

shipments are processed. However, in 1984, \$20.2 million was spent on ocean freight differentials. This included \$1.3 million for processed grain products, \$0.8 million for bagged grain, and \$18.1 million for bulk commodities shipped under title II. Total costs of all titles of Public Law 480 for cargo preference against the USDA budget in 1984 were almost \$90 million.

An example of how cargo preference legislation increases the costs to the Federal Government in expanding farm export sales is the subsidized sale of flour to Egypt in early 1983. Because the price of the flour was subsidized to meet the European Community level of prices of around \$160 per metric ton, cargo preference was applicable. The sale of flour to Egypt was made using Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of wheat. U.S. flour millers placed bids on wheat stocks from CCC holdings as the volume of free wheat needed in order to sell the flour to Egypt at a reduced price. Since the flour mills were aware that the cost of shipping to Egypt would be increased by the requirement that half the flour be shipped on U.S. vessels, they increased the volume of wheat needed. The Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service [ASCS] estimates that an additional 6 million bushels of U.S. wheat from CCC stocks were used to offset the increased cost of U.S. vessels. Based on prices at the time, the estimated cost to the CCC was \$24 million.

The future impact of cargo preference legislation could be even more devastating to the development of overseas markets for farm products due to a recent Federal district court ruling in late February of this year. In that decision, the court ruled cargo preference was also applicable to the blended credit program. Blended credit is a mixture of direct Government loans and credit guarantees to banks. In this program, the blend is generally 20 percent direct credit at a zero interest rate and 80 percent of loan guarantees and prevailing commercial interest rates. The direct credit portion at a zero interest rate was ruled by the court to constitute a subsidy and therefore cargo preference laws were applicable. Unless the decision is eventually overturned this will mean that 50 percent of the shipments under the blended credit program must be shipped in U.S. bottoms at rates \$20 to \$50 above non-U.S.-flag carrier rates. Cargo preference would therefore add between 15 percent and 30 percent to the cost of a ton of wheat which is averaging around \$150 per ton. The 2-percent interest subsidy will hardly offset the 15 to 30 percent increase in the landed price of the commodity. In this instance, cargo preference would effectively kill any efforts to combat unfair European Community trade practices and reduce the export volume for U.S. wheat farmers.

It should also be noted that the excessive costs of cargo preference requirements benefit only a handful of U.S. maritime companies. In 1984, companies that received payments for ocean freight differentials under titles I and III of the Public Law 480 program are:

1. Lykes Steamship Co., Inc.....	\$9,365,765
2. Ultimar Shipping Co., Inc.....	8,934,047
3. Central Gulf Lines, Inc.....	7,561,504
4. Phoenix Bulkship, Inc.....	7,395,471
5. American President Lines, Ltd.	5,311,396
6. Equity Carriers III, Inc.....	2,863,950
7. Waterman Steamship Co.....	2,781,852
8. Delta Steamship Lines, Inc.....	2,633,032
9. Apex Marine Corp.....	2,449,000
10. A.P. St. Philip, Inc.....	1,981,650
11. Asco-Falcon II Shipping, Inc..	1,650,949
12. Ogdan Missouri Transport, Inc.....	1,587,832
13. Archon Marine Co.....	1,434,160
14. Universal American Barge Corp.....	1,298,500
15. Ocean Barge Corp.....	1,267,537
16. Transbulk Carriers, Inc.....	1,115,224

In addition, a total of 14 other companies received payments for ocean freight differentials in 1984 for shipping under titles I and II of Public Law 480 with amounts ranging from \$13,869 to \$852,066.

Mr. Speaker, while I believe that a strong maritime industry is important to the United States, I do not believe that the maritime industry should be permitted to hide the cost of its cargo preference behind agricultural and food assistance programs in the Federal budget. I would recommend that the Federal budget contain a separate line item for financing the cost of cargo preference and that Congress prohibit the use of funds appropriated for Function 150—International Affairs—and Function 350—Agriculture—to finance cargo preference. Congress should also specifically exempt the blended credit program and other short-term programs designed to enhance the export competitiveness of U.S. farm products from cargo preference requirements.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE ANTI-APARTHEID ACT OF 1985

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY III
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 7, 1985

● Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this legislation I am introducing today, titled the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985, imposes economic restrictions against the apartheid government in South Africa that are very similar to the restrictions contained in the Export Administration Act approved by the House of Representatives during the 98th Congress.

