, such a plan might make more enemies than friends, might be branded "neo-colonialism," and, of course, it might very well fail amidst all kinds of recriminations.

At any rate I would at least test the water. And all the time I would use whatever influence or power or persuasion I had with the South African Government to urge an honest open negotiation begun now, and aiming at a non-racial, democratic nation, in an undivided South Africa.

You will notice that I have not discussed "disinvestment" or "divestment," phrases much used in America today. The subject is for me quite complex, even though my own

company, Cummins, has in effect "divested."

The important goal for me is a revised U.S. Foreign Policy toward South Africa. If a part of that policy were to be a requirement to disinvest, then I think disinvestment would send a powerful message.

If, on the other hand, the U.S. Government "sides with the S.A. Government" (as South African Blacks now think it is doing), disinvestment by private companies in the face of our contrary government policies would probably only confuse.

On this subject I am certain only that a firm clear U.S. Government policy obeyed in letter and spirit by U.S. corporations still resident in South Africa is an urgent need right now. That is why this evening I have concentrated my remarks on government policy.

It is now time to conclude.

This is not a complete list of recommended policy options. It is only an illustrative list.

The U.S. does not have the power to decide the future of South Africa.

Developments there have a life of their own, and whatever will happen there will in all probability happen regardless of what we do.

But it is important to us in our own domestic life and relations, and in our future world influence, that the seemingly inevitable power sharing or power transfer, whichever it may turn out to be, be accomplished as peacefully and rationally as possible, and probably sooner rather than later.

And that in the new South African society the United States be looked upon as a valuable and useful friend.

Thank you for listening. The crystal ball of history is forever clouded, and these are only the ideas of one person, who lives far indeed from the scene.

I have, however, enjoyed the opportunity to try to put my own thoughts together, and it has been a pleasure to be with you tonight.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my opposition to the President's veto of the anti-apartheid bill both the House and Senate have passed by overwhelming majorities.

In the past I called for the toughest sanctions against the apartheid regime. In May, the House paid heed to that call. I called for those sanctions again earlier this month, and I call for them again today.

It is most unfortunate that the President refuses to join the House of Representatives, the American people, and the Eminent Persons Group in expressing total abhorrence to apartheid. Apartheid enslaves black South Africans. It is evil. The United States will be an accessory to this evil until all ties are cut with the apartheid regime.

I continue to believe that we must send the strongest message possible to the South African regime that we oppose apartheid. I also believe that we must, as a nation, wait no longer to move decisively. Although I believe we should be taking stronger action, I support the action we are taking today.

We speak out today to free South African blacks from political persecution. We also speak out today to free America from our history of racial injustice, and from our present policy of "constructive engagement." The struggle against apartheid is as important to the well-being of this Nation as it is for the lives of our sisters and brothers in South Africa.

The sanctions the President imposed last year have simply not done the job. We must

send a stronger message. I urge my colleagues to override the President's veto.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto of H.R. 4868, the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986. The proper course of American foreign policy toward South Africa has been a subject of honest, energetic, and often emotional, debate for some time.

Developments in southern Africa are extremely important to the United States. The system of apartheid offends the moral sensibilities of the American people. The systematic violation of fundamental human rights and dignity by the state in South Africa cannot long continue without precipitating wider violence. As a people committed to the principles of liberty and democracy, the situation in South Africa requires a response by the United States.

From a strategic vantage point, southern Africa is not as vital to the future security of the United States as others which present a more subtle challenge. However, neither is it a region of peripheral importance. Economically, politically, and militarily, Pretoria is the dominant factor in the life and politics of southern Africa. The escalating cycle of violence in South Africa threatens the future of that potentially great nation. It also presents opportunities for the Soviet Union and its allies to exploit understandable discontent as a means to extend its influence in the region.

No one engaged in this policy debate disagrees with the premise that it is in the interest of the United States to encourage the peaceful end of the system of apartheid and the transition of South Africa toward a just and open society. The difference of opinion between Congress and the administration centers on the most appropriate means for influencing events in South Africa to reach this desired outcome.