There are four significant limitations on American financial support for the apartheid regime contained in this act, all of which have been considered, and approved by the House of Representatives, in some form, in the past, and some of which have a long

legislative history. As recently as last spring, more than 150 Members of the house joined me in writing to the conferees on the Export Administration Act urging them to retain the ban on new U.S. investments overwhelmingly adopted by the House in the first session of the 98th Congress.

The Anti-Apartheid Act prohibits: new American investments in South Africa; bank loans to the South African Public sector; the importation of South African gold coins into the United States; and the export of U.S. computer goods or technology to the South African Government.

This legislation seeks to end economic support for apartheid. At the same time a significant American presence in South Africa would continue as a potential source of positive American influence on the official policies of the openly racist government that controls that country.

One aspect of this legislation that may particularly interest many of my colleagues is the waiver provisions that provide incentives for the minority government to begin the "phased" dismantling of apartheid. Subject to the adoption of a joint resolution of approval, the President is granted the authority to waive, for specified periods of time, the restrictions on the importation of krugerrands, and new U.S. investment in South Africa, if that Government makes substantial progress toward eliminating apartheid.

South Africa is the only country in the world that practices legally mandated racism, most recently celebrating a new constitution that does not acknowledge the existence of 22 million South African citizens.

Since I first introduced legislation banning new U.S. investment in South Africa, in the 98th Congress, conditions for the vast majority of South Africa's citizens have deteriorated, in lockstep with the apartheid regime's public relations campaign to convince us that the minority government is striving for reform.

Only last year, the South African Government undertook yet another forced removal, under its black spot policy. South Africa's legal code requires racial segregation, and in 35 years, 3 million blacks, 800,000 coloreds, and 400 Indians have been forcibly removed to the so-called national states, or Bantustans.

The brutal show of force required to demolish the homes, schools, and yes, churches, in Magopa, a community built over generations by black South African men, women, and children, demonstrates the white supremacist regime's commitment to a system of governance that is alien to civilized societies.

In October of last year, just weeks following the enactment of House Concurrent Resolution 298, a bill calling for their immediate release, the dozens of men and women who had

been held in detention without charge or trial, and under harsh conditions for 6 years following their capture by South African security forces during a bloody raid on a refugee camp in 1978, finally gained their freedom.

I suspect, however, that those people are now free because of international pressure, and because South Africa cynically attempted to deflect attention away from Bishop Tutu's acceptance of the Nobel Peace Prize.

This year, only weeks following the announcement of major reforms, dispensations, and an earnest intention to seek negotiations with South Africa's black leadership, the Government arrested more than a dozen of the most highly respected individuals in the leadership of the largest coalition of nonviolent antiapartheid organizations in South Africa.

As the champion of democracy and human rights in the free world, our allegiance to the principles of freedom and equality are matters of conscience, not convenience. Since the end of the 98th Congress, when the Senate declined to approve measures adopted by the House pertaining to South Africa, it has become ever more clear, that, at best, the United States cannot continue to do business as usual with the apartheid regime.

At worst, our failure to swiftly enact this legislation, will represent the failure of a direct, yet moderate approach which must be taken if our critical economic and strategic interests on the continent of Africa are to be protected—especially in the wake of the growing polarization and violence in southern Africa.

As I said last year, congressional enactment of this legislation will not end apartheid, just as economic sanctions against Poland or the Soviet Union have not ended communism. But as we have demonstrated on so many other occasions, with respect to many different nations, these restrictions will clearly demonstrate that the United States, as a matter of policy, will no longer provide economic support for a repugnant system that, by its very nature, threatens the stability of a strategically critical region of the world.

Mr. Speaker, and distinguished colleagues, I therefore urge you to support the Anti-Apartheid Act of 1985. ●

TOM COLEMAN AND THE PRO-LIFE MOVEMENT

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1985

● Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to call attention to the hard work and strong support exhibited by my colleague from Missouri, TOM COLEMAN, for protecting the lives of the unborn. Since arriving in Congress in 1977, Tom has

been a steadfast supporter of the pro-life movement and his voting record proves it. In his 8 years in the House of Representatives, Congressman COLEMAN has repeatedly voted in favor of antiabortion amendments which I have authored. Designed to end the heinous practices of asking taxpayers to foot the bill for abortions, my amendments have always garnered TOM COLEMAN's support and vote.

I appreciate Tom's support in our ongoing effort to prohibit abortions, to do away with Federal support for taking the life of the unborn, and thus, end this needless waste of human life.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD TOM COLEMAN's outstanding pro-life voting record since coming to Congress.

PRO-LIFE VOTES BY CONGRESSMAN TOM COLEMAN OF MISSOURI

June 17, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 7555).

Aug. 2, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 7555).

Sept. 27, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 7555).

Oct. 12, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 7555).

Oct. 13, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 7555).

Nov. 3, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 7555).

Nov. 29, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 7555).

Dec. 6, 1977—H.J. Res. 662 Continuing Resolution FY 1978.

Dec. 7, 1977—H.J. Res. 662 Continuing Resolution FY 1978.

Dec. 7, 1977—H.J. Res. 662 Continuing Resolution FY 1978.

June 13, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (H.R. 12929).

June 13, 1977—Labor-HEW Appropriations Bill (ban on Medicaid funding of abortions) (H.R. 12929).

July 18, 1978—Pregnancy Disability Bill (H.R. 6075).

Aug. 9, 1978—Department of Defense Appropriations (ban on abortion funding in armed services) (H.R. 13635).

Sept. 6, 1978—Extension of U.S. Civil Rights Commission (banning the USCRC from appraising U.S. abortion law) (H.R. 12432).

Oct. 12, 1978—Labor-HEW Appropriations (ban on Medicaid funding of abortions) (H.R. 12929).

Oct. 14, 1978—Labor-HEW Appropriations FY '79 (H.R. 12929).

June 27, 1979—Labor-HEW Appropriations (ban on Medicaid funding of abortions) (H.R. 4389) FY '80.

July 17, 1979—District of Columbia Appropriations (H.R. 4580).

July 29, 1979—District of Columbia Appropriations (H.R. 4580).

Oct. 9, 1979—Labor-HEW Appropriations (Continuing Resolution through FY '80) (H.J. Res. 413).

Oct. 30, 1979—Labor-HEW Appropriations FY '80 (Ban on Medicaid Funding of Abortions) (H.R. 4389).

Dec. 6, 1979—Child Health Assurance Act of 1979 ("CHAP") (H.R. 4962).

Dec. 6, 1979—Child Health Assurance Act of 1979 ("CHAP") (H.R. 4962).

Dec. 11, 1979—Child Health Assurance Act of 1979 ("CHAP") (H.R. 4962).

Aug. 20, 1980—FY 81 Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations (H.R. 7583).

Sept. 3, 1980—FY 81 District of Columbia Appropriations (H.R. 8061).

Sept. 29, 1980—District of Columbia Appropriations (H.R. 8061).

July 30, 1981—Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Appropriations, 1982 (H.R. 4121).

Sept. 30, 1982—Health Research Extension Act (H.R. 6457).

June 8, 1983—Treasury—Postal Service Appropriations (H.R. 3191).

Oct. 27, 1983—Treasury-Postal Service Appropriations (H.R. 4139).

Nov. 15, 1983—Equal Rights Amendment (H.J. Res. 1).

Feb. 2, 1984—Child Abuse Act (H.R. 1904).

June 27, 1984—Treasury, Post Office and General Government Appropriations Act of 1985 (H.R. 5798). ●

CONTINUED UNFAIRNESS

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 7, 1985

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee I remain concerned about the ratio dispute currently raging within our committee. The ratio proposal put forth by the Democratic caucus of the committee does not reflect the ratio of the full House of Representatives. I believe the American people are the ones suffering as a result of this unfairness. Our constituents do not want their electoral rights violated through diminished representation in the committee process. However, if on the Energy and Commerce Committee, the Democratic caucus proposal prevails, this is exactly what will happen to the American public.

This ratio fight is an issue of principle which will not just go away. The American public has a right to know that their electoral decisions are being ignored in favor of partisan politics. I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of a recent article from the Washington Times which further details this situation. I commend it to my colleagues' attention:

REPUBLICANS SHUN SIX HOUSE PANELS

(By Bill Kling)

Republicans are boycotting the House Energy and Commerce Committee's six subcommittees over refusal of the Democratic majority to increase GOP subcommittee membership in line with Republican congressional election gains last November.

GOP congressmen also are threatening to snarl the full committee's bill-drafting sessions unless the dispute is settled in their favor.

House Democrats and Republicans have negotiated GOP membership increases on other committees in the current Congress, helped along by threat of retaliation against Democratic senators by the Republican Senate majority if the matter were not resolved in favor of the GOP.

Democratic chairmen of at least four of the subcommittees are blocking the additions and are attempting to conduct business without the Republicans, who in turn will attempt to get their licks in when and if legislation is considered by the full committee.