Sanctions against the Pretoria government have been under consideration since the early 1960's. In recent months and years, several Western governments, including the United States, have strengthened or begun a series of loosely coordinated sanctions in response to the unwillingness of the South African Government to address the basic aspirations of its people, an unwillingness that threatens regional stability.

The administration is understandably concerned that tough economic sanctions may embolden those in South Africa who seek a violent Marxist-Leninist revolutionary solution to that nation's problems. As I have previously stated on the floor of this House, "constructive engagement" was a policy that had to be tried, but has yielded few tangible results.

Constructive engagement, however, has offered some insights into South African strategy. Pretoria apparently believes that the United States and the United Kingdom will not allow the South African Government to fall out of a belief that it is the last remaining bulwark in the region to communism. Sanctions undertaken by Canada, Australia, Denmark, and France, among others, are sanctions to be regretted in Pretoria, but can be dealt with. The South African Government seems secure in the belief that it is in the interest of the West for the present Government to remain unchanged and unreconciled to the growing discontent beneath it. The response of the Botha government to President Reagan's diplomatic

efforts to find a way toward internal reconciliation in South Africa is indicative of this attitude.

What the South African Government fails to understand is that the position to which it continues to cling makes the revolutionary alternative more, rather than less likely. The enactment of the legislation before us will send an unmistakable message to Pretoria that cloaking apartheid, the root of the Southern African problem, in anticommunism is no longer sufficient.

I understand that the complex history of South Africa makes it extraordinarily difficult to secure meaningful reform in a short period of time. Men, however, need not be trapped by their history. All South Africans must begin to engage in a meaningful dialog that holds the promise of the evolution of a viable, open, and democratic society. That is the only path by which South Africa will step back from the chaos that threatens to engulf it.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 313, nays 83, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 425]

YEAS—313

Abercrombie	Cooper	Gilman
Ackerman	Coughlin	Gingrich
Akaka	Courter	Glickman
Alexander	Coyne	Gonzalez
Anderson	Crockett	Goodling
Andrews	Darden	Gordon
Annuzio	Daschle	Gradison
Applegate	Daub	Gray (IL)
Aspin	Davis	Gray (PA)
Atkins	de la Garza	Green
AuCoin	Dellums	Guarini
Barnard	Dicks	Gunderson
Barnes	Dingell	Hall (OH)
Bateman	DioGuardi	Hamilton
Bates	Dixon	Hawkins
Bedell	Donnelly	Hayes
Beilenson	Dorgan (ND)	Hefner
Bennett	Dowdy	Henry
Bentley	Downey	Hertel
Bereuter	Duncan	Hiler
Berman	Durbin	Hillis
Bevill	Dwyer	Hopkins
Biaggi	Dymally	Horton
Bliley	Dyson	Howard
Boehlert	Early	Hoyer
Boggs	Eckart (OH)	Hubbard
Boland	Edgar	Hughes
Boner (TN)	Edwards (CA)	Ireland
Bonior (MI)	English	Jacobs
Borski	Erdreich	Jeffords
Bosco	Evans (IA)	Jenkins
Boucher	Evans (IL)	Johnson
Boxer	Fascell	Jones (OK)
Brooks	Fawell	Jones (TN)
Brown (CA)	Pazio	Kanjorski
Brown (CO)	Feighan	Kaptur
Bruce	Fish	Kasich
Bryant	Flippo	Kastenmeier
Bustamante	Florio	Kennelly
Byron	Foglietta	Kildee
Carney	Foley	Kleccka
Carper	Ford (MI)	Kolbe
Carr	Ford (TN)	Kolter
Chandler	Frank	Kostmayer
Chapman	Franklin	LaFalce
Chappell	Frenzel	Lagomarsino
Clay	Frost	Lantos
Clinger	Fuqua	Leach (IA)
Coats	Gallo	Leath (TX)
Coelho	Garcia	Lehman (CA)
Coleman (TX)	Gajdenson	Lehman (FL)
Collins	Gekas	Leland
Conte	Gephardt	Lent
Conyers	Gibbons	Levin (MI)

Levine (CA)	Olin
Lewis (FL)	Ortiz
Lightfoot	Owens
Lipinski	Pashayan
Lloyd	Pease
Long	Penny
Lowery (CA)	Pepper
Lowry (WA)	Perkins
Lujan	Petri
Luken	Pickle
Lundine	Price
MacKay	Pursell
Madigan	Rahall
Manton	Rangel
Markey	Ray
Martin (IL)	Regula
Martinez	Reid
Matsui	Richardson
Mavroules	Ridge
Mazzoli	Rinaldo
McCain	Roberts
McCloskey	Robinson
McCurdy	Rodino
McGrath	Roe
McHugh	Roemer
McKernan	Roukema
McKinney	Rowland (CT)
Meyers	Rowland (GA)
Mica	Roybal
Mikulski	Russo
Miller (WA)	Sabo
Mineta	Savage
Mitchell	Saxton
Moakley	Scheuer
Molinari	Schroeder
Mollohan	Schuette
Moody	Schulze
Morrison (CT)	Schumer
Morrison (WA)	Seiberling
Mrazek	Sensenbrenner
Murphy	Sharp
Murtha	Shelby
Natcher	Sikorski
Neal	Siskisky
Nelson	Slattery
Nichols	Smith (FL)
Nowak	Smith (IA)
O'Neill	Smith (NE)
Oakar	Smith (NJ)
Oberstar	Snowe
Obey	Solarz

NAYS—83

Archer	Holt	Rogers
Armey	Hunter	Roth
Bartlett	Hutto	Rudd
Barton	Hyde	Schaefer
Billakis	Kemp	Shaw
Boulter	Latta	Shumway
Broomfield	Lewis (CA)	Shuster
Burton (IN)	Livingston	Skeen
Callahan	Loeffler	Slaughter
Chappie	Lott	Smith, Denny
Cheney	Lungren	(OR)
Cobey	Mack	Smith, Robert
Coble	Marlenee	(NH)
Combest	McCandless	Smith, Robert
Craig	McCollum	(OR)
Crane	McEwen	Snyder
Daniel	McMillan	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Michel	Spence
DeLay	Miller (OH)	Stenholm
DeWine	Monson	Strang
Dickinson	Montgomery	Stump
Dornan (CA)	Moorhead	Sundquist
Dreier	Myers	Sweeney
Eckert (NY)	Nielson	Swindall
Emerson	Packard	Taylor
Fields	Parris	Vucanovich
Hammerschmidt	Porter	Whittaker
Hansen	Quillen	Young (FL)
Hendon	Ritter	

NOT VOTING—37

Anthony	Grotberg	Panetta
Badham	Hall, Ralph	Rose
Bonker	Hartnett	Rostenkowski
Breaux	Hatcher	Schneider
Burton (CA)	Huckaby	Siljander
Campbell	Jones (NC)	Skeltan
Coleman (MO)	Kindness	Stangeland
Derrick	Kramer	Thomas (CA)
Edwards (OK)	Martin (NY)	Vander Jagt
Fiedler	McDade	Weaver
Fowler	Miller (CA)	Zschau
Gaydos	Moore	
Gregg	Oxley	

□ 1930

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Anthony and Mr. Panetta for, with Mr. Oxley against.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4868, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JONES of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, due to a malfunctioning machine I was not recorded on two votes last week. They were the motions to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5269 and H.R. 4216, rollcalls 401 and 402, respectively. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of both motions.

NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS
AMENDMENTS OF 1986—VETO
MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my signature H.R. 3247, which would extend and amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974.

I fully support the objectives of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to help American Indians, Alaskan Natives, and Native Hawaiians achieve economic and social self-sufficiency. My decision not to approve H.R. 3247 is based on my belief that this bill would seriously undermine the administrative flexibility needed to ensure responsiveness to individual tribes and Native American organizations—flexibility that is essential to the effectiveness of the Native American programs.

The Executive branch must be allowed to carry out its responsibilities to administer the laws effectively. H.R. 3247 would cause undue interference with ongoing program management. This legislation, if signed into law, would make effective administration of this important program extremely difficult by creating delays in implementing program policy that can